

Notice of meeting and agenda

Transport and Environment Committee

4.00 pm Thursday, 2nd December, 2021

Virtual Meeting - via Microsoft Teams

This is a public meeting and members of the public are welcome to watch the webcast live on the Council's website.

The law allows the Council to consider some issues in private. Any items under "Private Business" will not be published, although the decisions will be recorded in the minute.

Contacts

Email: veronica.macmillan@edinburgh.gov.uk / taylor.ward@edinburgh.gov.uk

Tel: 0131 529 4283

1. Order of Business

- 1.1 Including any notices of motion and any other items of business submitted as urgent for consideration at the meeting.

2. Declaration of Interests

- 2.1 Members should declare any financial and non-financial interests they have in the items of business for consideration, identifying the relevant agenda item and the nature of their interest.

3. Deputations

- 3.1 If any.

4. Minutes

- 4.1 None.

5. Forward Planning

- 5.1 None.

- 5.2 None.

6. Business Bulletin

6.1 None.

7. Executive Decisions

7.1 Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Report) – Report by the Executive Director of Place 5 - 88

Note: Members are advised that the report at 7.1 includes an option, which, if accepted, would require a change to the Transport and Environment Committee item 7.7 of 11 November 2021. This decision can only be changed if the Convener rules a material change of circumstances.

8. Routine Decisions

8.1 None.

9. Motions

9.1 If any.

Nick Smith

Service Director, Legal and Assurance

Committee Members

Councillor Lesley Macinnes (Convener), Councillor Karen Doran (Vice-Convener), Councillor Eleanor Bird, Councillor Maureen Child, Councillor Graham Hutchison, Councillor David Key, Councillor Kevin Lang, Councillor Claire Miller, Councillor Stephanie Smith and Councillor Iain Whyte

Information about the Transport and Environment Committee

The Transport and Environment Committee consists of 11 Councillors and is appointed by the City of Edinburgh Council.

This meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee is being held virtually by Microsoft Teams.

Further information

If you have any questions about the agenda or meeting arrangements, please contact Veronica Macmillan, Committee Services, City of Edinburgh Council, Business Centre 2.1, Waverley Court, 4 East Market Street, Edinburgh EH8 8BG, Tel 0131 529 4283, email veronica.macmillan@edinburgh.gov.uk / taylor.ward@edinburgh.gov.uk.

The agenda, minutes and public reports for this meeting and all the main Council committees can be viewed online by going to the Council's online [Committee Library](#).

Live and archived webcasts for this meeting and all main Council committees can be viewed online by going to the Council's [Webcast Portal](#).

Webcasting of Council meetings

Please note this meeting may be filmed for live and subsequent broadcast via the Council's internet site – at the start of the meeting the Convener will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being filmed.

The Council is a Data Controller under current Data Protection legislation. We broadcast Council meetings to fulfil our public task obligation to enable members of the public to observe the democratic process. Data collected during this webcast will be retained in accordance with the Council's published policy including, but not limited to, for the purpose of keeping historical records and making those records available via the Council's internet site.

Any information presented by individuals to the Council at a meeting, in a deputation or otherwise, in addition to forming part of a webcast that will be held as a historical record, will also be held and used by the Council in connection with the relevant matter until that matter is decided or otherwise resolved (including any potential appeals and other connected processes). Thereafter, that information will continue to be held as part of the historical record in accordance with the paragraphs above.

If you have any queries regarding this, and, in particular, if you believe that use and/or storage of any particular information would cause, or be likely to cause, substantial damage or distress to any individual, please contact Committee Services (committee.services@edinburgh.gov.uk).

Transport and Environment Committee

4.00pm, Thursday, 2 December 2021

Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Update)

Executive/routine Wards Council Commitments	Executive All
---	------------------

1. Recommendations

This report recommends that the Committee:

- 1.1 notes the contents of the report and the responses from the statutory public consultation on the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO):
- 1.2 sets aside the objections, having considered the content of the 218 objections received; and to agree to proceed with the trialling of the proposed measures under and ETRO;
- 1.3 approves the making of the ETRO as advertised; and
- 1.4 notes, subject to law, that because this report is being brought back to Committee within a six month period, in accordance with the Council's Interim Standing Orders (30.1(a)), a decision of the Committee cannot be changed by the Committee within six months unless the Convener rules there has been a material change of circumstances.

Andrew Kerr
Chief Executive

Contact: Veronica MacMillan, Committee Officer
Legal and Assurance Division, Corporate Services Directorate
Email: veronica.macmillan@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 529 4283

Report

Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Update)

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 The Transport and Environment Committee is asked to reconsider the Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Update) report that was brought before the Transport and Environment Committee on 11 November 2021 in order to fully comply with the quasi-judicial process for ETROs and to ensure good governance.

3. Background

- 3.1 At the Transport and Environment Committee of 11 November 2021 a decision was taken on the setting aside of objections in relation to an ETRO for Brunstane Road. There were two declarations of interests from members of the committee. If a member declares an interest in a quasi-judicial item they should not take part in consideration of the relevant item. To ensure good governance it is recommended that this item is re-considered.

4. Main report

- 4.1 At the Transport and Environment Committee of 11 November 2021, the Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Update) report was considered by Committee. The decision taken by Committee was in division and details can be found in Appendix 1
- 4.2 After the meeting it came to light that there were two declarations of interests from members of the Committee. If a member declares an interest in a quasi-judicial item they should not take part in consideration of the relevant item. Advice was provided from the Head of Democracy, Governance and Resilience that due to the correct process not being fully complied with the item should be re-submitted for re-consideration.
- 4.3 It should be noted that the report is being brought back to the Committee within a six month period. Subject to law, a decision of the Committee cannot be changed by the Committee within six months unless the Convener rules there has been a material change of circumstances. The material change of circumstance is that since the decision, it has come to light that the process for quasi-judicial items was not followed correctly and is required to be re-considered.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 For Committee to reconsider the Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Report), subject to the Convener ruling, in accordance with 30.1(a) of the Council's Interim Standing Orders that there has been a material change of circumstances.

6. Financial impact

- 6.1 Not applicable.

7. Stakeholder/Community Impact

- 7.1 Not applicable.

8. Background reading/external references

- 8.1 None.

9. Appendices

- 9.1 Appendix 1 – Decision taken by Transport Environment Committee, 11 November 2021
- 9.2 Appendix 2 – Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Update) – report by the Executive Director of Place

Appendix 1 - Decision of the Transport and Environment Committee of 11 November 2021

Motion

- 1) To note the previous Committee decision of 28 January 2021 instructing the progress of the scheme.
 - 2) To note the contents of the report and the responses from the statutory public consultation on the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO).
 - 3) To set aside the objections, having considered the content of the 218 objections received; and to agree to proceed with the trialling of the proposed measures under and ETRO
 - 4) To approve the making of the ETRO as advertised.
- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment

- 1) To note that the full ETRO public consultation showed an even higher proportion of the wider population being against the closure with 74% indicating their opposition with 211 lodging an objection. Committee
 - 2) To therefore agree to abandon the ETRP process and that officers would re-examine alternative measures for Brunstane Road such as parking controls and/or an HGV ban.
- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Smith

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	7 votes
For the Amendment	-	4 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Burgess, Child, Doran, Key, Miller and Macinnes.

For the Amendment: Councillors Lang, Rose, Smith and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday, 11 November 2021

Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Update)

Executive/routine Wards Council Commitments	Executive Craigmillar-Portobello Ward 16, 19
---	--

1. Recommendations

- 1.1 This report recommends that the Committee:
 - 1.1.1 Recalls the previous Committee decision of [28 January 2021](#) instructing the progress of this scheme;
 - 1.1.2 Notes the contents of this report and the responses from the statutory public consultation on the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO);
 - 1.1.3 Sets aside the objections, having considered the content of the 218 objections received, and agrees to proceed with the trialling of the proposed measures under an ETRO; and
 - 1.1.4 Approves the making of the ETRO as advertised.

Gareth Barwell

Service Director, Operational Services

Contact: Cliff Hutt, Service Manager – Roads and Transport Infrastructure

E-mail: cliff.hutt@edinburgh.gov.uk | Tel: 0131 469 3751

Report

Brunstane Road Closure (ETRO Progress Update)

2. Executive Summary

- 2.1 Brunstane Road is a residential street to the east of Portobello which forms a route between Milton Road East to the south and Joppa Road to the north. It has been subject to longstanding traffic problems south of the bridge over the railway line due to a combination of narrow road width, traffic volumes and parking, resulting in traffic congestion, damage to parked vehicles and instances of anti-social behaviour from drivers.
- 2.2 As a means of addressing this, the Transport and Environment Committee, on 28 January 2021, agreed to trial the closure of Brunstane Road to motorised vehicles, together with complementary traffic management measures introduced within the Coillesdene area, through the introduction of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO).
- 2.3 This report highlights the response to the statutory consultation for the ETRO, which shows that those who live on Brunstane Road are generally supportive of the proposed ETRO, while those who indicated that they do not live on Brunstane Road are opposed.

3. Background

- 3.1 Residents on Brunstane Road, between Milton Road and the railway bridge, have experienced long-standing traffic problems due to a combination of the narrow width of the road, increasing volumes of traffic and the general increase in the physical size of vehicles. This has resulted in numerous instances of traffic congestion, anti-social behaviour by drivers and conflict with residents whose cars have frequently been damaged.
- 3.2 At its meeting of [28 January 2021](#), the Transport and Environment Committee agreed to the introduction of an ETRO to permit the closure of Brunstane Road at the railway overbridge, while still permitting a through route for pedestrians and cyclists. The Committee also agreed to the introduction of traffic calming measures within the Coillesdene area to discourage any displaced traffic from seeking an alternative route via this residential area.

4. Main report

- 4.1 It is widely acknowledged that there are traffic problems on Brunstane Road. This is due to a variety of factors including the width of the carriageway, parking, traffic volumes and vehicle types.
- 4.2 A number of options were explored and views sought, following which it was determined that the closure of Brunstane Road to through vehicular traffic at the railway bridge, just north of Brunstane Gardens, in conjunction with traffic management interventions in the Coillesdene area, was the most appropriate way to address the issue.
- 4.3 This preferred option was discussed at 28 January 2021 Transport and Environment Committee and approval was granted to implement the restrictions using an ETRO.
- 4.4 The key stages of promoting an ETRO include; statutory consultation, placing the draft order on public deposit, assessing objections and finalising the ETRO.
- 4.5 The first stage of statutory consultation commenced on 9 July 2021. This informed statutory consultees that the City of Edinburgh Council were proposing to promote an ETRO (Appendices 1 and 2).
- 4.6 One supportive comment from Spokes was received. Spokes noted the promotion of active travel and improved safety of vulnerable users as important factors in introducing the scheme (Appendix 3). No adverse comments were received from the statutory consultees during this stage of the process.
- 4.7 The full public ETRO consultation commenced on 1 October 2021 by means of a press advert and via the Council website.
- 4.8 Interested parties (those groups and individuals who have expressed a keen interest in the proposal) were also notified via email that the consultation period for the ETRO was about to commence.
- 4.9 Feedback received from the ETRO statutory public consultation is provided in Appendix 4. There were 66 supporting responses and 218 objections noted. There were two responses that included comments only and one objection was withdrawn during the consultation period. These are excluded from the above number.
- 4.10 An overall analysis of the feedback shows:
 - 4.10.1 Of residents who indicated that they lived on Brunstane Road (54 of 284 responses), 87% (47 responses) supported the proposed ETRO and 13% (7 responses) objected to the proposed ETRO; and
 - 4.10.2 Of residents who indicated that they lived at a non-Brunstane Road address (230 of 284 responses), 8% (19 responses) supported the proposed ETRO and 92% (211 responses) objected to the proposed ETRO.
- 4.11 Those supporting the proposal have generally expressed the following (a breakdown of the supporting comments is shown in Appendix 5):

Appendix 2

- 4.11.1 That there are longstanding traffic issues on Brunstane Road that need to be addressed. The short-cutting has resulted in property damage (damage to parked vehicles) and aggressive, anti-social behaviour towards the residents of Brunstane Road;
 - 4.11.2 That Brunstane Road was not designed to have this level or classification of vehicles (HGVs) using the street as a through route. Owing to the single lane available for through traffic, short-cutting vehicles often save no time due to the conflicts encountered with oncoming vehicles. The strategic routes are better suited and provide more reliable journey times; and
 - 4.11.3 The proposal will make it safer for residents and active travel users, improving quality of life and community interaction.
- 4.12 While supporting comments are noted, the legal purpose of the consultation is to allow objections associated with the ETRO to be considered (Appendix 4).
- 4.13 Therefore, all objections must be considered by the Committee prior to approving the order. Once the objections have been considered, the decision to proceed with the ETRO, by setting aside the objections, can be made.
- 4.14 Those objecting to the proposed ETRO have generally expressed the following (a breakdown of the objections is shown in Appendix 5):
- 4.14.1 That the proposal moves traffic elsewhere, particularly into the Coillesdene area increasing the number of heavy vehicles in the area, affecting more residents than those living on Brunstane Road;
 - 4.14.2 The closure of Brunstane Road directs local traffic down the already congested roads of Brighton Place, Eastfield / Milton Road East and Sir Harry Lauder Road / Portobello High Street;
 - 4.14.3 That the proposal requires traffic to take a longer journey resulting in higher levels of vehicle emissions and increased speeds through residential areas;
 - 4.14.4 That other options remain the favoured way forward to address the issues on Brunstane Road e.g. one-way option, or parking restrictions. An area-wide approach is required;
 - 4.14.5 That the proposal reduces access for emergency vehicles; and
 - 4.14.6 That the Committee has ignored the majority view of residents expressed in December 2020, with 72% of the community against the proposal.
- 4.15 Council officers have considered the above objections and would highlight that the proposal is experimental in nature and all aspects of the trial will be monitored throughout the 18-month period to assess the effects on the wider road network. There is currently no indication or supporting evidence that road safety will be compromised within the surrounding areas as a result of the trial; all of the surrounding roads affected by the proposed measures are within the 20mph zone.
- 4.16 The Council has a statutory duty under the Local Air Quality Management regime (Environment Act 1995), to review and assess ambient air quality. The monitoring site nearest the proposed scheme is located at Portobello High Street; results

indicate that the Air Quality objectives are being met at this location, thus there are no immediate concerns related to the small number of additional vehicles that may use this strategic route if Brunstane Road was closed.

- 4.17 Several options were explored to address the problems with the aim of substantially reducing or eliminating through traffic on Brunstane Road. Options that were ruled out, such as making Brunstane Road one-way, or introducing parking restrictions, do not adequately address the problems caused by through traffic and were discounted on that basis.
- 4.18 At a discussion with the Scottish Fire and Rescue Service (SFRS) and Police Scotland in December 2020, a minor concern regarding the proposal and how it could affect response times was raised. These concerns were generally allayed as it was explained that the majority of traffic calming in the Coillesdene area would still physically allow access for a fire tender. It was also established that the SFRS did not routinely use Brunstane Road as a through route due to the width of the carriageway and the likelihood of meeting oncoming traffic. Notwithstanding this, no further comments were received from any of the emergency services when input was sought from all statutory consultees in July 2021. Again, no response was received from the emergency services in October 2021 during the public consultation period.
- 4.19 Further pre-closure traffic surveys have been undertaken in the immediate and surrounding area, providing a baseline for future surveys to be compared against should this proposal be implemented. The surveys show that approximately 2,200 vehicles per day currently use Brunstane Road. General vehicles account for 90% of the traffic: 6.4% are HGVs and 3.6% are two-wheel vehicles (i.e. motorcycles and bicycles).
- 4.20 Approximately 4,700 vehicles per day currently use Southfield Place (Brighton Place corridor). General vehicles account for 88.4% of the traffic: 7.3% are HGVs and 4.3% are two-wheel vehicles (i.e. motorcycles and bicycles).
- 4.21 Experience has shown that it can take a considerable period for driver behaviour to adapt to any changes on the network. Thus, the implications of the trial on the surrounding network will be monitored through further traffic surveys, inspections by officers and feedback from the local community.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 If the recommendations of the report are approved:
 - 5.1.1 The temporary on-street infrastructure required to implement the order will be procured and installed during November/December 2021; and
 - 5.1.2 A further update will be provided to Committee once the trial is in operation.

6. Financial impact

- 6.1 The trial will be funded through the capital renewals budget.
- 6.2 The cost of the trial, including all surveys and temporary measures, is estimated at £60,000.

7. Stakeholder/Community Impact

- 7.1 Statutory consultation has been carried out as part of the ETRO process.
- 7.2 It is expected that the proposed infrastructure will advance equality of opportunity on the transport network. The proposal encourages participation in active travel, enabling the health and social benefits associated with active travel. In addition, the proposal promotes an increased awareness of vulnerable road users and encourages road users to share space.
- 7.3 The Council's Waste and Cleansing service has agreed that their operations will be unaffected by the proposals.
- 7.4 The proposal is in line with policies and actions contained in the Council's [Local Development Plan](#) and [City Mobility Plan 2021-2030](#).

8. Background reading/external references

- 8.1 Transport and Environment Committee Report, [28 January 2021](#), Item 7.4
- 8.2 Portobello Community Council [Consultation](#) 10-27 March 2020

9. Appendices

- 9.1 Appendix 1: Draft Order (Brunstane Traffic Management ETRO)
- 9.2 Appendix 2: Trial Infrastructure Drawing
- 9.3 Appendix 3: ETRO Statutory Consultation Feedback (July 2021)
- 9.4 Appendix 4: Feedback from the Public Advertisement of the ETRO (October 2021)
- 9.5 Appendix 5: Summary of objections and supporting comments
- 9.6 Appendix 6: Traffic Survey Data (8 – 14 October 2021)

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL (TRAFFIC REGULATION; BRUNSTANE TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT) (NO _) EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC ORDER 202_ - TRO/21/13

The City of Edinburgh Council in exercise of their powers under sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984¹ as amended (which Act as so amended is hereinafter referred to as "the 1984 Act"), and of all other enabling powers, and after consultation with the Chief Constable in accordance with Part III of Schedule 9 to the 1984 Act, hereby make the following Order:

Citation, commencement and expiry

1. This Order may be cited as "The City of Edinburgh Council (Traffic Regulation; Prescribed Routes) (No _) Experimental Traffic Order 202_", shall come into force on the ---- day of ---- Two thousand and ----, and shall expire on the ---- day of ---- Two thousand and ----.

Interpretation

2. (1) In this Order, except where the context otherwise requires, the follow expressions have the meanings hereby respectively assigned to them:
 - ” Chief Constable” means the Chief Constable of Police Scotland;
 - “electronic communications network” has the same meaning as in section 32 of the Communications Act 2003²;
 - “pedal cycle” has the same meaning as in section 151 of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984³;
 - "Schedule" means a Schedule to this Order; and
 - “traffic sign” means a sign of any size, type and colour prescribed and authorised under, or having effect as though prescribed or authorised under section 64 of the 1984 Act.
- (2) The restrictions imposed by this Order shall be in addition to and not in derogation of any restriction or requirement imposed by any regulations made under the 1984 Act or by or under any other enactment.

One Way Roads and Prohibitions of Motor Vehicles

3. (1) Save as provided in Article 4(1) of this Order, no person shall cause or permit any vehicle to proceed in a length of road specified in columns (1) and (2) of the table in Schedule 1 in a direction other than that specified in column (3) of that table.
- (2) Save as provided in Articles 4(1) and (2) of this Order, no person shall cause or permit any motor vehicle to enter into or proceed in a length of road specified in columns (1) and (2) of the table in Schedule 2 to this Order.

¹ 1984 c.27

² 2003 c.21

³ 1984 c.54

Exceptions and exemptions

4. (1) Nothing in Articles 3(1) and (2) of this Order shall apply in relation to
- (a) a vehicle being used for ambulance, fire brigade or police purposes; or
 - (b) anything done with the permission or at the direction of a police constable in uniform or a traffic warden;
 - (c) any person who causes a vehicle to proceed in accordance with any restriction or requirement indicated by traffic signs placed pursuant to section 66 or 67 of the 1984 Act.
- (2) Nothing in Article 3(2) of this Order shall apply in relation to: -
- (a) a pedal cycle; or
 - (b) a vehicle being used in connection with the laying, erection, alteration, or repair in or adjacent to a length of road specified in Schedule 2 to this Order of any sewer, main, pipe or apparatus for the supply of gas, water, electricity, or of any electronic communications network; or the placing, maintenance or removal of any traffic sign, if the vehicle cannot be used for that purpose in any other road or length of road.

Power to modify or suspend this Order

5. In pursuance of Section 10(2) of the 1984 Act, the City of Edinburgh Council's Executive Director of Place or an officer of the Council to whom power has been duly delegated, may, if it appears to them or that person essential in the interests of the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic, or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which any road affected by this Order runs, after consultation with the Chief Constable, modify or suspend this Order or any provision thereof.

Executed by The City of Edinburgh Council this ----day of ---- Two thousand and ----.

(witness)

Signed on behalf of Executive Director of Place









SCHEDULE 1
ONE-WAY ROADS



<i>(1)</i> <i>Road in Edinburgh</i>	<i>(2)</i> <i>Length of road</i>	<i>(3)</i> <i>Direction of one-way traffic</i>
Milton Drive	From a point 2.5 metres or thereby south of the southern kerb-line of Seaview Crescent to its junction with Seaview Crescent.	From south to north.
Milton Drive	From a point 3.0 metres or thereby north of the north-western kerb-line of Milton Road East to its junction with Milton Road East.	From north to south.
Milton Terrace (South)	From a point 2.5 metres or thereby south-east of the southern kerb-line of Coillesdene Avenue to its junction with Coillesdene Avenue.	From south to north.

SCHEDULE 2
PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES


<i>(1)</i> <i>Road in Edinburgh</i>	<i>(2)</i> <i>Length of road</i>
Brunstane Road	From a point 6.5 metres or thereby south of the southern kerb-line of Joppa Station Place to a point 74.5 metres or thereby south of the southern kerb-line of Joppa Station Place.
Coillesdene Crescent	From a point 3.5 metres or thereby north-west of the north-western kerb-line of Milton Road East to a point 2.5 metres or thereby north-west of the north-western kerb-line of Milton Road East.

NOTES:

-  Signs mounted on temporary concrete base
-  Planter
-  Temporary rubber kerbs
-  No entry except cycles signs
-  One way / cycle contraflow signs
-  Traffic priority sign
-  Opposing traffic priority sign
-  Cycles only sign



This map is reproduced from Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.
100023420 (2020)



REVISION	DETAILS	BY	DATE	CHECKED

EDINBURGH
THE CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL

The City of Edinburgh Council
Waverley Court
4 East Market Street
Edinburgh, EH8 8BG
Telephone: 0131 200 2000

PLACE MANAGEMENT
ROADS AND TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE
TRANSPORT CONTRACTS AND DESIGN

Coillesdene Area
Proposed Temporary Traffic Measures

Date: July 2021
Scale: NTS @A0
Job No. 000016
Drawn by: A Parkinson
Checked by: K Teather

ETRO Statutory Consultation Feedback (July 2021)

Spokes Party is a local Spokes Lothian group. We are working to make walking, wheeling, and cycling safe, easy and fun for everyone in and around Edinburgh East.

Spokes Party strongly supports the Brunstane Road ETRO to close through traffic in Brunstane Road, and associated traffic calming in the Coillesdene area. Brunstane Road is an important strategic link for cycling. It should provide a safe and direct cycling route between Portobello and: the National Cycle Network Route 1; shopping destinations such as Asda, the Range and Fort Kinnaird; the Innocent Railway Path to the city; and other leisure and commuting routes. It is currently overwhelmed with traffic, and is considered too dangerous by many people, particularly those with children, to use on cycles. Many are forced to use indirect and complicated routes, for example going through the Magdalenes. Many people have commented to us on how safe it felt when it was temporarily closed to through traffic during the Brighton Place works. This was evidenced through the demand to open the barriers to cyclists at the time.

We agree that the residents at the southern end of Brunstane Road should not have to suffer the negative consequences of rat running in a narrow residential street. It is unsafe for some disabled people, children, and pets. It is also deeply unpleasant, with reports of abuse by some drivers, and damage to parked vehicles.

We also agree that taking an area-wide approach, with a lengthy trial period, is the best thing to do. Evidence from throughout the UK shows that schemes similar to this take several months to settle down. The trial would allow the Council to monitor impacts and address any unintended consequences within or outside the scheme, for example in Brighton Place.

Evidence also shows that before such schemes are implemented, there is noisy opposition by some groups. However, once the schemes have been in place, and tweaked/adapted where required, there is overwhelming support for them. See for example the recent report from the Walking and Cycling Alliance (The urgent case for more walking and cycling in the UK).

We believe that this scheme, over time, would help reduce traffic (traffic evaporation) and encourage people to switch from cars to active travel modes for short trips. Portobello is increasingly dominated by traffic and parked vehicles with all the negative consequences this entails. We would like to see the scheme expanded over time across the whole area, implementing the sustainable travel hierarchy with low traffic neighbourhoods, and putting walking, wheeling, cycling and bus use above use of the private car (excluding blue badge holders). This would contribute to the Council's own policies on climate change, air quality, and increasing active travel.

We would like to see, as an added benefit to the scheme, a safe practical convenient crossing from Brunstane Road over Milton Road East for people walking, wheeling, and cycling. This would increase the likelihood of people taking the opportunity to walk/cycle instead of driving to the locations mentioned above and would vastly enhance the scheme.

Finally, an effective tailored and on-going communications strategy will be essential to help people understand why the scheme is being undertaken and the benefits that are expected to accrue. Lessons need to be learned from similar schemes undertaken across the UK by other local authorities. Communications should include positive and attractive signage and barriers in the scheme. Signs should welcome those who can go through streets with barriers. For example, 'road open to...' signs rather than 'road closed.'

With best wishes,

On behalf of Spokes Party.

Email: SpokesParty@gmail.com

Response	Comments
Comment	I wish to comment on the above road closure. I am not against it in general however there are no restrictions on our road, Coillesdene Avenue to slow down the problem we already have with speeding cars. The problem in particular stems from speeding cars approaching from the Musselburgh direction.
Comment	I would like to add a comment on the proposal for Brunstane Road. I would like to see this road changing to one way. There are lots of disputes and angry motorists with the present 2 way traffic.
Object	<p>the purpose of this amendment is to close one of the elements of the proposed implementation of the ETRO (Oct 2021), by preventing the closure to motor vehicles of the east over the bridge at Brunstane Road (prevention of motor vehicles in Brunstane Road between points of junction with Joppa Station Place").</p> <p>My name and address are provided at the bottom of this email. I live at the junction between Brunstane Road (just south of the bridge) and Brunstane Gardens and therefore I have particularly intimate knowledge of the traffic situation in immediate area and of the effects of the previous, expended temporary closure of this same part of the road to motor vehicles which was set up while Brighton Place was closed to traffic (I think this ended in 2019). My direct experience during the period of this previous closure has informed my view on the current proposal.</p> <p>Grounds of my objection:</p> <p>1) The proposed closure will not promote a quieter neighbourhood. I note that one of the purposes of this experimental traffic order is to promote quiet local neighbourhoods. I do not think the proposed closure will promote quiet local neighbourhoods for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The previous experience described above shows that this effect is very limited. While there will obviously be no traffic coming over the bridge from the northern part of Brunstane Road if the closure goes ahead, and traffic using Brunstane Road as a through-road between Milton Road East and Joppa Road will be prevented, it is apparent that all of the traffic that services properties in the southern part of Brunstane Road, Brunstane Gardens, the allotments and the bowling club will be obliged to turn around and travel back the way they came along the southern part of Brunstane Road, rather than continuing northwards along Brunstane Road. The traffic involved here, both private, public and commercial and serving local homes and activities, is not insubstantial, and will have to go both ways. The turning tends to take place at the junction of Brunstane Road and Brunstane Gardens as the street itself is narrow. • I am aware that there are neighbours of mine in Brunstane Road that have been taking photographs of larger vehicles which they feel should not be using the road, and of 'stand-offs' when two vehicles going in opposite directions along Brunstane Road have difficulty passing each other. However, these photographs are highly selective and do not represent the true traffic situation. For most of 2020, I worked from home on my first floor, overlooking the junction with Brunstane Road and Brunstane Gardens. Most of the time there is no traffic at all, and most of the traffic consists of cars. I do hope the council is not swayed by people who have carried out a sustained campaign to get what they want but which is not necessarily a balanced view of what others in the neighbourhood want. If the overall volume of traffic is the issue, this should be measured properly using unbiased methods, and the effects of closing the road and forcing traffic to travel back the way they came should be assessed. • It is true that occasionally there are 'stand-offs' on Brunstane Road but mostly drivers are almost always considerate and pragmatic in pulling in to allow others to pass. My own feeling is that the narrowness of the road serves to slow the traffic, and that the possibility of not being able to rush along Brunstane Road will put off drivers in a hurry from coming this way, once they know how narrow the road is. • Closing the road at the bridge will not prevent the possibility of stand-offs as all traffic that uses the road will have to use it in both directions. • From the previous closure of Brunstane Road at this point, it was apparent that the motor traffic journeys that would have gone over the bridge at Brunstane Road were simply displaced to other roads. I know that my own essential car journeys were generally much longer and I spent more time in traffic on other roads, especially the Harry Lauder Road, Milton Road East, Joppa Road and the smaller roads in the Coillesdene area than I would normally do. Deliveries to my home, and taxi services, were regularly delayed and more expensive due to the additional distance travelled. Any quietening of the immediate neighbourhood was slight and was offset by increased traffic in other nearby neighbourhoods. <p>2) The proposed closure will result in less sustainable motor traffic due to additional road-miles resulting from the diversion of traffic (please refer to my last bullet point above). The increased road miles will result in overall greater atmospheric emissions (contributing to greenhouse gas emissions and local air pollution) and traffic noise. I do not think that this road closure will result in choices to cycle or walk rather than drive. I and my neighbours already cycle and walk when possible. It simply means that motor vehicle journeys will be longer.</p> <p>3) The proposed closure creates an unnecessary barrier/division in the local neighbourhood. My overriding feeling the last time the road was blocked at the bridge was of being disconnected from the rest of Joppa and Portobello. Any necessary car journeys to Portobello (e.g. for a large shop at the co-op) or for a drive</p>
Object	<p>I object to the suggested Road closure. It is scandalous that the whole road should even be considered for road closure creating extended journeys for many and putting additional pressure on surrounding areas. I appreciate there is a concern at how congested this road can be at times. This could be alleviated by making it one way in the northerly direction towards Portobello. I trust that the committee will see sense and not pass this traffic order.</p>
Object	<p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colliedene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examined the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about children's safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of whom own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road Safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p>
Object	I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.
Object	We would like to object to the proposal to close this road (TRO/21/13).
Object	It is an important road to connect to Joppa and Portobello and its closure will push traffic onto other roads - including Park Ave - which is also a busy road and one that has a lot of school children on it. This area has already become busier due to the closing of Stanley Street- which we also think should be reopened. Do not close Brunstane Road- with all the new housing in the area, as many roads as possible need to be open to traffic to spread the traffic out.

Page 21

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order covering changes around the Brunstane Road Area on the following grounds:</p> <p>1 - Closure of this road will displace traffic onto other roads in the area. Traffic from surrounding streets North of the closure will have to take considerably longer journeys thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. When the road was previously closed, accessing the bypass from St Marks Lane took an extra 10-15 minutes and traffic was noticeably greater around our streets as people used Argyle Crescent, St Marks ok and Hope Ln North to avoid High Street congestion accessing into the Harry Lauder</p> <p>2 - The council should be prioritising activities targeting areas which have a record of accidents and serious injury. Brunstane Toad appears to be a low priority in this respect yet. I work has been done on the junction of the High St and the Harry Lauder road where there have been recent cyclist deaths. Moving more traffic towards this junction is likely to make it more dangerous for cyclists.</p> <p>3 - The Statement of reasons is flawed, when it aims "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. In fact, what this closure does is provide a car park for many of the residents on Brunstane Road rather than discouraging car use. With the pavement parking regulations coming into force, I can understand that the road width will be further limited but this would suggest a one way system would be better suited than a closure, possibly with removing parking down one side as will occur elsewhere in Portobello. Much of the discussion at recent consultations was focussed on enabling parking for residents on this street which incidentally falls outside the controlled parking zone proposals. This goes against the promotion of active travel.</p> <p>4 - It has also been widely reported that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides in this area. FOI requests regarding the closure and individual councillors involvement have gone unanswered. This is of great concern regarding the potential conflict of interest.</p> <p>5 - This does not seem to be an appropriate time to perform an experimental traffic study. With traffic and working patterns remaining very different due to the continued impact of covid, I would suggest that any research would be better postponed until public transport goes back to pre pandemic numbers.</p> <p>6 - For the CPZ proposal, the council have commented that it could not be a temporary trial due to the costs of putting it in place if it then had to be removed later. There seems to be no assurance that budget will still exist to remove these measures after the trial if continued objection is received.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed ETRO TRO/21/13 for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. When the proposals were presented to councillors, when asked what would happen to Brighton Place with displaced traffic, council officials stated that they proposed to put double yellow lines along the east side of Brighton Place to improve traffic flow. Since then, the council have carried out a consultation on parking in Portobello showing this area as residents' parking. Both cannot be true. There appears to be no coherent plan for how traffic displacement will be managed by this TRO.</p> <p>2. My daughter was struck by a car on her way to school the last time Brunstane Road was closed. Vehicles were forced to turn in the limited space at the bottom of the closed road and this led to a vehicle striking my daughter. Luckily, her bag took most of the impact and she was not injured but the incident illustrates that this scheme is not safe for pedestrians.</p> <p>3. On several occasions, I have had to call ambulances that have then used Brunstane Road to access the hospital. The increased journey time to the hospital is a real risk to people's lives and should not be allowed.</p> <p>4. As for ambulances, response times for fire engines will be dangerously increased.</p> <p>5. No consideration has been given to alternatives to full closure such as parking restrictions on the road.</p> <p>6. This road has been a key route into Portobello for over a hundred years. To displace the traffic from this route through residential areas is unjustified and unfair.</p> <p>7. This is not an "experimental" TRO. It was in place during the closure of Brighton Place for the setts work. It caused chaos at the time. We know it is a bad idea. This is not an experiment.</p>
Object	<p>I write to object in the strongest way possible to the ETRO that involves closing Brunstane Road and installing traffic calming measures into the Coillesdenes. This seems the worst possible solution to a situation that could be handled so much more creatively and with better outcomes. Why is this being rushed through? The road is a vital connecting road. Closing it will simply displace traffic onto other roads, increasing the amount of pollution, and increasing the journeys of everyone who needs to get from the Milton Link to Portobello. This will make it more dangerous for children walking/cycling/scooting to school from these streets also.</p> <p>This is not joined up thinking at all.</p> <p>Why not move all the car parking onto one side, organised in a diagonal fashion and make the rest of the space a "shared space" where pedestrians are king/queen. Get rid of curbs etc. and have a nice flat surface across the entire space for wheelchair users. Reduce the speed limit to 5 or 10 mph and ENFORCE it. The road can stay open, but by making this a shared space, it will become - and/or made clear - that here the pedestrian takes priority, and that car drivers are tolerated rather than prioritised. It would be SO MUCH easier for ambulances, wheelchair users, bin lorries and indeed residents and road users. I implore you NOT to simply close the road - which just creates new problems and/or moves the same problem elsewhere.</p>
Object	<p>I and all my neighbours below the bridge in Brunstane Road are totally against this proposed closure. Bearing in mind it will only benefit the residents in the top half of the road. These selfish people bought their houses knowing that it was a through road to Portobello and only a handful have drive inns. Recently Brighton Place was again closed and traffic was diverted down Brunstane Road. Minutes count in emergencies and if a fire engine or ambulance was needed it's not a few minutes taking an alternative route, it could be someone's life. Take note Edinburgh Council think of the many not the few. A sensible alternative is making the whole of Brunstane Road One-way.</p>
Object	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals for the ETRO with regard to proposals to close Brunstane Road at the bridge and also introduce further traffic calming measures to the surrounding Colliedene area.</p> <p>I fully appreciate the concerns of local residents however I believe that complete closure is wrong and simply appeases the residents of one street while causing significant disruption for a whole community.</p> <p>1. There are limited routes in and out of Portobello with significant traffic. Closing Brunstane Road further directs local traffic down already congested roads of Brighton Place, Eastfield/Milton Road and Harry Lauder/Portobello High Street.</p> <p>2. The junction at Eastfield is unsuitable for the traffic from Portobello turning right on Milton Road due to parked cars and also doesn't take into account the proposals for cycle lanes at this junction too.</p> <p>3. The previous consultation of residents was not in agreement with the proposals, the only people who wanted it were the residents of Brunstane Road south of the bridge. The residents of Colliedene were not in agreement due to the restrictions on their access to Milton Road.</p> <p>4. There would be access issues for emergency vehicles. For example if you live in Joppa Station Place the route via Milton Road/Eastfield is an additional 1.7miles and at least an extra 5 minutes in time.</p> <p>I think there are other solutions such as parking on one side of Brunstane Road only with a cycle lane, perhaps one way only with a cycle lane. If closure of Brunstane Road is required then it actually makes more sense to close the road at Milton Road due to the congestion at the main junction there. There needs to be some joined up thinking about the proposals for CPZ in Portobello, the plans to extending cycle ways from Portobello to Musselburgh, and the traffic flow in general along with this project.</p>
Object	<p>As a resident of Brunstane Road North I object to the proposed order for the following reasons:</p> <p>i) No mention/allowance has been made about the longer time it will take Fire, Ambulance and Police emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point beside the East Coast railway bridge on Brunstane Road.</p> <p>ii) It is surely unfair that residents living in Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and mid Coillesdene Avenue will have to accept all the cars/lorries flowing through the area, albeit some one-way. Also residents in Morton Street and Coillesdene Drive (north part) would have to accept some additional displaced traffic flow.</p> <p>iii) No mention/allowance had been made for residents in Eastfield Gardens/Coillesdene Avenue for traffic using their streets as a method of avoiding additional traffic build- up</p> <p>iv) That speed reduction measures are planned for mid Coillesdene Avenue is an admission that through traffic still using our area will tend to speed to make up for the longer journey time/distance caused by the proposed closure. As our area has a sizeable elderly population and some young families, this is a point of concern.</p> <p>v) Brunstane Road has been a main thoroughfare into and out from Portobello for well over 100 years and traffic problems are largely due to their residents parking cars and vans in the carriageway/on the pavement in front of older houses not built with driveways.</p> <p>vi) As far as we are aware, no traffic survey has been carried out to identify who is currently travelling on Brunstane Road, where they are from, going to, and for what reason! Also, what route would they take if this road was closed and the ETRO implemented?</p> <p>vii) Thought should be given at this time to the 1,300 houses proposed for Brunstane Farm where a point of exit will be onto Milton Road East -beside the Cemetery, and some of this new traffic will inevitably wish to travel north through our area.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I write to object to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road, which is reckless to the point of endangering lives. As one of only two roads into Portobello/Joppa from the south it is an essential access route for emergency services, especially the fire station at Newcraighall. Brighton Place has been repeatedly closed in the last few years, most recently for several days a few weeks ago and every time we have seen that the impact on traffic Portobello High St and Joppa Road is severe. Access via Brunstane Road is vital to avoid delays should there be an incident blocking Portobello High St/ Joppa Road requiring the rapid attendance of emergency services.</p> <p>The closure is an extreme response to the concerns of some Brunstane Road residents before any other alleviating measures have been tested. Why have chicanes or parking limited to one side of Brunstane Road not been tried? The interests of the rest of the residents of Portobello and Joppa and the concerns of the emergency services must be taken into account.</p>
Object	<p>I urge you to reject the proposed closure.</p> <p>The comments below have been already submitted by another Portobello Resident. But since they fully encapsulate our views, I would am submitting them as our formal objection, for all the reasons contained therein.</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colliedene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examined the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year reporting period, the last, minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>Can I say how tired I am of being 'consulted' on this subject. Colliedene residents association, a letter sent to my house asking for my views, now this. It is perfectly clear that the majority of residents object to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road - as proven by your own 'consultation'. It will merely displace traffic to nearby streets - how lovely for the residents in Brunstane Road, not so good for everyone else.</p> <p>At the Transport Committee there was a sensible suggestion: trial one way north. This would still be the way to go.</p>
Object	<p>I reject totally the proposal to close the road. Is this clear enough for you?</p> <p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order for the following reasons: Introduction to the proposed measures is "to promote quiet local neighbourhoods, encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home". Does this suggest that the residents of Brunstane Road are allowed to have their very many motor vehicles parked outside their own houses, but that everyone else is to walk or cycle around? Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in and around the greater Colliedene area. The restricted access into and out of the Colliedene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. This whole process is completely unnecessary as this whole situation could be improved by either putting double yellow lines up one side of Brunstane Road, or making it a one way street. This would then allow the safe passage of cycles/cyclists, as they would no longer have to navigate between parked cars on both sides of the Road and would leave the footpath/pavement free and safe for walkers. When the suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, the main concerns from residents were that "They would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space on the public highway, by bowing down to pressure from residents of one street for their selfish reasons. In fact, the Council are actually encouraging these residents to own cars as they will have their very own parking place, of course the Council could use this as an opportunity to install parking for permit holders only and at least get some money as we are constantly hearing about how little budget is available to them!!</p> <p>I believe that the whole ethos around the proposal was because the residents on Brunstane Road were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. I have seen recent photographs that indicate that these residents maybe more concerned about their own children's safety than the safety of all other pedestrians including children and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway/pavement. Perhaps if there had not been a delay to implementing the law to ban pavement parking there would be no need for any of these measures as there would only be space for limited parking on the road or is it that the Council are trying to rush these measures through before the residents find themselves in trouble with the Law?</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the Vice Convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides nearby and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. This has led to the locals crowing that Brunstane Road was going to be closed as they had the councillor living amongst them. The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of accidents. I don't believe that this could be a reason for the closure of this Road to non residents.</p> <p>With regards to The Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus, rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the wider local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there.</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I would like to respond to this consultation to say I object to Brunstane Road being entirely closed.</p> <p>Why can't it be one way? Many other streets in Portobello could do with being one way or having traffic calming measures installed also such as Regent Street, Marlborough Street and Bath Street. Why just Brunstane and Coillesdene? It seems uncoordinated and a response to effective local lobbying by those residents but what about the rest of Portobello?</p> <p>The streets I've mentioned are either very narrow and suffer the same issues as Brunstane (parking in both sides and vibrant blockages) or in the case of Bath Street, suffer cars driving too fast.</p> <p>Closing off Brunstane entirely will force all traffic past Portobello High School and eventually down Briggton Place into Portobello, or down Milton Road and along the High Street; good for the residents of Brunstane but not so nice for residents of those other streets. I predict massive traffic jams and a big spike in resultant air pollution.</p>
Object	<p>We are most concerned to learn that the proposal for the unnecessary and ill-considered closure of Brunstane Road and Coillesdene Crescent to through traffic is still under consideration despite 72% of the respondents to the council's original consultation opposing it and more than 92% of a survey undertaken by residents in the Brighton Area are similarly in opposition.</p> <p>The proposal does not acknowledge the extra traffic that will be displaced into an already overcrowded Portobello High St and Brighton Place as well as the effect on the supposedly safe walking routes for that have been created throughout the area.</p> <p>It should be noted that Scottish Fire and Rescue Service and Police Scotland have previously expressed concerns regarding the proposal and how it could affect their response times.</p> <p>Police Scotland also noted that the trial traffic management measures will likely require increased resources from their officers to enforce the restrictions.</p> <p>Whilst the proposed measures may align with current placemaking philosophies which take a people-centred approach to urban planning to promote health, happiness and well-being which may well be true for the residents of Brunstane Road, they will have the opposite effect on health, wellbeing, safety, etc, of the residents of Portobello and the Brighton Place area with the increased traffic volumes and attendant congestion and air pollution.</p> <p>The proposal seems to benefit a few people at the expense of the majority.</p> <p>Why has this ill-considered proposal still been proposed when whilst it may benefit a very small minority it will have a detrimental effect on the lives and wellbeing of the majority?</p> <p>This ill-thought proposal should be CANCELLED permanently. It is contrary to the democratic will of the local residents and stakeholders. Brighton Place is already a bottle neck with traffic often at a standstill because of sheer volume of traffic at certain times. This was particularly bad when Brunstane Road was closed previously. Edinburgh is congested enough from the ever-moving roadworks and the ever-growing and hardly used pedestrian and cycle routes as it is without instigating a proposal that will subject the majority of Portobello residents to an unnecessary increase in pollution and congestion for the benefit of a small minority.</p>
Object	<p>Regularly working in Portobello, with many friends and elderly ex-neighbours I visit there. From personal experience of problems getting to and from places in Portobello over the years when I lived there and now that I visit and try to get from place to place I've seen the effect of displacing traffic to the Eastfield junction, onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and onto Brighton Place and had personal difficulties reaching jobs on the Milton Rd that not shutting Brunstane Rd would have alleviated during previous shutdowns.</p> <p>These caused increased travel distance and pollution for residents; increased response times for emergency vehicles; increased pollution and safety risk to children in Brighton Place which is designated a safe route to school; increased rat-running along East Brighton Crescent and Lee Crescent; and restriction of access to the Brunstane allotments and bowling club.</p> <p>I would like to see a constructive overall strategy for traffic that doesn't cherry-pick odd streets like B Rd and looks overall at what needs to be done. Making certain streets one way in Marlborough St and Regent St, perhaps would be considered...</p> <p>Please don't close Brunstane Rd to through traffic but find a way of minimising traffic for all areas.</p>
Object	<p>Objective; 'Lowering traffic in the neighbourhood';</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote quiet local neighbourhoods, • Encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home, and to • Reduce motor vehicle through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area. <p>The proposed closure to vehicles would not I believe be a benefit to cyclists - traffic has been slow moving on the road for 20 years, very rarely stationary, and so cyclists are able to negotiate it. There is also already an alternative cycleway at S Morton St. if needed.</p> <p>The Brunstane Road route is substantially used for those journeys that people want to make by car - supermarket shopping trip, access to own home etc - rather than choose to switch to bicycle or make on foot. So the vehicle traffic flow into the area will not reduce as a result of rerouting it down another street.</p> <p>The better solution is traffic management on the existing road, not closure.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Coillesdene area, including roads.</p> <p>The restricted access into and out of the Coillesdene area will require traffic to take a longer, more convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be a resident in Coillesdene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), who will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km extra on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents.</p> <p>A fellow Edinburgh resident has examined the road accident statistics, and it would appear that there have been no accidents or injury on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 years. The last minor accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reason given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>Many residents attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children.</p> <p>Having walked on that road on a weekly basis, it is clear that these residents are not that concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway. This has made it extremely difficult for me to walk on the pavement with a buggy and my 3 month old.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concern from residents was that they would have nowhere to park. It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking spaces.</p> <p>In addition, it is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road junction, I note that the Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
	<p>I would like to object to the proposed changes to the roads in Milton/coillesdene/Brunstane area.</p> <p>As a council tax paying resident here I am concerned that this will lead to an increase in traffic along Coillesdene Avenue by my house. We already are back, after the lockdowns, at the see four learner drivers every time you leave home within driving one side of a block of houses and I foresee the slow down measures will make this worse. More residents will be going by my house due to the reduced road options so increased fuel use when we all want to cut emissions.</p>
Object	<p>I do not see your proposed plan as being a helpful option.</p>
	<p>Whilst I acknowledge that this order is experimental it does not appear to address the problems of traffic in this area in that it moves traffic from one location to another rather than resolving the issue.</p> <p>Brunstane Road is a well-used thoroughfare linking Portobello to Milton Road East and to the A1. With the proposed development on the green belt at Brunstane Farm there will be an increase in traffic and to force this traffic to travel through the narrow streets of Coillesdene, albeit with traffic calming measures, is hardly a solution.</p> <p>The main problem in Brunstane Road is caused by residents parking on both sides of the street and on the pavements. This is a matter that should be addressed rather than closing the street to enable residents to park their cars! Perhaps everyone who lives in a narrow street will apply for similar measures if this precedent is set? A more logical solution would be to limit the parking or to make the street one way rather than creating a private car park.</p>
Object	<p>Increasing traffic through Coillesdene and the surrounding streets can hardly be considered environmentally friendly, especially given the residential nature of the area and a sizeable elderly population, nor will pedestrian safety or the promotion of cycling be achieved by closing one road!</p>
	<p>I object on the grounds that this action is an individual and very localised response to a much broader problem. Put very simply, there are three direct west-east routes into Portobello. Two of these routes pass through residential areas. The shutting off of one will inevitably lead to the strangulation of the other.</p> <p>As the proposed 'permit parking' in Portobello has shown, the research done has proved to be a woefully inept attempt at identifying and analysing relevant data. These problems cannot be solved by focussing solely on restricted vision - street by street, or one solution ideas, parking. Please get serious about infrastructure and the environment and the needs of business-residential-leisure/cultural life of our communities.</p>
Object	<p>I am writing to register my objection to TRO/21/13 for an ETRO to close Brunstane Road to through traffic on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Most of the the traffic from Brunstane Road will be displaced onto Duddingston Park, Southfield Place and Brighton Place, the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello. This route already suffers high volumes of traffic, queues and congestion, which will be exacerbated by the additional traffic diverted onto this route due to this closure. Traffic will also be displaced onto Milton Road East, Joppa Road and Portobello High Street, adding to the existing congestion on these roads. There is also the likelihood of rat-running down Park Avenue, Stanley Street, East Brighton Crescent and Lee Crescent. The Brighton Place/Southfield Place route is a safe route to school, used by many parents and children to access the numerous schools and nurseries along this route. Increased traffic would mean a less safe environment for children and their parents walking, scooting and cycling to and from school and nursery. Worsened air pollution, which is harmful to human health. This is especially concerning on a Safe Routes to School road, Brighton Place, which carries a lot of school and nursery foot and bicycle traffic on a four times daily basis. This plan will benefit a few people living in the Brunstane Road, where other alternatives such as a one-way system, traffic lights or passing places should be considered. It will however be detrimental to a large number of people who will have to suffer extra traffic in their neighbourhoods, and drive for longer distances to get around this road closure, leading to more congestion and harmful emissions. Your own survey showed that 72% of Portobello residents oppose this closure. Please listen to us.
Object	<p>Please do not implement this ill-advised road closure</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>The statement of reasons says that: "The introduction of the proposed measures is intended to promote quiet local neighbourhoods, encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home, and to deter motor vehicle through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area."</p> <p>This differs somewhat from the statement of reason given in July 2021, i.e. that: "The trial proposes to address long-standing traffic problems due to a combination of the narrow road width, increasing volumes of traffic and the general increase in the physical size of vehicles on Brunstane Road. This has resulted in numerous instances of traffic congestion, anti-social behaviour by drivers and conflict with residents whose cars have frequently been damaged. Residents in the Coillesdene area note concerns over increased traffic as drivers reroute due to the closure of Brunstane Road, so additional traffic calming measures have also been included in the trial scheme in the Coillesdene area".</p> <p>It is well known that this move has been driven by a group of residents (not all residents) in Brunstane Road so to dress it up as something to benefit the Coillesdene area is disingenuous. The Council's own survey stated in section 4.15 of the report of 28 January 2021 to the Transport and Environment committee that: "Of residents who indicated that they lived at a Joppa Triangle postcode (excluding Brunstane Road) (295 responses), 18% (52 responses) were in favour of the proposal and 82% (241 responses) were not in favour of the proposal." This makes it very clear that by and large the only people who want this closure are some of the residents in Brunstane Road, i.e. it is a project to placate a minority at the expense of the majority.</p> <p>This road closure would merely displace the traffic that normally uses Brunstane Road to other streets, mainly down Brighton Place as that is the only other north /south route in and out of Portobello. Brighton Place is a residential street that under normal circumstances experiences high volumes of traffic, especially at peak times when long queues tail back under the railway bridge which is a single lane pinch-point, much like the railway bridge on Brunstane Road. Brighton Place experienced a huge increase in traffic volumes during a period in August 2020 when Brunstane Road was closed for utilities work so it is obvious what the result of this road closure would be. In addition, when Brighton Place was closed for resurfacing work in 2019, the Brunstane Road residents complained that the closure displaced traffic down their road and argued for closure during the course of the work, which was granted. It stands to reason that the opposite effect would occur, i.e. if you close Brunstane Road traffic will be displaced onto Brighton Place.</p> <p>The proposal to close this road would benefit a small number of people and disadvantage many, many more. Brunstane Road and Coillesdene will become a "quiet neighbourhood" at the expense of other neighbourhoods, such as the one where I live, which will be blighted by additional traffic and air pollution on what is already a busy, traffic-congested route. This seems a very divisive move and will set one group of residents against another. Why not try and find away of alleviating the traffic problems in Brunstane Road that takes a fairer approach?</p> <p>Cars wishing to access Milton Road from Portobello would either have to drive up Brighton Place or travel all the way along to Eastfield meaning that they would be travelling for longer distances, leading to more harmful emissions. Drivers living north of the bridge in Brunstane Road will have to drive for about a mile to access Milton Road, instead of being able to drive a few metres up the road to access it.</p> <p>Brighton Place is supposed to be a safe route to school however, an increase in traffic makes the journey that children make five days a week less safe with more possibility of accidents. Queueing traffic that is stopping and starting, with engines idling, releases toxic and harmful emissions that would be inhaled by children as they walk and ride up and down Brighton Place every day to access the schools to the south of the area. Air pollution is particularly harmful to children and young people.</p> <p>It was agreed at the Transport and Environment committee meeting on 14 October that HGVs will be banned from turning left from Portobello High Street onto Sir Harry Lauder Road as a safety measure for cyclists. While I support measures to make this junction safer the inevitable knock-on effect is that more HGVs will use the Brighton Place/Southfield Place/Duddingston Park route to access Milton Road, making it a less safe environment for cyclists and pedestrians of all ages but particularly school children. This will be over and above the extra traffic generated by the closure of Brunstane Road. Why should this street be made</p>
Object	<p>I object to this Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to close Brunstane Road on the following grounds:</p> <p>This measure is being imposed without carrying out a survey that establishes where traffic is coming from or is going to in Portobello and Joppa. Therefore, the effect on other roads is unknown and has not been quantified. From inception the council's traffic officers have refused to acknowledge the increased pressure on other parts of the network other than to inhibit access for residents in the Coillesdenes.</p> <p>This proposal does nothing to limit or mitigate the resulting displaced traffic.</p> <p>This proposal is not part of a wider strategy or the first stage of improvements in Portobello as no plan has ever been published and further changes are not planned. It is purely as a result of lobbying from residents in Brunstane Road over a long number of years.</p> <p>This proposal will not lead to traffic evaporation as some supporters claim – for this laudable aim to happen, a wider programme of measures would be required. The Council is not proposing this. This is not the first stage of a strategic programme.</p> <p>There is overwhelming opposition from the local residents to this proposal as indicated by both the Council's consultation and a survey conducted by Portobello Community Council where 80% of respondents were against what is proposed. Indeed, over 80% of those in the Coillesdenes objected with the only area in favour being those at the south end of Brunstane Road, but even then 20% of these were against. The Council has failed to get popular support for this proposal.</p> <p>On a more personal level, I object to this as it will displace traffic to Brighton Place, the only other south/north connection into Portobello and which is a safe route to school for primary school children and others. Little respect to the views of those who live in the Brightons has been shown by traffic officers with, from the start, outright dismissal of the fears that extra traffic will use Brighton Place.</p> <p>In addition, I have a huge objection to, and dissatisfaction with, the way that City of Edinburgh Council has now tried to justify the introduction of the ETRO in the Statement of Reasons. All along this has been a proposal driven by the concerns of a number of residents in part of Brunstane Road. As late as July 2021 the Council was still promoting the ETRO on the basis of problems in the south part of Brunstane Road "with numerous instances of traffic congestion, anti-social behaviour by drivers and conflict with residents whose cars have frequently been damaged". The Statement of Reasons for the ETRO now pretends that the driving force comes from the desire to make the Coillesdenes a better environment even though there had been no clamour for this from the residents before the temporary closure of Brunstane Road during roadworks on Brighton Place. Only the closure of Brunstane Road caused a problem with displaced traffic for residents in the Coillesdenes. The Council is being less than honest in this last minute change in emphasis to cover up favouring the betterment of a small number of residents.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to record my objections to the following TRO: TRO/21/13 on the grounds that this will not reduce traffic movements through the Joppa triangle merely displace them onto Coillesdene Crescent, Avenue and Drive. This is a highly residential area of elderly residents and many families with young children, turning this area into a rat-run for traffic seeking a route between Milton Rd East and Portobello does not seem a logical step. The area is not designed for large HGVs which will inevitably make use of this route to avoid using the frequently congested Harry Lauder Rd to access Portobello high street from the Milton Link.</p>
Object	<p>Here are my comments on the above ETRO:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strongly support closure of Brunstane Road. This will also reduce traffic congestion at the junction of Brunstane Rd, Brunstane Rd South and the top of Milton Rd East where motorists entering from Brunstane Rd/Brunstane Rd South often ignore the traffic box. 2. Whereas traffic management measures are needed to close roads in the Coillesdene Triangle to stop rat-running by traffic no longer able to use Brunstane Road, object strongly to that part of the TRO to close Coillesdene Triangle to through traffic, because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Drivers will quickly find new rat runs using combinations of Coillesdene Avenue, Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and Seafield Crescent. Also, many drivers would ignore speed calming measures used along Coillesdene Avenue, leading to complaints. o Eastfield Gardens, which will remain without traffic movement restrictions, will become a rat-run to avoid having to pass through the Eastfield/Milton Rd East junction. Vehicles already drive over Scott's Garage forecourt to do this, if they can. o In a few years there will be potentially hundreds of vehicles using Milton Rd East to get to/from the new housing development on Brunstane Fields, and drivers will use rat-runs through the Coillesdene Triangle if they can. <p>The present proposal for the Coillesdene Triangle has serious flaws and will fail to meet the Statement of Reasons for the ETO. It is therefore imperative to implement a "mini-Holland" type ETO now rather than wait to confirm the obvious weaknesses of the presently proposed ETO. This will inevitably result in some streets in the Coillesdene Triangle becoming rat runs for traffic that can no longer use Brunstane Road, making these street more dangerous and polluted for local residents, their children and cyclists.</p>
Object	<p>I am writing to vote against the closure of Brunstane Road and the wider measures above. Brunstane road makes a massive difference to my life as I need to commute and take my family around Edinburgh. Closing this road will just increase traffic on other streets - as presumably most people that use it simply need to be in or out of portobello. Since the measures do not close traffic going through coilledene streets (simply make it "calmer" and one way) people will pick their routes through coillesdene streets thereby making this area busy and dangerous for residents. The measures therefore just transplants a perceived problem to another adjacent area.</p> <p>So I am very much against the measures outlined.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>By way of background: I have lived in the wider Portobello area all my life (Stanley Street, Morton Street (Joppa) and Mountcastle. I am now retired, but spent much of my working life managing process and flow, in fact I designed and worked on the early computer simulation systems that are today used to simulate traffic flow and to test out new road designs. I was project lead on what was in 1980-90s the worlds leading flow simulation system, used in multiple countries around the world, initially in shipping industry, but laterally on land based transport infrastructure.</p> <p>I am an avid walker and cyclist and get out 4-5 times a week and roughly 50% of my walks or cycles are in and around the local Portobello area.</p> <p>I object to this proposal on multiple grounds. First and foremost there are multiple off road paths and options that can better and safer channel cyclists in, around and through the Joppa/Portobello area. This narrow minded thinking that routes cyclists onto major roads rather than quieter/safer/quicker alternatives is indirectly the cause of x2 fatal incidents at Kings Road junction and multiple other incidents. This proposal, will focus more car traffic onto the main highways, and will not re-route cyclists, rather it will intensify the use of shared space.</p> <p>It's absolutely right that the council seeks to improve road safety, but increasing the volume and flow of traffic onto already busy roads does not do that. More cars on roads, simply increases the likelihood of incidents. Why is that difficult to understand?</p> <p>There are ample alternative routes in, around and through the wider portobello that are (a) quieter, therefore (b) safer and (c) as quick, or in many instances (d) quicker) than try to align cyclists on the same roads as your now directing more traffic onto.</p> <p>The 2 deaths at Kings Road are testament to this incoherent approach. For 90% of cyclists, there are better, safer, quicker routes for bikes than going across this (and other) busy vehicle based junctions. If someone would just step back from the "get cars off the roads' agenda for a minute they can get educated on these alternatives routes. Indeed the council has belatedly made a token gesture at this with the lame attempt to route cyclists down Fishwives Causeway. Too little, too late and more important, a standalone idea, rather than a piece of a coherent thought through plan.</p> <p>Secondly, and I know this is slightly controversial, but the lack of understanding and awareness about basic behavioural science is common in many council designs. What does this mean. Well it's the thinking that says if we put a stop sign up, then people will follow that instruction. It's the same thinking that sees "No Ball Games" signs in parks used as football goal posts, or the Police get 10+ calls a week from residents of Vexhim Park as cars ignore the signs of cars/bikes only. The same mentality that says, ok, but up a camera to catch them. Like post event action, will somehow change people behaviour.</p> <p>Multiple studies (and thats council independent ones) have shown traffic calming measures to increase the instances of erratic and dangerous driving. If anyone in council would like to position a hidden camera and speed guns on any number of streets you will witness. Cars swerving around obstacles, while speeding up, hitting the brake, speeding up, hitting the break. Worst still, owners of company vans, don't do the hitting the break part as they don't care about the impact speed bumps have on a company vehicle. Indeed, I witness this regularly with council vehicles and laugh to myself.</p> <p>These proposals. Like many council designs, ignore customer behaviour and multiple studies that highlight this and its dangers.</p> <p>As someone who is very familiar with good design flow, I regularly watch in abject despair at road layout and design, so my expectations for this objection are very low. More than happy to expand on any of the above points, or take anyone from planning on a 'see bad road design in action tour' of portobello if that's of interest to anyone.</p>
Object	<p>I object to this order. The plans will divert huge volumes of traffic from Brunstane Road through residential Joppa.</p> <p>I have been surprised that the council has not taken the opportunity to implement a proper LTN given that a residents association poll favoured this.</p> <p>At the last committee some of the members talked about their positive experience observing a LTN IN London as if this plan will achieve this.</p> <p>I was almost knocked off my bike twice in Seaview Crescent during the last closure and expect this time the situation will quickly worsen. Apps such as Waze and Google maps will direct traffic through Residential Joppa. Again research by the Residents Association showed that using these rat run diversions is rational as they save considerable time.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to register my objection in relation to the plans put forward inTRO/21/13 affecting Brunstane Road and the Joppa Triangle.</p> <p>The proposed Brunstane Traffic Management measures affecting the Joppa Triangle are a response to complaints from residents of Brunstane Road that has a detrimental effect on residents of the Joppa Triangle area.</p> <p>A consequence of closing off junctions from Milton Road East, possible access routes for local residents will be fewer, forcing traffic coming from e.g. the Jewel, A1 to travel further along Milton Road East to access local streets. Those access roads that would remain open will become more congested and potential flash points for tailbacks on to the main road. All the proposal will achieve if implemented, the measures outlined in the proposal will merely shift the traffic through adjacent streets, creating rat runs in residential areas, and add to already busy roads.</p> <p>With the future New Brunstane Village development and the very significant increase in traffic and congestion that will result in Milton Road as a main access point, the proposed measures will merely compound this impending problem. Something to be avoided I would suggest.</p> <p>The previously trialled closure of Brunstane Road to through traffic also had the effect of restricting Brunstane Road residents' easy access to Portobello or beyond to Seaview, Portobello Road by car. Again necessitating additional diversion-related mileage.</p> <p>Pollution will also increase as drivers are forced to travel longer distances. In attempting to solve an issue for Brunstane Road risks causing other issues and therefore not really providing a solution. it merely shifts a problem.</p> <p>With the spotlight of the world on COP26 and Glasgow, is further polluting the atmosphere, burning more fuel and contributing to further climate change through increased diversion-related mileage not contrary to the goals and ethos of saving our planet?</p> <p>Of real concern is also the access of the emergency services to the Joppa Triangle and area from Milton Road East. With restricted access, including the use of planters, the emergency services will also be subject to using diversions, which may then delay their reaching an incident. I hope that lives will not be lost as a consequence.</p> <p>In objecting to the plans outlined in TRO/21/13, I would urge that the Council reject this proposal and seek alternative solutions, perhaps involving technology, rather than physical ones to create a quieter neighbourhood for all.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I am aghast that yet once more Edinburgh City council are riding roughshod over residents opinions and pressing ahead with an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) against the overall view of those consulted with the closure of Brunstane Road and the knock-on effect for citizens living in the Joppa Triangle. I am formally objecting to this on the basis of the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012</p> <p>The previous consultation (Public Pack)Agenda Document for Transport and Environment Committee, 28/01/2021 10:00 (edinburgh.gov.uk) stated :- Of residents who indicated that they lived at a Brunstane Road postcode (147 responses), 84% (123 responses) were in favour of the proposal and 16% (24 responses) were not in favour of the proposal. This can be further broken down using the railway bridge as a natural boundary. Those residing between the south side of the bridge and Milton Road East were in favour of the proposal by a majority of 90% for (96 responses) and 10% against (11 responses). Those residing at the north side of the bridge were in favour of the proposal by a majority of 67.5% for (27 responses) and 32.5% against (13 responses).</p> <p>Of residents who indicated that they lived at a Joppa Triangle postcode (excluding Brunstane Road) (295 responses), 18% (52 responses) were in favour of the proposal and 82% (241 responses) were not in favour of the proposal. Two respondents did not answer the question. The full breakdown is detailed in Appendix 4.</p> <p>If you total the responses from Brunstane Road postcode + Joppa Triangle postcode then it comes out clearly against the proposed scheme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 265 against • 172 in favour <p>So why does the opinion of residents that live in Brunstane road postcode take precedence over those in Joppa Triangle – where is the equality and diversity that is being applied by the Council to ALL residents? .</p> <p>As you are aware, City of Edinburgh Council has a statutory duty under the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012 to: Duty to assess and review policies and practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.—(1) A listed authority must, where and to the extent necessary to fulfil the equality duty, assess the impact of applying a proposed new or revised policy or practice against the needs mentioned in section 149(1) of the Act. • (2) In making the assessment, a listed authority must consider relevant evidence relating to persons who share a relevant protected characteristic (including any received from those persons). • (3) A listed authority must, in developing a policy or practice, take account of the results of any assessment made by it under paragraph (1) in respect of that policy or practice. • (4) A listed authority must publish, within a reasonable period, the results of any assessment made by it under paragraph (1) in respect of a policy or practice that it decides to apply. • (5) A listed authority must make such arrangements as it considers appropriate to review and, where necessary, revise any policy or practice that it applies in the exercise of its functions to ensure that, in exercising those functions, it complies with the equality duty. • (6) For the purposes of this regulation, any consideration by a listed authority as to whether or not it is necessary to assess the impact of applying a proposed new or revised policy or practice under paragraph (1) is not to be treated as an assessment of its impact.
Object	<p>I am likely to be badly affected by closure of Brunstane Road. I live at the corner of Brighton Place and East Brighton Crescent. Traffic there is frequently very congested, especially with buses being unable to pass each other and other drivers needing to back up to give room. Brunstane Road and Brighton Place are the two main north/south access roads to Portobello. Any closure of Brunstane Road would inevitably lead to even greater congestion problems on Brighton Place, even sometimes with total logjam needing outside intervention to sort out.</p>
Object	<p>I strongly oppose any closure of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>I strongly object to the closure of Brunstane Road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Brunstane Rd and Brighton Place are the only North/South access roads into Portobello; Brighton Place is already congested and carries a steady flow of cars, buses and cyclists at all times. Sometimes the traffic is at a standstill already; 2 Is there an overall strategy for traffic management in Portobello? Closing one of the two access roads seems drastic; careful traffic management on both roads would seem a better approach; 3 The closure would increase the response times for emergency vehicles; 4 The increase in traffic on Brighton Place would create an increased rat-run on East Brighton Crescent and Lee Crescent, all three of which streets are residential except for one part of Brighton Place, are in a conservation area and would suffer detriment to the conservation area if traffic and pollution were increased; 5 There would be an increased pollution and safety risk to children using Brighton Place which is a designated 'safe route to school', as it would be for other pedestrians and scooter-users and cyclists. <p>For the above reasons I object to any closure of Brunstane Road.</p>
Object	<p>Certainly there seems to be no plan overall for managing the traffic in and around Portobello. This particular proposed closure will obviously displace the current flow of traffic elsewhere. The effect of displacing that traffic to the Eastfield junction, onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and onto Brighton Place needs to be assessed properly and is surely going to be a cause for congestion. Residents within the neighbourhood will experience an increase in the distance they have to travel in order to avoid Brunstane Road and notably emergency vehicles will have increased difficulty accessing the locality.</p> <p>There has already been several efforts to present alterations to the traffic flow along Brunstane Road and the nearby Joppa Triangle and many objections have been voiced, so it seems to me that there has already been a clearly demonstrated lack of enthusiasm for this proposal.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds: Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads on which I live - Joppa Terrace.</p> <p>The restricted access into and out of the Colliedene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examines the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residennts was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p> <p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to express my objection to the above proposal.</p> <p>Without community agreement this plan seems to move traffic from one area of our area to another. It is ill thought out and many who live here have no idea why the changes are being implemented.</p> <p>if Brunstane Road is closed traffic will undoubtedly have to use Brighton Place as their route to the centre of Portobello. There is no other north to south through route. Brighton place is already extremely busy with consistent long queues at the High Street traffic lights and at the narrow Southfield Place bridge.</p> <p>Brighton place is designated a safe school route. The extra traffic and pollution would contradict that.</p> <p>I also believe that because of traffic build up on Brighton Place drivers would use East Brighton Crescent and the narrow and at times congested Lee Crescent as rat runs.</p>
Object	<p>Please reconsider this closure.</p>
	<p>I am writing to object of the proposed closure of Brunstane Road, Portobello. TRO/21/13</p> <p>Closing Brunstane Road will not lower traffic, it will only send it elsewhere. In this case the traffic will be forced through the Coillesdene area in Joppa. Perhaps you envisage the traffic making the journey to the bottom of Milton Road East and heading back through Eastfield but I have no doubt that no driver will have the patience or desire to drive the extra time or distance. Instead all traffic will be making its way through the Coillesdenes and entering / exiting at Milton Drive / Milton Terrace. These are two very small streets and in my opinion not sufficient for the traffic that will pass through. A major concern is that traffic will speed through Coillesdene Ave to get out of this crazy proposals. This area is home to lots of young families and kids playing and the increase in traffic is a worry to their safety. There have already been a number of car crashes at the junction of Coillesene Avenue / Coillesdene Drive and I think this will increase.</p> <p>I have spoken to a number of residents about these proposals and the same question always arises - why should Brunstane Road be closed when it is a public road? Could it be that a few residents have asked for this to be pushed through? The idea that a public road can be closed is absolutely preposterous. This could even affect emergency vehicles getting to their destination.</p>
Object	<p>I reiterate my objection and I hope you see sense and cancel this badly thought out idea.</p>
	<p>I am writing about the proposal to close Brunstone Rd to through traffic.</p> <p>I can't see the rationale for closing this road whilst there is a plan to look at parking in the whole of Portobello and at the same time there is a plan to stop lorries from turning right at the King's Rd junction.</p> <p>My question is - where will the traffic go that normally passes through Brunstane Rd. Will it be going down Brighton Place instead? The volume of traffic in Brighton Place is already huge - with serious congestion problems. Brighton Place is also the main bus route for 42, 49 and 21 buses. There is serious congestion in the vicinity of the railway bridge where the road narrows.</p> <p>Brighton Place is the main route for children walking from Portobello to St John's Primary School and Duddingston Primary school. It doesn't make sense to increase the volume of traffic on this route.</p>
Object	<p>I would therefore ask that you do take into consideration the effect on other roads in Portobello if Brunstane Rd is closed.</p>
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order for Brunstane Road and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Whilst I acknowledge that something has to be done to ease the difficulties experienced in Brunstance Road this shouldn't be at the benefit of Brunstane Road residents but the detriment of residents in all surrounding areas.</p> <p>Better solutions exist, for example, Brunstane Road could benefit from being one direction, leaving the rest of the Coillesdene area alone.</p> <p>Closure of Brunstane Road will displace traffic onto other roads in the Colliesdene area. The restricted access into and out of the Colliesdene area will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions.</p> <p>There would be a very significant increase in the volume of traffic using Milton Drive (as the only exit from the Coillesdene area for anyone travelling North). This is a concern as I have 2 young children (one of which is Autistic) that will be put in danger every time they leave home. We will be disturbed by the noise and pollution.</p> <p>The exit from Milton Drive to Milton Road East is particularly difficult, with a large hedge meaning cars often edge out into the path of the buses using the bus stop immediately beyond. This will cause a number of accidents.</p> <p>The entrance in to the Coillesdene area will be through a residential area heavily populated by elderly and infirm, putting them at greater risk.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
	<p>I write to object to the above proposed traffic order.</p> <p>Turning Brunstane Road into a cul-de-sac may suit the residents of that particular street, however if implemented, this proposal would be to the detriment of the residents living in the streets which form the Coillesdene triangle, which is currently a quiet, safe area that does not require traffic restrictions or calming measures. The issues with traffic blockages on Brunstane Road are created because there is car parking on either side and no passing spaces for two-way traffic. The poor design of the junction with Milton Road East also contributes to the congestion at the south end, leading to tail-backs and frustration.</p> <p>Making Brunstane Road one-way for north bound vehicular traffic, with passing spaces for south bound cyclists, would greatly improve the situation in terms of congestion and safety and would deal with the problem locally, without drastically affecting the amenity of residents in the surrounding streets.</p> <p>There is no need or justification to offset the traffic issues of one street onto others where there is currently no problem. An overwhelming majority (80%) of responses from Joppa residents were against these proposals last year. The results of that consultation should be acknowledged and respected. When my wife wrote to our local Councillors for their views on the issue she received the following response from the incumbent Labour representative:</p> <p>"A consultation is not a referendum and - even it were - the majority is not always right. Need I give examples of bad decisions arrived at by referendum? We are a representative democracy. Councillors are elected to lead and to take decisions like this. If you believe you can do it better, you have that opportunity in 2022."</p>
Object	<p>If this dogmatic stance is shared by the other elected officials in the City of Edinburgh Council, why bother with public consultations in the first place?</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I object to the above proposed order on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposal does not have an overall strategy for traffic management for the whole of Portobello and given that traffic will be displaced this should be the first consideration • Traffic will be displaced onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and the busy junction there as well as sending increased traffic to the Eastfield Junction and Brighton Place • Brighton Place is a designated safe route to school and this traffic order will increase pollution and pose a safety risk for school children • Traffic pollution will be increased and travel times for Portobello residents will increase • There will be an increase in response times for emergency vehicles in the area • Access to the allotments on Brunstane Road North and the neighbouring bowling club will be restricted <p>For the above reasons I object to this proposed order and would like my objections taken into consideration when discussing its imposition.</p>
Object	<p>I am objecting to Brunstone Rd Portobello being closed. By closing this road you will be sending cars into the centre of Portobello It is a walking route to school for 3 schools and with car's idling in queues will kick out loads of pollution. Also no measures have been tried to help calm traffic in Brunstane road. Not one passing place....Nothing! Brighton Place has so many cars /congestion. It is not fair to divert any more down this axis.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to object to the proposed Experimental Traffic Regulation Order TRO/21/13. As I pointed out in my response to the original proposal, in January this year, the overwhelming majority of residents in Portobello do not want the closure of Brunstane Road to go ahead. No widespread traffic survey has been carried out to model what effect this closure would have on access to Portobello. As a long-term resident, I am acutely aware that access to the town is very susceptible to road closures or traffic congestion caused by road works, and the existing routes need to be maintained. Closure of Brunstane Road would divert traffic entering or exiting Portobello on to Eastfield, Harry Lauder Road and Brighton Place.. I am particularly concerned about a traffic build up in Brighton Place, which is a bus route and a safe route to school. Traffic congestion in Brighton Place will lead to East Brighton Crescent and Lee Crescent being used as a rat run. There will also be considerable inconvenience to the residents of the Coillesdene area who will see access to their neighbourhood severely restricted, with increased journey times and fuel expenditure. Finally, it must not be forgotten that any perturbation in traffic flow into Portobello will have a profound effect on local shops and traders. There has been a recent resurgence in business activity in Portobello and this is very welcome and must not be jeopardised by tinkering with access routes to the town.</p>
Object	<p>I ask you to reconsider the closure of Brunstane Road. I cannot understand the logic of diverting traffic away from a road which has been in use as a through route for 100 years into previously quiet streets. Much of this traffic will probably speed up to save time on the slightly longer journey and this area has a lot of elderly residents. Is it really feasible that roads such as Milton Drive and Milton Terrace are suitable for the volume of traffic that will be generated.? It also seems to me that a lot of the problems of Brunstane Road are caused by residents parking their cars outside their house. They are the source of their own problem. There is going to be a major development near here of 1300 houses and inevitably this will increase pressure on this previously quiet area even more. Would it not be wise to divert the traffic, if Brunstane Road has to be closed, by way of Eastfield and up Milton Road as this is a major highway. . Finally, I note that this may be to encourage cycling. Brunstane Road is on a hill and the last time it was closed there was a serious danger from cyclists zooming down it, often without a thought for pedestrians.</p>
Object	<p>Having experienced the problems caused by the closure of Brunstane Road, I strongly object to this continuing.</p> <p>There is only have one north/south route into Portobello, leading to a heavy increase in traffic with the resultant increase in queues and congestion. Brighton Place is heavily used by pedestrians; school children, cyclists, parents with young children, dog walkers etc. making this route a lot less safer than before.</p> <p>Having only one north/south route into Portobello is unwise to say the least. This was highlighted recently when the junction at Brighton Place/Portobello High Street was closed recently and the frustration this caused to drivers who had a find another route. It was particularly galling when very little work was carried out the whole time the road was closed.</p> <p>It was distressing to see the shocked faces of drivers of emergency ambulances suddenly faced with an unexpected (and largely unmanned) road closure.</p> <p>I urge that Brunstane Road be re-opened to through traffic for the above reasons.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond.</p>
Object	<p>I object strongly with regard to Brunstane Road Closure. There has been considerable increase in traffic in Brighton Place, often causing holdups especially when larger vehicles are using the road. Also, because it's not a particularly wide road, it is definitely a danger to cyclists.</p> <p>It is the ONLY North/South access road to Portobello. It seems an extremely unwise move to have only one North/South access road.</p> <p>Recently Brighton Place was closed at Portobello High Street for some days and left no alternative for ambulances. I personally witnessed the frustration of emergency ambulance drivers unable to go down Brighton OR the alternative Brunstane Road.</p> <p>Why close a road (ie Brunstane Road)that doesn't have bus routes? Surely it is prudent and wise to have two North/South routes into and out of Portobello.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road at the bridge. I concede that there is a traffic problem on Brunstane Road but total closure of the road for through traffic, does not solve it. It merely moves it. The proposed replacement system through the Coillesdenes will make journeys longer, create even more pollution, and the roads are no wider. The most logical solution to the problem is to make Brunstane Road one way from Milton Road northwards. The Coillesdenes could be used for journeys southwards to Milton Road. If this solution were implemented residents of Brunstane Road would have less traffic and Coillesdene residents would not be completely overwhelmed. I think more people would be willing to accept this solution as being fairer. The majority of residents do NOT want this total closure to happen at all, but this compromise is more likely to be acceptable to the community at large. I have lived in this area for 40+ years just 50 metres from the junction of Argyle Crescent and Brunstane Road, and know the traffic problems well. The proposed closure may very well be acceptable to residents of the upper end of Brunstane Road, but for residents of the immediate and much wider locality the total closure it is not . Please take the views of all residents into account when making any decisions.</p>
Object	<p>I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal to close Brunstane Road at the railway bridge and make associated changes to roads in the Coillesdene area.</p> <p>While I recognise that traffic driving through Brunstane Road often results in queues and indeed accidents, I do not believe this proposal is the way to resolve this. I believe it will merely move the problem elsewhere.</p> <p>If this proposal goes ahead, it will have the effect of increasing traffic in the Coillesdene area as most drivers just will not take the longer route to the bottom of Milton Road East and then along Seaview Terrace and vice versa. Instead, most will try to find a shorter route through Coillesdene. The changes proposed will mean that much more traffic will divert through Milton Drive and Milton Terrace - streets which are much smaller than Brunstane Road. It is likely that if traffic builds up at the Eastfield traffic lights, Eastfield Gardens would also see increased traffic flow as people try to avoid the queues.</p> <p>Many cars already exceed the 20mph limit particularly in Coillesdene Avenue and there have been several accidents at its junction with Coillesdene Drive. Increased traffic would inevitably lead to more accidents. Increased speeding traffic would also compromise the safety of the many young children who live in this area, and indeed the elderly residents in the sheltered housing in this street.</p> <p>I would be in favour of making Brunstane Road one way northbound as many of the issues are caused by cars queuing to turn right onto Milton Road, thereby narrowing the road.</p> <p>Closing the bridge may well result in lower traffic in the Brunstane Road area but it will simply increase driving times, emissions and traffic volume in nearby streets.</p> <p>I understand that in a previous consultation the majority of respondents, myself included, were against the proposal to close Brunstane Road. If this is still the case. I hope that the Council will listen to the residents and reconsider this proposal.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colloiesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examines the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year resporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residennts was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p> <p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to object to the above because the views of local people have not properly been taken into account and because the alternatives in the council report which agreed this TRO were not fully explored. The cost is also very high.</p> <p>It would be much cheaper and more palatable to everyone to place a no entry sign at the Milton Road end of Brunstane Road and make it a one way Street.</p> <p>Why has this not been considered for experiment.</p> <p>Therefore I object to this because there are cheaper and less disruptive options available.</p>
Object	<p>(Submitted by addressee 2)</p> <p>I wish to object to the above because the views of local people have not properly been taken into account and because the alternatives in the council report which agreed this TRO were not fully explored. The cost is also very high.</p> <p>It would be much cheaper and more palatable to everyone to place a no entry sign at the Milton Road end of Brunstane Road and make it a one way Street.</p> <p>Why has this not been considered for experiment.</p> <p>Therefore I object to this because there are cheaper and less disruptive options available.</p>
Object	<p>We object to the closure of Brunstane Road as it would impact on the residents of Coillesdene, Seaview Crescent, Milton Drive and Milton Terrace. It would simply shift the problems of Brunstane Road to Morton Street and Seaview Crescent etc.</p> <p>Traffic diverted along Milton Road East would turn in to Milton Terrace and cause unnecessary traffic through the sheltered housing area and now some young children.</p> <p>Seaview Crescent is not in a fit state to carry an increase in traffic. The advent of the new houses to be built at Brunstane Farm exiting onto Milton Road East will cause even more unnecessary through traffic which we haven't experienced before.</p> <p>There is always the constant traffic from learner drivers 7 days a week will add to the problems.</p> <p>We do not believe that the proposed closure of Brunstane Road is the best solution for the traffic problems.</p>
Object	<p>I want to register my objections to the proposed changes for Brunstane road. The experimental closer last time as a resident lead to increased pollution as people still use their cars but went round the long way rather than the idea of people not using their cars. There was incredible congestion coming up Milton Road East waiting to turn right into Branston Road sometimes waiting for 20 to 30 minutes on a Saturday morning with previously there would've been zero weight. These cars were idling with lots of pollution entering the atmosphere that would otherwise not have been there. I believe the original concern raised was in relation to congestion on Branston Road. This could be easily remedied by making parking one side only on Branston Road, or making Preston Road a one-way street if required. However I do not believe any changes required with your original concern to be addressed. It is already a very low traffic area. I have huge concerns about the impact on costing costing Avenue and the way to costings. I do not believe there has been efficient and evident impact survey undertaken of the pollution and overall impact of the experimental closure. I have huge concerns about the impact on shopping local in Portobello, as Experience last time showed that people went to the fort of the Chule rather than go to local businesses in Portobello when they could not drive down Preston Road. I vehemently oppose this to the proposed changes and have concerns about the transparency of the impetus behind the changes.</p>
Object	<p>I am writing to object to the above TRO on the following grounds:</p> <p>There is no plan to deal with traffic that will be displaced by of the closure of Brunstane Rd.</p> <p>As Brighton Place/Southfield Place is the only other route leading north to south into Portobello, traffic will be displaced along these roads.</p> <p>This additional traffic and congestion will create the potential for rat-running along Lee Crescent and East Brighton Crescent, both residential streets.</p> <p>It will also have an impact in terms of air pollution and safety on both residents and the many children who walk, cycle and scoot along Brighton Place and Southfield Place on their way to one high school, three primary schools and several nurseries.</p> <p>The impact of the recent council vote to close Sir Harry Lauder Rd to left turning HGVs is yet to be seen, but there is every likelihood that Brighton Place and Southfield Place will end up being used by HGVs looking to get out of Portobello. If the additional traffic from Brunstane Rd is added into the mix, this will not be a safe route to school.</p> <p>This decision to close Brunstane Rd is simply pushing a traffic problem for one group of residents on to another.</p> <p>I would urge the council not to close one road in isolation, but to survey the whole of Portobello and Joppa so that our entire area can benefit from much-needed traffic calming measures.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I am writing to object to the TRO closing Brunstane Road.</p> <p>In principle I would generally support road closures as I believe they can be a useful tool in reducing dependence on cars and encouraging people to use public transport and/or active travel. However, I also believe that this has to be done in a safe and responsible way. Closing roads in an ad hoc fashion (without a proper review of what the impact will be on all neighbouring roads) can be very dangerous and can create more problems than it solves.</p> <p>By closing Brunstane Road, it seems inevitable that this will force yet more traffic down Southfield / Brighton Place, as this will be the only remaining direct access point to Portobello. Additionally, the recent decision to ban HGVs from turning left into the Sir Harry Lauder Road will bring even more traffic (HGVs) to Southfield /Brighton Place. This road is already dangerous. It gets very congested and there is a lot of dangerous driving. Because of all the parked cars it is difficult (and in places impossible) for two vehicles to pass each other, resulting in drivers often speeding to get through a gap before another vehicle comes in the opposite direction. The parked cars also mean that sightlines are bad for pedestrians crossing the street.</p> <p>This very busy road is part of what is supposedly a 'safe route to school' for many children – going from Duddingston to Tower Bank Primary or Portobello High; or from Portobello to St John's / Duddingston Primary or Portobello High. In particular, it was the decision of the council several years back to change the catchment area which has meant that a number of children now have to travel along this road up to Duddingston Primary, instead of going a much shorter and safer route to Towerbank Primary, their closest school. At the time of this change the council insisted these children would have a safe route to school. This is not the case.</p> <p>There was recently a serious incident involving a child being knocked off their bike by a car turning into Stanley Street from Southfield Place. If yet more traffic is directed down Southfield / Brighton Place as a result of the above TRO and the decision to ban HGVs from turning left into the Sir Harry Lauder Road, it will only be a matter of time before there are more accidents.</p> <p>If the council would take steps address road safety /congestion / environmental issues across Portobello and Joppa as a whole – for example, putting a bus gate on Southfield / Brighton Place, and using the Sir Harry Lauder Road as a 'Portobello bypass'; creating 'park and ride' car parks at either end of the High St; making Portobello a low traffic neighbourhood – then I would be in support of this TRO. However, simply closing this road in isolation is short-sighted and dangerous.</p>
Object	
	<p>I believe that the road should be made one way, heading down towards Portobello/Joppa. Closing the road altogether seems unnecessary, and would cause a lot of problems as it closes off one of the major arteries that connects Portobello. This traffic will just cause problems elsewhere.</p>
Object	<p>I also think this road shouldn't be closed in order to enable access for emergency services.</p>
	<p>I Object to Brunstane Rd being closed at the bridge . I have lived here for 35 years .The only residents in this area that will be happy or benefit from this are those living at the top of Brunstane Rd .It would be fairer to make it one way downwards .All the traffic will use the coillesdenes that are even narrower or Brighton place which is a bus route and already overwhelmed by traffic.</p>
Object	
	<p>I agree with the road calming in the Coillesdenes. However, I believe completely closing BRN is a mistake and will simply end up pushing traffic elsewhere, creating even greater congestion bottle necks, adding more pollution and create unnecessary stress for key workers, business users, people with mobility issues etc.</p> <p>BRN is a key connection into the east side of Portobello. It is a narrow road and it can be difficult for traffic to flow effectively in both directions. The problem is exacerbated by parking on both sides of the road. If at least one side was made no parking I believe the problem would largely be removed.</p>
Object	<p>I find it strange how a key road could be considered for closure. I have read a number of comments that a senior council official on the Transportation Committe lives in the vicinity and has been instrumental in pushing this traffic order through. I hope this isn't the case, as it would be a clear conflict of interest. If it is the case, the truth will surface and Edinburgh Council's reputation will decline to an all time low.</p>
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to TRO/21/13 on the grounds listed below.</p> <p>Closure of Brunstane Road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the Coiliesdene/Morton Street/Eastfield areas. The restricted access into and out of the Coiliesdene area that you wish to implement will require traffic to take a longer route, resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. The new Brunstane housing development of 1300 houses is progressing and this will increase traffic on all the surrounding areas, more so if the closure of Brunstane Road goes ahead. There is no mention of the longer time it will take emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point by the railway bridge on Brunstane Road. The statement of reasons says the changes are to encourage sustainable travel such as walking/cycling and promote quiet local neighbourhoods. South Morton Street, in close proximity to Brunstane Road, fulfils the criteria for walking/cycling. Attempting to promote quiet local neighbourhoods in one area using the measures you are proposing just diverts issues to where you are pushing traffic onto and will not make them any quieter.</p> <p>There have been numerous consultations when the views of people have been sought in relation to Brunstane Road and on each occasion the majority response has been NO to a closure. A one way option (South to North) has been put forward at each consultation yet this has always been discounted with no reasons given as to why this option and others e.g. yellow lines on one side of Brunstane Road, speed reduction measures, etc., are not being considered.</p> <p>The main aim of the Council appears to want to give residents in Brunstane Road a private parking place for their cars, vans, motor homes - yet this doesn't seem to be a consideration the Council adopt in other areas. Brunstane Road residents in favour of the closure are more interested in ensuring their vehicles can be parked safely, not the safety of others – you only have to venture along the street to see how many of their vehicles are parked on footpaths with complete disregard for pavement users.</p> <p>It is known, and is stated often on social media posts, that the Vice Convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides very close to Brunstane Road. This person should not be allowed to take part in any of the discussions/decisions relating to Brunstane Road as this is a blatant conflict of interest. The Council have recently received a 'red' rating for their handling of the 'spaces for people' scheme and ignoring warnings and issues raised. The situation with Brunstane Road is receiving the same treatment from the Council – a large majority do not wish the closure to be progressed and their views/suggestions are being ignored. Pro-closure residents are already announcing that the closure is 'in the bag' and the audit report in relation to the Kings Road junction mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. This current consultation is a farce if decisions have already been made regardless of the majority who do not wish Brunstane Road to be closed. The majority who do not want a closure have tried on numerous occasions to put forward alternatives which are discounted, as it appears the only action the Council wants to progress is 'closure'.</p> <p>The traffic situation on Brunstane Road is not unique. There are many other streets within and outwith the area that are narrower, with vehicles parked on both sides, and you don't hear of residents wanting to have their area closed off. Closing Brunstane Road will set a precedent as anyone who doesn't want traffic using their road can ask for the road to be closed. However, unless they have someone with Council connections either living on or nearby, it is unlikely that the support would be forthcoming.</p>
Object	<p>I hope that the issues raised in this formal objection will be considered. There are many other urgent roads and transportation matters that the Council should be attending to instead of providing private parking for one street, the closure of which will have a major impact on more people than just the residents.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>The plan to close Brunstane Road completely is ill-considered and will adversely impact not only the surrounding area but also the wider Portobello area and severely impact people wishing to visit businesses, family and friends in the Portobello area.</p> <p>I wish to make a formal objection to TRO/21/13 on the grounds listed below.</p> <p>Closure of Brunstane Road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the Coillesdene/Morton Street/Eastfield areas. The restricted access into and out of the Coillesdene area that you wish to implement will require traffic to take a longer route, resulting in an increase in traffic and congestion on many routes, higher levels of vehicle emissions and longer journey times. The new Brunstane housing development of 1300 houses is progressing and this will increase traffic on all the surrounding areas, more so if the closure of Brunstane Road goes ahead. There is no mention of the longer time it will take emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point by the railway bridge on Brunstane Road. The statement of reasons says the changes are to encourage sustainable travel such as walking/cycling and promote quiet local neighbourhoods. South Morton Street, in close proximity to Brunstane Road, fulfils the criteria for walking/cycling. Attempting to promote quiet local neighbourhoods in one area using the measures you are proposing just diverts issues to where you are pushing traffic onto and will not make them any quieter.</p> <p>There have been numerous consultations when the views of people have been sought in relation to Brunstane Road and on each occasion the majority response has been NO to a closure. A one way option (South to North) has been put forward at each consultation yet this has always been discounted with no reasons given as to why this option and others e.g. yellow lines on one side of Brunstane Road, speed reduction measures, etc., are not being considered.</p> <p>The main aim of the Council appears to want to give residents in Brunstane Road a private parking place for their cars, vans, motor homes - yet this doesn't seem to be a consideration the Council adopt in other areas. Brunstane Road residents in favour of the closure are more interested in ensuring their vehicles can be parked safely, not the safety of others – you only have to venture along the street to see how many of their vehicles are parked on footpaths with complete disregard for pavement users.</p> <p>It is known, and is stated often on social media posts, that the Vice Convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides very close to Brunstane Road. This person should not be allowed to take part in any of the discussions/decisions relating to Brunstane Road as this is a blatant conflict of interest. The Council have recently received a 'red' rating for their handling of the 'spaces for people' scheme and ignoring warnings and issues raised. The situation with Brunstane Road is receiving the same treatment from the Council – a large majority do not wish the closure to be progressed and their views/suggestions are being ignored. Pro-closure residents are already announcing that the closure is 'in the bag' and the audit report in relation to the Kings Road junction mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. This current consultation is a farce if decisions have already been made regardless of the majority who do not wish Brunstane Road to be closed. The majority who do not want a closure have tried on numerous occasions to put forward alternatives which are discounted, as it appears the only action the Council wants to progress is 'closure'.</p> <p>The traffic situation on Brunstane Road is not unique. There are many other streets within and outwith the area that are narrower, with vehicles parked on both sides, and you don't hear of residents wanting to have their area closed off. Closing Brunstane Road will set a precedent as anyone who doesn't want traffic using their road can ask for the road to be closed. However, unless they have someone with Council connections either living on or nearby, it is unlikely that the support would be forthcoming.</p> <p>I hope that the issues raised in this formal objection will be seriously considered. There are many other urgent roads and transportation matters that the Council should be attending to instead of providing private parking for one street, the closure of which will have a major impact on more people than just the residents.</p>
Object	<p>We write in objection to the proposed amendments to the traffic flow in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area.</p> <p>Our primary objection is that by deterring motor vehicle through traffic in one area of Portobello, the proposal will create precisely that detrimental effect on the neighbourhood area around Brighton Place and Southfield Place. Our reasons are :</p> <p>It will compound the problem by creating a greater public nuisance because of the location of Brighton Place and Southfield Place in relation to vehicular access to Portobello and parent and child pedestrian and cycling safety en route to two primary schools.</p> <p>The traffic that would have used Brunstane Road would be displaced onto Brighton Place / Southfield Place, the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello;</p> <p>Brighton Place / Southfield Place is part of the bus route for three buses, 21, 42, 49 all with regular services and all leading to a build up of traffic at busy times;</p> <p>There is a pinch point before the railway bridge where the road narrows - something already managed, for safety but not congestion, by preference given to on-coming traffic into Portobello;</p> <p>Increased volumes of traffic will cause drivers to seek means of avoiding a straight drive through Brighton Place either by going through East Brighton and Lee Crescents resulting in hold-ups at these exit points or, for those unfamiliar with the lay out, trying to drive through the dead ends of West Brighton Crescent or Rosefield Place as was evident during the closure of Brighton Place for re-surfacing.</p> <p>Increased volumes of traffic will add to the existing congestion and delays as traffic moves (or doesn't) along Southfield Place, already an area of significant build up and delay at the Baileyfield Road traffic lights. There is already a tendency to avoid this by using Stanley St/ Park Avenue as a rat run.</p>
Object	<p>We are not unsympathetic to the traffic nuisance suffered by our neighbours in the Coillesden and Brunstane Road area. However, this is an ill considered proposal which does not manage the underlying problem but merely moves it to another part of Portobello.</p>
Object	<p>With regards to the above traffic order, I believe the current plan will increase traffic through Portobello High Street and cause more delays and pollution to people walking and shopping in this busy high street area. As a resident of Portobello and a former resident of 25 years on Brunstane Road, I think I most realistic solution would be to make Brunstane Road a one way street. Allow traffic to travel north from Milton Road East to Joppa Station Place. This would reduce traffic considerably on Brunstane Road and reduce the impact on the Coillesdene area. Please remember that not everyone has the ability to walk uphill in this area and the residents of Brunstane Road deserve to have car access to Portobello maintained without a lengthy detour which will add to pollution.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make some comments and give feedback on consultation TRO/21/13 (Brunstane Low Traffic Neighbourhood) as a resident of that neighbourhood.</p> <p>Broadly I'm supportive of low traffic neighbourhoods, and as a resident of Eastfield Gardens, I've enjoyed the benefits of living on a quieter street and want other people to also have this privilege.</p> <p>Eastfield Gardens is next to the proposed changes and I was surprised to see it hadn't been considered as part of the overall plan. I can see the rationale - the proposed changes act to prevent moving the existing cut-through along Milton Road and onto other streets. My concern is that in missing out Eastfield Gardens, the plan overlooks the potential for our street to become a cut-through, as people chop off a difficult and traffic lighted junction to get onto the promenade.</p> <p>Already we have a small number of people using our street this way, often driving at some speed. I am concerned closing Brunstane Road will increase this.</p> <p>I appreciate the traffic has to go somewhere! I wonder if it would be possible to add in traffic calming measures, similar to those proposed for Coillesdene Avenue, to disincentivise drivers from using our street in this way.</p>
Object	<p>I appreciate that on paper it may look like people would just continue to the junction - we already know from experience that this isn't always the case, and if the volume of traffic increases, so will the numbers of drivers who will take the option to cut off that corner.</p>
Object	<p>I strongly object to the closure of the road. Traffic in the whole portobello area is becoming problematical and the closure of this road will drive more traffic into other areas. Traffic will increase on Brighton place, Baileyfield road and duddingston park where there are several nurseries and these streets lead up to primary and secondary schools. Traffic is already heavy around here and speeding is a problem.</p> <p>One of the reasons for this measure is "The introduction of the proposed measures is intended to promote quiet local neighbourhoods". However this will have the direct opposite effect on our neighbourhood.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>1. It will increase traffic through a residential area already used by many driving instructors for learner drivers.</p> <p>2. It will increase journey times, pollution and fuel consumption.</p> <p>3. It will have a detrimental effect on emergency service - response times.</p> <p>4. It will require the construction of a turning area</p> <p>5: It will necessitate significant expenditure</p> <p>6. A perfectly reasonable alternative to this proposal exists which would minimise the impact locally and be much more acceptable to the majority of local residents.</p> <p>Of the four options recorded in the-report, the dismissal of the option to make Brunstane Road one way flawed.</p> <p>The road has speed bumps and is in the 20 mile an hour area, what supports the contention that vehicle speeds would exceed this limit? Given the figures recorded in the report, less than 3% of the traffic is two wheeled why should two way access be provided for cycles? Some 250 metres along Milton Road to the West is Hope Lane which is a cycle way directly into the heart of Portobello.</p>
Object	Further, a controlled crossing offers safe passage for pedestrians and cyclists across the Milton Road at that point. This option is supported by the vast majority of residents in the area who accept that the current situation is unsatisfactory but don't want to replace one problem with another.
Object	I am utterly opposed to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road as well as the other associated restrictions. This is poorly thought out and will simply push traffic through residential areas throughout Joppa.
	<p>I object to this order.</p> <p>The works proposed are completely out of proportion to the problem and will create lots of difficulties in areas traffic is diverted to.</p> <p>A much simpler and cheaper option would be to make Brunstane Road one way only with traffic being able to turn in off Milton Road East and come down onto Portobello. 2 way traffic on Brunstane Rd has been problematic for years as has traffic coming up and turning right into the busy Milton Road East.</p> <p>The proposals create unacceptable levels of traffic through other narrow residential streets and create a new rat run along the Coillesdenes rather than there simply being a number of options which spread the traffic as now.</p> <p>The area is super for learner drivers at present and the changes will make it more dangerous for this to continue in the numbers it happens now.</p> <p>In addition something needs to be done about the speed of 40 miles an hour and parking near junctions on Milton Road East. There is no need for such a residential road to be 40 and the blind spots created by parking (currently within legal distances) on the road make it a potentially lethal combination for those turning onto Milton Rd East heading east or west.</p>
Object	I find it difficult to understand why you can consider closing the above road and making Milton Drive and Milton Terrace one way. The diversion roads are narrower than Brunstane road which you don't seem to want to try one way. The disruption to the closure of my street and diversion of surrounding area will affect far more residents than would Brunstane residents. It seems to me that for whatever reason they are being given preferential treatment. I know the proposal is to be experimental but don't believe for one minute this is the case, will the Council have available funds to revert back at a later stage? Please do not go ahead with this, also bearing in mind the proposed housing intended off the Milton road.
	<p>I would like to make a formal objection to TRO/21/13 for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Over the last two years there have been a number of serious accidents at the junction of Coillesdene Drive and Coillesdene Avenue, with the most recent incident only two weeks ago resulting in injuries and damage to a property on Coillesdene Drive. Vehicles are not stopping at the junction and HGVs are using the route as a short cut. There are a number of young children living on Coillesdene Drive, including our own, and this proposal puts them at serious risk of injury as this will increase traffic flow, noise, pollution and opportunity for incidents.</p> <p>2. Many of the local residents use bicycles for transport of children to schools, nurseries - the increase in traffic flow makes the routes more dangerous.</p> <p>3. There are not enough existing restrictions in place - speed bumps, signs to control the speed of traffic at 20mph. That speed reduction measures are planned for mid Coillesdene Avenue is an admission that through traffic still using our area will tend to speed to make up for the longer journey time/distance caused by the proposed closure. As our area has a sizeable elderly population and some young families, this is a point of concern.</p> <p>4. It is surely unfair that residents living in Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and mid Coillesdene Avenue will have to accept all the cars/lorries flowing through the area, albeit some one-way. Also residents in Morton Street and Coillesdene Drive (north part) would have to accept some additional displaced traffic flow.</p> <p>5. No mention/allowance has been made about the longer time it will take Fire, Ambulance and Police emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point beside the East Coast railway bridge on Brunstane Road.</p> <p>6. No mention/allowance had been made for residents in Eastfield Gardens/Coillesdene Avenue for traffic using their streets as a method of avoiding additional traffic build-up at Eastfield Lights. And we have seen this happen when work was ongoing on the recent upgrades to internet services.</p> <p>7. Brunstane road has been a main thoroughfare into and out from Portobello for well over 100 years and traffic problems are largely due to their residents parking cars and vans in the carriageway/on the pavement in front of older houses not built with driveways.</p> <p>8. As far as we are aware, no traffic survey has been carried out to identify who is currently travelling on Brunstane Road, where they are from, going to, and for what reason! Also, what route would they take if this road was closed and the ETRO implemented?</p>
Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed Experimental Traffic Regulation Order which seeks to enforce the closure of Brunstane Road to vehicular traffic by the imposition of totally unnecessary traffic calming measures in the Coillesdenes. There was no pressure for such measures locally except during the temporary closure of Brunstane Road when Brighton Place was being relaid.</p> <p>The proposed measures would generate severe pressure on Brighton Place, which is designated a safe route to school, and surrounding streets probably increasing rat runs. As well as traffic dislocation emission levels would be raised.</p> <p>Why is the Council proposing to go ahead with this plan? Surely the money would be better spent on known accident black spots in Portobello or even wider afield in Edinburgh. What are the figures for Brunstane Road and surrounding area? Is this a case of officials surrendering to sustained lobbying by a relatively small group of residents who were privileged by having a period of temporary traffic calm and want it restored in perpetuity to the detriment of their neighbours? It certainly looks like it.</p>
	<p>It surprises me that this plan is still being pushed on, despite the clear opposition.</p> <p>I have already submitted my re-actions in detail. Am I required to do so again, & if so, why?</p> <p>Is it jobs for the girls/boys?</p> <p>Most households have cars, & need access, & there is no demand for drastic action.</p> <p>Brunstane Road is the only issue, & there is a strong argument for a one way system, but the rest of the impositions are a sop to the cycling lobby.</p>
Object	You want quiet neighbourhoods, so you say, yet you propose to invite strife from motorists. These people live in said neighbourhoods, & pay their council tax.
	<p>I strongly object to this. Traffic has steadily increased in Portobello and Joppa due to more and more residents moving to the area. We need more roads open not fewer. The environment and sustainability of transport is a non argument. People can still cycle on roads. Roads in the city need to be made safer for cyclists but remain open to traffic, particularly in areas such as Portobello and Joppa.</p> <p>Brunstane road should either be a 1 way system or resident parking on 1 side to facilitate fluidity of traffic. Not everyone can walk or cycle to work.</p> <p>Also, deciding to close a road during a pandemic when a lot of residents are still working from home is not giving a realistic picture of pending traffic issues.</p>
Object	We are writing to object to TRO/21/13, the ETRO proposing to close Brunstane Road to traffic.
	<p>This will not, as is claimed, encourage sustainable travel, improve exercise or deter through traffic.</p> <p>It will simply move the problem to other streets, affecting the residents of those streets in a negative way.</p> <p>The residents of the affected streets, including Milton Drive, Milton Terrace, Coillesdene Avenue, Morton Street and Coillesdene Drive have chosen to live there because these streets are relatively quiet.</p> <p>The residents of Brunstane Road have chosen to live in what has historically been a main thoroughfare. So have the residents of Brighton Place but they do not deserve to have additional traffic resulting from a closure of Brunstane Road.</p>
Object	Surely any safety issues in Brunstane Road can be addressed by making the street one way, thus sharing the volume of traffic with the surrounding area.
Object	A more logical solution would have been to make Brunstane Road one-way northbound and let southbound traffic from Joppa Road find their own way to Milton Road

Response	Comments
Object	<p>We wish to object to the above as the issues cited to justify the closure and the other measures in the surrounding streets will transfer to Brighton Place / East Brighton Crescent / Lee Crescent, yet no measures are being proposed by CEC to address this. There seems no rationale to exclude Portobello from this whole exercise.</p>
Object	<p>I write to object to the proposals. As I said in my initial objection, I remain concerned about the following:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the removal of the Brunstane Road option means that the traffic that would have used Brunstane Road will inevitably be displaced onto Brighton Place, the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello. Obviously, Brighton Place is a significantly residential area already severely impacted by traffic use, including being a bus route in quite a narrow thoroughfare. Adding to the traffic that already uses Brighton Place will have an undeniably negative impact; - the inevitable displacement of traffic onto other routes such as Joppa Road and Portobello High Street will increase an already hugely congested area and add to air pollution (currently very high indeed) from cars having to go all the way along to Eastfield and along these roads to get to Portobello from Milton Road; - there will also be vastly increased volumes of traffic causing even more queueing (with concomitant additional emission levels) and congestion; - greater possibility of rat-running around East Brighton and Lee Crescents; - increased traffic would mean a less safe environment for children and their parents walking, scooting and cycling to and from school up and down Brighton Place, supposedly to be a safe route to school. Obviously creating a situation which impacts on the Council's avowed aim to facilitate both safer routes to school as well as encouraging more healthy options for the school journey, will send all sorts of wrong messages, particularly for the next generation; - worsened air pollution, which is harmful to human health. <p>In addition to the foregoing, I also understand that it is likely that the council will ban HGVs turning left along Harry Lauder Road from the High Street, which could send more HGVs up Brighton Place, adding to traffic congestion and making it less safe.</p> <p>I trust that my views will be taken into consideration and that something far more beneficial to all those requiring to use our roads and not just seeking to satisfy well-off residents in the immediate vicinity. I would particularly like to say that all residents in Edinburgh are required to pay Concil Tax and make fair financial input into our city. By allowing the views and wishes of a tiny proportion of residents, who have an interest in limiting access in order to benefit themselves solely, smacks of an elite approach. Please take this into account.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to hereby voice our concern and objection regarding the closure of brunstane road and coillesdene area (TRO/21/13). Rerouting traffic from these roads is not only an inconvenience, but also increases pollution by lengthening the route people take into portobello by quite a bit. Moreover, emergency response will also take longer if they cannot use these roads to get to the area which lies closest to the coillesdene area.</p>
Object	<p>I was previously a resident adjacent to Brunstane Road, and although the traffic could be bad, I felt a simple solution would have been a one way traffic system from Milton Road to Portobello.</p> <p>I now live just off Brighton Place, and the idea that all of the traffic would now be diverted to Brighton Place from Brunstane Road closure is completely preposterous. We already have buses and heavy throughflow of traffic, with absurd parking whereby people can park on both sides of the road effectively making it a one way street. The idea that someone Brunstane Road and surrounding residents are more worthy of quiet and safety than this area is awful. We have the traffic when people shop in Portobello or go to the beach, but adding to that on a narrow cobbled street where there are parks for families and children to enjoy is so wrong.</p> <p>I understand there is now going to also be no turning left for lorries onto Sir Harry Lauder road, so I take it these large, unsafe, polluting vehicles will now also travel up Brighton Place. It is appalling to think that the residents in Joppa are worthy of more quiet than us, and there is surely a solution that is not a complete closure of Brunstane Road with a massive and irreversible impact on Brighton Place and the surrounding streets.</p> <p>I am an NHS worker and it is already unbearable trying to get parked at times on my street after long nightshifts. This has got worse since lockdown with more people visiting the beach. I can live with that, but the idea that the traffic will be constantly busier, worse, and unsafe is something that would absolutely drive me and others away from this area that we moved to for relative peace from the city. It would change this area from a lovely suburb to a thoroughfare of heavy traffic and large vehicles that will change the streets for good.</p>
Object	<p>I object to the ETRO to close Brunstane Road.</p> <p>The closure will only force traffic down the nearby roads. Hope Lane is already closed to traffic, and by closing Brunstane Road, traffic will increase on Park Avenue which is meant to be a safe route to school. There will be further congestion in an already blocked Stanley Street, Southfield Place and Brighton Place. I believe this measure could increase accidents and am strongly against it.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to raise an objection to TRO/21/13.</p> <p>There is no overall strategy for traffic management in Portobello;</p> <p>The effect of displacing traffic to the Eastfield junction, onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and onto Brighton Place / Southfield Place is unknown;</p> <p>Increased travel distance and pollution for residents;</p> <p>Increased response times for emergency vehicles;</p> <p>Increased pollution and safety risk to children in Brighton Place / Southfield Place which is designated a safe route to school;</p> <p>Increased rat-running along East Brighton crescent and Lee Crescent; and Restriction of access to the Brunstane allotments and bowling club.</p> <p>It has come to my attention that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to object formally to the above proposed order.</p> <p>It is clearly wrong that the residents of the Coillesdene area should be subjected to increased traffic flow with a probable ignoring of speed limits because of inconvenience to the relatively few residents of Brunstane road much of which is caused by their parking their own vehicles in the road concerned. The proposed diversion through Milton Drive will put that traffic on a road which is even narrower than Brunstane Road itself.</p> <p>The resultant increase in traffic will be even worse when the proposed development of the 1300 houses at Brunstane Farm comes to fruition.</p> <p>Has the council considered the current traffic patterns of those presently using the Brunstane Road "shortcut"? What is the general destination of this traffic? If Portobello (as I suspect) is there an alternative route avoiding both Brunstane Road and the Coillesdenes? If the traffic patterns have not been analysed why not?</p> <p>The whole proposal seems to have been ill thought out and much more needs to be done to convince the Coillesdene residents that the proposition is viable.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I live at the top of Gilberstoun Brig and regularly need to drive into Portobello High Street to drop my child off and then pick him up from private nursery. There are no other private nurseries closer to Gilberstoun, and no public transport options from Gilberstoun to Portobello High Street. My oldest child has recently school in Newcraighall, so I need to take her with me to drop off my youngest child. If I could not use my car and had to walk from my house to nursery, then Google maps tell me it is a 24 minute walk down there, then the same amount of time to come back home again, before another 10 minute walk from my house to the school. So almost an hour for my 5 year old to walk in the morning before she even starts school, then the same again in the evening. Although in an ideal world, we wouldn't need cars to move around within the city, I have provided an example where there are no public transport options and no other private nursery providers closer to my home, so I require to use my car to drive into Portobello on a daily basis. The closure of Brunstane Road will just add time to my day, and increase vehicle emissions in residential areas in Coillesdene. This is why I am against the closure of Brunstane Road.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of Brunstane Road will only move traffic onto other roads in the Colliedene area. The restricted access into and out of the Colliedene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many other routes.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents like the junction at Sir Harry Lauder Road.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space. Making the road one way would reduce traffic both on Brunstane Road and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p>
Object	I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.
Object	<p>I object strongly to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road. This would leave Brighton Place as the only north/south entry to Portobello and would increase traffic on an already very busy road, increasing queues and congestion.</p> <p>It would increase pollution and traffic on what is a reasonably safe route for parents and children walking or cycling to and from school.</p> <p>It would also increase traffic on East Brighton/Lee crescents which would almost certainly become a rat run.</p>
Object	The coming ban on HGVs turning left onto Harry Lauder Road from the High Street would possibly also send HGVs up Brighton Place, increasing noise and pollution and making it less safe still.
Object	I strongly object to this proposal as it would strongly impact on our street, Lee Crescent, which with East Brighton Crescent, would become a ratrun for all the displaced traffic. Brighton Place would become the only North/south route into Portobello; traffic is already heavy and would become heavier. In addition the proposal to prevent HGVs turning left onto Harry Lauder Road from the High Street might mean more HGVs using Brighton Place.
Object	<p>I object to the council idea of Brunstane Road closure and traffic restrictions in the Coillesdene area. At the moment we have no traffic problems in Coillesdene and these suggestions will mean we will have vans, lorries and cars driving about trying to find a way down from Milton Road therefor making the area congested and unsafe. Also quite a few elderly people in the area require to use their car as too far to walk to the bus stops and shops. There are also many learner drivers using this area so not good for them either. The junction from Morton Street onto Joppa Road will be extremely busy and it's not always easy to turn right at the moment so may well become an accident blackspot.</p> <p>Lee Crescent is a narrow street and it will become a rat race so not good for them either.</p> <p>The traffic is just being shifted about and thus causing unnecessary expense to the council and inconvenience for many residents.</p> <p>Instead of closing Brunstane Road perhaps some passing places could be made e.g. Small sections of the Road with double yellow lines to allow passing vehicles more room. This means the residents should be able to park at least one of their cars in the street and traffic should flow.</p> <p>I hope the council listens to these objections and don't just ignore them to please a few. I have heard that someone on the committee lives on or near Brunstane Road and they may influence the decision!! Hopefully this will not be the case. If the council doesn't take into account views of the majority of residents perhaps there will need to be an inquiry into why they haven't.</p>
Object	<p>Cutting off all through traffic on Brunstane Road dumps all that traffic onto neighbouring streets.</p> <p>Making Brunstane Road one-way is a more equitable resolution to the problem.</p> <p>Were Brunstane Road one-way, the present through traffic would be reduced by half.</p> <p>And neighbouring streets would see half the increase of traffic which they face at present.</p>
Object	Public opposition to this has been huge so I really cannot understand how there is even going to be a trial never mind a full closure. Questions not answered in realistic terms include the impacts of re routing of traffic elsewhere: through the quiet Coillesdene estate, Brighton Place - which is the only other north south route in and out of Portobello; the traffic will noticeably increase on Portobello High Street and Joppa Road..And all because of one minimal section on Brunstane Road. The disadvantages to those aforementioned surrounding areas will be far greater than this.
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposal to close Brunstane Road to all traffic. This proposed road closure may achieve its objective of "lowering traffic" for the residents of Brunstane Road but will increase it in the surrounding streets, thus creating more traffic and pollution for everyone else in the area. Why do the residents of Brunstane Road expect to have a quiet, traffic-free street at the expense of all those around them?</p> <p>Traffic will take the next quickest route, which will involve various rat-runs down Milton Terrace and through the Coillesdenes, where many elderly residents and families live. Motorists who follow the detour along Milton Road East to the lights at Eastfield and back along the front (or vice versa), will have a two mile drive, which is not only costly to them in time and money but has an environmental impact, at a time when we are trying to cut emissions. It is unrealistic to think that motorists are suddenly going to stop driving just because they can't get along Brunstane Road – they will simply take another route. Potentially hundreds of vehicles every day driving an extra two miles must have significant road safety and environmental implications.</p> <p>If a compromise has to be reached, then I hope that, as a minimum, Brunstane Road will be made one-way, with traffic allowed to travel northwards. This would "lower traffic" on Brunstane Road and have less of an impact on the surrounding streets. The closure of Brunstane Road at both ends, would set a precedent for the residents of other congested streets (of which there are many in Portobello) to ask for the same measures.</p>
Object	<p>I write to object to the above Experimental TRO.</p> <p>The closure of Brunstane Road will not achieve the sustainable accessible aspirations sought but will prevent suitable access along this route, to the significant detriment to access for local residents.</p> <p>Moreover, the closure of access/egress of ce provision of traffic calming measures within certain roads in the Coilestines is not required. Finally, provision of traffic calming measures within the Coilestines are not proportionate to the objectives sought by the TRO and are grossly over engineered solution to a non-existing nor forthcoming problem. They should therefore be removed from the TRO.</p>
Object	I've seen the impact that closing Brunstane Road has on the rest of the surrounding area when this happened in the past couple of years. Surrounding streets, especially Portobello High Street and Brighton Place became more congested due to the restriction on the number of routes in and out of Portobello. I'd imagine that the air pollution levels along the High Street are already quite high (I don't have the figures, but I would hope that the council does) and the closure of this route will add to the traffic congestion already present, especially at rush hour times.

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I wish to strongly object to the Brunstane Road Experimental traffic order TRO/21/13.</p> <p>I do not feel that the closure of Brunstane Road to through traffic will solve the issue of traffic flow in the Portobello and surrounding areas. It has been shown, in the short time that the road was temporarily closed that all this serves to do is push the problem into other areas namely Coillesdene. It was even noted by my 8 year old daughter how much busier the surrounding streets were when Brunstane road was closed.</p> <p>I have attended community council meetings and strongly disagree with the opinion that 'if you close the roads then the traffic will just disappear' as was stated by a local councillor.</p> <p>I cannot understand why these measures are being implemented when the majority of respondents to previous consultations are against the recommendations. It makes no sense!</p> <p>Whilst the proposal may make some of the residents of Brunstane Road happy, it does not take in to account the residents of the surrounding areas and simply moves the problem from one place to another.</p>
Object	<p>I'm so disappointed that, in spite of several public consultations, the Council has chosen to ignore the wishes of the vast majority of residents in the Brunstane/Coillesdene/Portobello area, and decided to go ahead with their decision to trial the closure of Brunstane road. I do not feel that sufficient rationale has been given to justify this. The consultation process has therefore felt disingenuous, and the decision an undemocratic, foregone conclusion. In the face of such public opposition, it would have seemed more reasonable to trial one of the less extreme options e.g. to make Brunstane road one way. Instead the Council has decided to undermine the public's confidence in it's decision making.</p> <p>i) No mention/allowance has been made about the longer time it will take Fire, Ambulance and Police emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point beside the East Coast railway bridge on Brunstane Road.</p> <p>ii) It is surely unfair that residents living in Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and mid Coillesdene Avenue will have to accept all the cars/lorries flowing through the area, albeit some one-way. Also residents in Morton Street and Coillesdene Drive (north part) would have to accept some additional displaced traffic flow.</p> <p>iii) No mention/allowance had been made for residents in Eastfield Gardens/Coillesdene Avenue for traffic using their streets as a method of avoiding additional traffic build-up at Eastfield Lights.</p> <p>iv) That speed reduction measures are planned for mid Coillesdene Avenue is an admission that through traffic still using our area will tend to speed to make up for the longer journey time/distance caused by the proposed closure. As our area has a sizeable elderly population and some young families, this is a point of concern.</p> <p>v) Brunstane road has been a main thoroughfare into and out from Portobello for well over 100 years and traffic problems are largely due to their residents parking cars and vans in the carriageway/on the pavement in front of older houses not built with driveways.</p> <p>vi) As far as we are aware, no traffic survey has been carried out to identify who is currently travelling on Brunstane Road, where they are from, going to, and for what reason! Also, what route would they take if this road was closed and the ETRO implemented?</p> <p>vii) The closure of Brunstane road is not going to reduce traffic, but redirect it to other roads. Improvement of public transport, and safe cycle paths would have a significant impact on reducing traffic on the roads.Would the council consider improving the safety of cyclists using the Kings Road junction and increasing the frequency, capacity and reliability of the trains passing through Brunstane Station?</p>
Object	<p>I would echo the comments below. I am really concerned about the impact on Coillesdene Avenue, as we have young children.</p> <p>I'm so disappointed that, in spite of several public consultations, the Council has chosen to ignore the wishes of the vast majority of residents in the Brunstane/Coillesdene/Portobello area, and decided to go ahead with their decision to trial the closure of Brunstane road. I do not feel that sufficient rationale has been given to justify this. The consultation process has therefore felt disingenuous, and the decision an undemocratic, foregone conclusion. In the face of such public opposition, it would have seemed more reasonable to trial one of the less extreme options e.g. to make Brunstane road one way. Instead the Council has decided to undermine the public's confidence in it's decision making.</p> <p>i) No mention/allowance has been made about the longer time it will take Fire, Ambulance and Police emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point beside the East Coast railway bridge on Brunstane Road.</p> <p>ii) It is surely unfair that residents living in Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and mid Coillesdene Avenue will have to accept all the cars/lorries flowing through the area, albeit some one-way. Also residents in Morton Street and Coillesdene Drive (north part) would have to accept some additional displaced traffic flow.</p> <p>iii) No mention/allowance had been made for residents in Eastfield Gardens/Coillesdene Avenue for traffic using their streets as a method of avoiding additional traffic build-up at Eastfield Lights.</p> <p>iv) That speed reduction measures are planned for mid Coillesdene Avenue is an admission that through traffic still using our area will tend to speed to make up for the longer journey time/distance caused by the proposed closure. As our area has a sizeable elderly population and some young families, this is a point of concern.</p> <p>v) Brunstane road has been a main thoroughfare into and out from Portobello for well over 100 years and traffic problems are largely due to their residents parking cars and vans in the carriageway/on the pavement in front of older houses not built with driveways.</p> <p>vi) As far as we are aware, no traffic survey has been carried out to identify who is currently travelling on Brunstane Road, where they are from, going to, and for what reason! Also, what route would they take if this road was closed and the ETRO implemented?</p> <p>vii) The closure of Brunstane road is not going to reduce traffic, but redirect it to other roads. Improvement of public transport, and safe cycle paths would have a significant impact on reducing traffic on the roads.Would the council consider improving the safety of cyclists using the Kings Road junction and increasing the frequency, capacity and reliability of the trains passing through Brunstane Station?</p>
Object	<p>I wish to object to the abovementioned proposal.</p> <p>Brunstane Road and Brighton Place constitute the main North-South routes into and out of Portobello. Closing the former will necessarily divert traffic to the latter, which already suffers congestion. Longer queues here will worsen the air pollution in the area and promote rat-runs in adjoining streets, such as East Brighton and Lee Crescents. Brighton Place is supposed to provide 'a safe route to school', and the proposal will inevitably render it less safe.</p>
Object	<p>For these reasons I believe that Brunstane Road should not be closed.</p>
Object	<p>Brunstane Road and Brighton Place constitute the main North-South routes into and out of Portobello. Closing the former will necessarily divert traffic to the latter, which already suffers congestion. Longer queues here will worsen the air pollution in the area and promote rat-runs in adjoining streets, such as East Brighton and Lee Crescents. Brighton Place is supposed to provide 'a safe route to school', and the proposal will inevitably render it less safe.</p>
Object	<p>For these reasons I believe that Brunstane Road should not be closed.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I believe Brunstane Road is an important access road, being one of only four such access roads serving Portobello and Joppa. As we have all witnessed over the last few weeks, Brighton Place can be closed for any number of reasons. When this happens in future there will be only two roads at opposite ends which is certainly not a safe option, with little contingency for accidents and emergency should one of these also become blocked.</p> <p>Furthermore I do not believe Brighton Place is sufficient on it's own as the only access road on the south side of Portobello, especially at certain times when it is usually very busy as the only access to our schools.</p> <p>I feel completely frustrated and unsupported by Edinburgh Council's lack of understanding and continued intransigence in what the vast majority of the local community want. Instead they continue to favour just the wishes of the residents at the top end of Brunstane Road. Why is this the case? It seems that whatever we say is ignored, and there's a complete lack of common sense in the council's conclusion. There have been many suggestions to improve road safety without closing the road. Closure should be the very last resort. If the Council is serious about experimenting, why is it that they are not experimenting with some of these alternative less draconian suggestions?</p> <p>Brunstane Road is a public right of way, which is frequently blocked by traffic. It's a simple statement, but everyone seems to be ignoring the causes. Traffic is only part of the story. The other part is parked cars down both sides frequently leaving nowhere for two-way traffic to pass. It's that simple. The correct action for the benefit of all is to make space for traffic to pass safely. It's just the same issue in other streets in Portobello where the Council intends to implement a CPZ which will remove parking spaces down one side of the street. I fully support the Council in this approach. Who could reasonably argue that such action wouldn't work in Brunstane Road?</p>
Object	<p>I object to Brunstane Road being closed on the following grounds:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -It will increase emergency services access to Portobello by more than a mile (when Portobello and Joppa Parish Church burnt down in the 1990s it was critical for the emergency services to get down to Brunstane Road fast, similarly the terraced houses fire on Eastfield.) The ambulance and fire service service uses Brunstane road as a key access to the A1 and the ERI , detours cost lives. -Brighton Place will become a bottleneck for vehicles and children with all the associated air pollution and danger to young people -Closing the Brunstane Road will benefit a handful of people while causing real problems for the rest of the local community and local businesses -To remove a quarter of the main road access to Portobello and Joppa will cause displacement congestion with the other three accesses. -No attempt has been made to reduce traffic flow by reducing parking on Brunstane Road or by making it one way. -it will restrict access to Brunstane Bowling Club and Brunstane allotments <p>At the last meeting the agreement to proceed with this went through 'on the nod', I was really shocked at this lack of democratic discussion, it has quite shaken my faith in local democracy. We know local representative bodies and a huge number of local people object strongly to this proposal and no account was taken of their views. I hope to see evidence on file of a proper discussion and account taken of all views of this proposal.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to strongly complain about, and totally disagree with, the rather suspect proposals covering the Brunstane Road closure and surrounding streets.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How many complaints has Council had from the Portobello area and what exactly are these? Is it only from Brunstane Road and the potentially affected local surrounding streets? What percentage of the affected Portobello Community wishes the road to be closed? Is this just to satisfy a small, verbal minority trying to get what they want and damn the effect on everyone else? We have not been given this information. 2. This affects the whole of the Portobello /Joppa area and information about this 'consultation' has not gone out to this greater area to be affected by closures. Indeed, I only discovered this by a casual comment from a very irate council taxpayer in Abercorn Terrace. Seems like one has to be in the inner sanctum of the 'right group'. The process seems suspiciously underhand in this case. 3. In previous missives purporting to be 'consultation', some of us offered some more, fairer, efficient and cheaper ideas/alternatives to help Brunstane Road residents resolve their perceived problems. We should be able to see minutes of any committee debate discussing these suggested alternatives. Have you actually considered any of them? <p>For example, it surely can't be because of playing area safety for their children, as they, luckier than most people, have a huge park for children to play in Joppa Quarry. The traffic movements (<20mph!) only become busier at the two peak times in the day. The rest of the time I've observed over recent months is the road is relatively quiet! If you established clearly signed closure at two set times in the day, say, 8.00 – 9.00 and 4.30-5.30 and clearly applied the rule, that would be at least a democratic, fair and reasonable compromise. One must remember the house owners bought their houses knowing full well there is a road there, as we all have to consider when buying a property. If this attitude of SELF importance perhaps by the Brunstane Road residents were to be replicated over the city, no-one would be going anywhere. Certainly, social visiting, local businesses and emergency services would grind to an even bigger halt than they are now. To re-iterate some earlier ideas. Maximum vehicle width for parking on the road. A small amount of staggered double yellow lines to enable vehicles to pull in to enable oncoming vehicles to pass safely. Vehicles under a certain size only can use the road, e.g. no lorries unless delivering.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. If this road is being closed due to the suggestion it's too narrow for cars, but okay for bicycles as they are narrower, by that argument then, motorcycles will still be allowed through travel due to their equally narrow stature? 5. The closure of yet another access road in and out of Portobello will create more concentrated pollution and unnecessary congestion for the rest of Portobello. Does that mean we can all have our streets closed too, including those living in the High Street. Surely these people can expect these same rights too? We've all experienced the shambles when Brighton Place was closed, and then again when previously Brunstane Road was closed. 6. Personally, I dread the day an ambulance/fire appliance/police car cannot get down the quickest route to resolve an emergency as Brunstane Road et al are shut off. <p>PLEASE LISTEN TO YOUR PORTOBELLO CONSTITUENTS, GIVE US ALL THE INFORMATION REQUESTED (see para. 1) AND SEND IT TO THAT COMMUNITY AS YOU ALMOST MANAGED WITH THE PROPOSED PORTOBELLO CPZ'S. DO NOT HAVE THE TAIL WAGGING THE DOG.</p> <p>Coincidentally, I have just arrived home today via Brunstane Road, timed at 5.35p.m., carrying personal goods impossible to transport by bicycle or bus. I met one car coming up the way and followed none going down. In the main this has not been so unusual. I would like that point noted/ added to my earlier comments please.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to submit my comments with regards to proposal reference TRO/21/13 - Brunstane Low Traffic Neighbourhood.</p> <p>Having reviewed the proposal, I believe that the closing of the connection from Milton Road to Portobello via Brunstane Road would cause unnecessary inconvenience, pollution and added congestion along other routes for the benefit of only a handful of people.</p> <p>I believe that the underlying aim of the proposal is aimed to please the residents of Brunstane Road, and ultimately increase the value of their properties. The subsequent proposals to add restrictions to Coillesdene have only been added due to the problems that closing this road to please the few would cause on those streets. The benefit from closing Brunstane Road will be reaped by less than 200 people, whilst the inconvenience, extra costs, climate impact and added travel time will be felt by thousands of people.</p> <p>If there are genuine concerns about the traffic levels on this road, I believe that a far better compromise and a solution that will actually also improve safety along the road is to turn it into a one-way system.</p> <p>I can only imagine that this proposal has been born out of someone with vested interest in property on Brunstane Road being able to influence that council and will be demanding that an independent review of the decision making process will be conducted, should this proposal to close Brunstane Road be accepted.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>Further to your proposed draft traffic order, please see our comments, suggestions and objection.</p> <p>1) While this traffic order will greatly reduce the passing traffic at our house, it is not a realistic proposal for the management of traffic in the general area. That is the triangle from Brunstane Road to Eastfield.</p> <p>2) The proposed traffic order does not in any way meet the 'Statement of Reason' in your proposal as it increases the traffic in many of the streets. I fail to see how the order implements your statement of " promote quiet local neighbourhoods, encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home, and to deter motor vehicle through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area."</p> <p>The proposal fails this statement as it will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Increase traffic in the one-way streets by closing Brunstane Road and diverting through traffic in the one-way system b) Encourage the 'L' drivers to use the area of Coillesdene Crescent as a practice area, even more than at present. c) Reduce the response time of emergency services to the area. e) Impact the house price profile across the area, some increased and some reduced. f) Make access to many of the houses very difficult, actually increasing traffic flow. <p>3) Therefore to meet your 'Statement of Reason' it could be suggested that a more inclusive and acceptable scheme is implemented. What is clear is that a system to reduce the traffic in all these areas is essential.</p> <p>It is suggested that the 'triangle from Brunstane Road to Eastfield becomes a 'resident only' access and that using any of these streets as a short-cut or quick route is banned. The use for 'L' drivers should also be reviewed and limited as it is currently excessive with some motoring schools using the Coillesdene loops as trial loops with some going round more than 20 times on a continuous basis.</p> <p>To implement this, please consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The inclusive area Brunstane Road to Eastfield traffic lights is a 'resident only area' b) Signs are provided at all entry points c) A number plate recognition system (NPR) is installed at all entry and exit points to fine those who transit through the area within a certain time window, with an exception available to residents. d) Road calming measures are introduced throughout (speed bumps)
Object	<p>In summary the existing TRO/21/13 proposal is unacceptable and does not meet the Statement of Reason.</p>
Object	<p>I am emailing to say I oppose this road closure. Any of the reasons anyone else has emailed or written to you against it, I likely agree with. I don't see the point in wasting my time writing it all out for you to ignore as well, as I have done in the past in other surveys or chances to oppose it. You are clearly going ahead with this despite what the majority want. If a councillor lived on my street I wonder what we could get done. What an absolute joke.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Coillesdene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Coillesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Coillesdene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examined the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>We are concerned at the impact of the closure of Brunstane Rd is a potential increase of traffic on Seaview Crescent, particularly as the street already has problems with drivers using it at as a cut through at speed and the danger this poses with the two blind corners at the junction with Milton Drive and the sharp right hand bend to the western end of Seaview Crescent, just before the junction with Musselburgh Rd. Should this plan be implemented we'd ask that traffic-calming measures are introduced on Seaview Crescent to try and alleviate this problem.</p> <p>Far from deterring traffic in the area, we feel the decision to close a section of Brunstane Rd instead of making it one-way, or introducing other traffic calming measures, is in our view just going to push traffic into the surrounding streets rather than taking a broader approach to introducing consistent traffic calming measures across the whole area.</p>
Object	<p>Re this advertisedTraffic Order, the stated aim is to reduce traffic volumes in Brunstane Road and the Coillesdenes. While it would certainly have that effect in Brunstane Road, it would simply move the problem to the Coillesdenes, with Coillesdene Avenue bearing the brunt of it (as you obviously recognise with the proposal to include speed reducing measures in the affected part of the Avenue) and increase greatly the volume of traffic presently using Milton Drive and Milton Terrace.</p> <p>In short, the solution looks worse than the problem. We would prefer to keep the status quo but an alternative which would share the problem between Brunstane Road and the Coillesdenes would be to make Brunstane Road one way (the more logical of which would be North from Milton Road East), which would reduce the volumes of traffic in Brunstane Road and halve the amount of additional traffic being sent through the Coillesdenes compared with the proposed traffic order.</p> <p>Your stated aim of reducing traffic volumes in these areas seems to us to be pie in the sky - solving the problem in one place simply moves it to another.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I live on Brighton Place and am concerned that increasing levels of traffic will be displaced onto this street by the closure of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>On Brighton Place this will lead to more congestion, air pollution (especially with increased queueing traffic) loss of amenity, increased levels of noise, and a less safe environment for children using the street as a 'safe' route to school.</p>
Object	The situation will be exacerbated by the proposed left-turn ban of HGV's onto Harry Lauder Way who will also need to use Brighton Place as a north/south route.
	<p>I wish to strongly object to the Brunstane Road Experimental traffic order TRO/21/13.</p> <p>The closure of Brunstane Road to through traffic does not solve the issue of traffic flow in the Portobello and surrounding areas but merely pushes the problem into another area namely Coillesdene. You will be aware that the closure of Brunstane Road was proposed previously but was rejected by the Council for this very reason.</p> <p>If the council are serious in their desire to "promote quiet local neighbourhoods, encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home, and to deter motor vehicle through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area" this proposal does not achieve that goal. A solution must be found that pushes traffic out of residential areas not, as this does, displaces it from one area to another.</p> <p>The Council has already accepted that increased traffic in the Coillesdene area will be the case and as part of this proposal are suggesting speed reduction measures be installed in Coillesdene Avenue. I assume this is because they recognise Coillesdene Avenue will now be used as a through route and, as it is a wider road, traffic speed will be a problem. When you add this to the already significant number of learner drivers using the Coillesdene area for three point turns, emergency stops and practicing parallel parking round stationary vehicles this proposal makes no sense.</p> <p>I attended the consultation meeting held by the roads department and spoke to a number of the transport officers about this proposal. I understand that following the consultation process the majority of respondents were, unsurprisingly, against these recommendations. Why then are they being implemented?</p> <p>I accept traffic management around Portobello is an issue but this proposal is not the answer! It takes no account of the views of residents in the Coillesdene area or indeed looks at the wider implications of future traffic management issues caused by a significant housing development at Brunstane Farm.</p> <p>I urge the Transport and Environment Committee to take a step back and develop a longer term strategy to deal with the long term implications of traffic management in this area.</p>
Object	The current proposal does no more than satisfy some (as not all are in favour of closure) of the residents of Brunstane Road at the expense of the majority of Coillesdene residents.
	<p>I wish to object to the proposed measures outlined in the above on the following basis:</p> <p>We are already a quiet, local neighbourhood where people have access to safe spaces for walking and cycling, and where traffic is not heavy. I therefore reject the rationale on which the proposal is based.</p> <p>None of the 'problems' being addressed in the Coillesdenes existed before the temporary closure of Brighton Place in 2019. There is no need for reduced access and traffic calming in the area if Brunstane Road remains open.</p> <p>The Council's proposal is an experiment with unpredictable outcomes. There may be increased traffic pressure on Brighton Place and the roads round about, all of which are a school route. Increased congestion here is potentially dangerous and will increase pollution in Portobello.</p> <p>I have to say that my impression is that the proposal has come about as a result of sustained lobbying by residents of Brunstane Road. I am disappointed with the Council for responding in the way it has to such lobbying by a small group of residents campaigning to close their own road to benefit themselves. There are other roads in Edinburgh which may need attention by the Council - perhaps even roads where there have been serious accidents or fatalities. Can it be right that that better-off people living in leafy suburbs can attract Council resource and attention to the potential neglect of others in the city? What exactly are the traffic issues on Brunstane Road that have initiated all of this? I have experience mild congestion from time to time, but nothing worse. How many serious accidents have there been?</p>
Object	Even assuming the existence of major traffic issues on Brunstane Road, closure is not the only possible 'solution' - one way traffic, passing places, banning parking on one side of the road are all possibilities - I have not seen evidence that these have been considered.
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Coillesdene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colloiesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examines the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>The whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	Additionally, should this closure go ahead this will result in Brighton Place in Portobello becoming even more congested, given it will serve as a main route into the city which will have an even greater impact on the area.
Object	I refer to Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) for the closure of Brunstane Road to through traffic. I object to this on the grounds that traffic will redirect down Brighton Place the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello, already a busy main thoroughfare for what is a residential road in a conservation area, leading to greater congestion, increased pollution and increased risk to children on a school route.
Object	I object to this on the grounds that traffic will redirect down Brighton Place being the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello. It is already a busy main thoroughfare for what is a residential road in a conservation area, leading to greater congestion, increased pollution and increased risk to children on a school route. It is noticeable as well that the traffic, after the repair work was completed on the setts, has speeded up substantially increasing this risk.
Object	I wish to formally object to the 'Brunstane Road' TRO/21/13 for the following reasons; 1) No allowance has been made for the longer time it will take Fire, Ambulance and Police vehicles to reach residents north of the rail bridge in case of emergency. This could be a matter of life and death for those residents. 2) It is unfair on residents of Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and Coillesdene Avenue to expect them to take much of the traffic displaced from road closures elsewhere. 3) No thought would appear to have been given to traffic who will use Eastfield Gardens/Coillesdene Avenue to avoid the inevitable bigger queues at the Eastfield Junction. 4) Road closures will surely mean traffic speeding up to make up for the longer journey times. This could mean accidents and injury to residents. 5) Brunstane Road has been a main thoroughfare into and out of Portobello for many years and traffic problems there are caused by vehicles parked on the street/pavements outside houses with no driveways. 6) I don't think a survey has been done on traffic currently using Brunstane Road, where are they from, going to and why. Surely this information is important to know before any change, even experimental, is made. 7) This TRO is not a means to persuade people to walk or cycle instead of using a car but will just cause problems elsewhere which is unfair. At the present time traffic flow is shared through the area but this proposed TRO is forcing traffic onto fewer and therefore busier roads.

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I object to the proposed Order for the following reasons :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic will be displaced from Brunstane Road onto Brighton Place, the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello. 2. Brighton Place is a major bus route for several buses and is already congested with frequently queuing traffic . 3. There is the likelihood of "rat-running" through East Brighton & Lee Crescents . 4. Increased traffic on Brighton Place would mean a less safe environment for children & their parents walking/cycling to and from school on a route which is supposed to be a safe route to and from school. 5. Brighton Place would suffer increased air pollution and consequent damage to human health. <p>6. If the Council proceeds with its proposal to ban HGV's turning left along Harry Lauder Road , more HGV's are likely to use Brighton Place ,thus exacerbating traffic congestion,pollution and lack of safety for pedestrians & cyclists.</p>
Object	<p>I disagree with closing the above road and making Milton Drive and Milton Terrace one way. The diversion roads narrower than Brunstane road which you don't seem to want to try one way. The disruption to the closure of the other street and diversion of surrounding area will affect far more residents than would Brunstane residents. Your proposal is in my mind ineffective and unnecessary and more than likely cause havoc elsewhere.</p> <p>I think making brunstane road one way down to joppa makes more sense</p>
Object	<p>[I] wish to oppose to the closure order TRO/21/13. I find it difficult to understand why you can consider closing the above road and making Milton Drive and Milton Terrace one way. The diversion roads narrower than Brunstane road which you don't seem to want to try one way. The disruption to the closure of my street and diversion of surrounding area will affect far more residents than would Brunstane residents. Your proposal is in my mind ineffective and unnecessary and more than likely cause havoc elsewhere.</p> <p>I think making brunstane road one way down to joppa makes more sense</p> <p>I have lived and driven in my area for over 35 years</p>
Object	<p>(Addressee 2)</p> <p>As a local resident in Portobello, I wish to object to the proposed TRO at Brunstane Road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full consideration to viable alternatives including a one way system has not been properly considered; 2. There is no overall strategy for traffic management in Portobello; 3. The effect of displacing traffic to the Eastfield junction, onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and onto Brighton Place is unknown; 4. Increased travel distance and pollution for residents; 5. Increased response times for emergency vehicles; 6. Increased pollution and safety risk to children in Brighton Place which is designated a safe route to school.
Object	<p>As a local resident in Portobello, I wish to object to the proposed TRO at Brunstane Road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Full consideration to viable alternatives including a one way system has not been properly considered; 2. There is no overall strategy for traffic management in Portobello; 3. The effect of displacing traffic to the Eastfield junction, onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and onto Brighton Place is unknown; 4. Increased travel distance and pollution for residents; 5. Increased response times for emergency vehicles; 6. Increased pollution and safety risk to children in Brighton Place which is designated a safe route to school.
Object	<p>I would like to object against the closure of Brunstane Road and consider that a one way road should be implemented instead of complete through traffic closure.</p> <p>The extra cars this will result in all surrounding roads will be significant.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to object against the closure of Brunstane Road. A one way system would be a better outcome as the main issue on Brunstane Road is the ability for two cars to pass each other.</p> <p>A complete road closure will simply route traffic through other surrounding residential roads to get from Milton Road East down to Joppa Road or Seaview Terrace. Of the council thinks people will simply drive on Harry Lauder Road into the middle of already busy Portobello or all the way down Milton Road East and turn back onto Seaview Terrace I fear they are sadly mistaken. Drivers will simply route down other residential road as a 'shortcut' to Joppa Road. The increase in traffic as a result of road closure was evident with the previous closure of Brighton Place for a prolonged period of time.</p> <p>Closing Brunstane Road may solve an issue for residents of Brunstane Road but it will simply route traffic through other back streets down onto Seaview Terrace. A one way system would be a much better solution.</p>
Object	<p>I do not support the proposal to close Brunstane Road because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There appears to be no evidence of there being any current road safety/accident issue and accordingly the proposed scheme can deliver no benefits in that direction. • The closure of Brunstane Road will merely transfer existing traffic flows onto the Coillesdene streets to the east. • There appears to be no demonstrable benefit (with the exception of that to the residents of Brunstane Road) and therefore the proposal can't represent value for money.
Object	<p>I wish to express my formal objection to the above TRO.</p> <p>Why was nothing put through the letter boxes of the households affected to make us aware of this current TRO proposal?</p> <p>One of the purposes of your TRO is to deter through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area however this is going to encourage an increase in through traffic in the Milton and Seaview area instead and still in the Coillesdene Avenue/Drive area.</p> <p>I believe that this will push a lot of traffic onto Seaview crescent as it will be the quickest unobstructed route from Milton Terrace onto Musselburgh Road and then onwards onto Portobello. You are assuming that traffic will go along Coillesdene Avenue as that is where you have indicated the installation of traffic calming measures but I believe they will come down Seaview Crescent instead as that is the most direct route into Portobello.</p> <p>A lot of driving lessons take place in this vicinity so there are already a lot of vehicles driving round the streets all day, every day and this TRO will direct more vehicles to this area. But you wouldn't know that as you are not measuring this.</p> <p>There has been nothing laid on Seaview Crescent to measure the current volume of cars. I have only seen survey devices on one section of Milton Drive and one section of Coillesdene Avenue . I have not seen any devices at the junction of Coillesdene crescent/gardens and Milton road east which is the junction you plan to close or on Milton Terrace which the majority of traffic will come along from Milton road east.</p> <p>How can you measure the affect of the proposed changes if you are not measuring the current traffic using these streets?</p> <p>There has already been a significant increase in the number of people walking around these streets over the last 18 months without the need of this TRO and I don't see how these proposed changes will in any way impact this. Have you measured how many people are walking around these streets currently , what is your target number of people walking the streets and how will you measure the success of this proposed TRO?</p> <p>Do the residents of Brunstane road want this / ask for this? Is there sufficient room on this road for vehicles , particularly large delivery / rubbish collection/ emergency service vehicles to turn and get back out of the street.</p> <p>Some of the residents are going to have to drive a lot further to get from their home onto Milton Road East.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I am (again) lodging my opposition to these plans.</p> <p>I see no benefit in diverting existing traffic from one area to the surrounding areas. Contrary to your stated desire to "deter motor vehicle through traffic in the Colliedene and Brunstane Road area" you will simply increase the traffic in the Colliedene area and will do so at financial cost and disruption to those living in the area.</p> <p>I am assuming you have done some research on the benefits of this plan. However, I find it difficult to believe this research provided any tangible benefits to the residents in the Colliedene area. Therefore, apart from being an official objection, please consider this an official request under the freedom of information act to see all the research and reports connected to this proposal.</p>
Object	<p>I live [on] Morton Street and will be directly affected by people using my street as part of the rat run that will be created by the proposed closing of Brunstane Road. My children will be out at a higher risk of danger from the higher volume of cars and as a concerned local who has seen the overwhelming local feedback in two polls (both over 90% against these measures) I am agog that the council are pressing ahead with these. I would like this to be referred to the Scottish Government and will be contacting our local MPs as this makes no sense in its current form.</p> <p>1) do we understand the increased time for emergency services to reach some of the households affected by the closure?</p> <p>2) cars and lorry traffic will seek routes through the scheme including Coillesdene Avenue/Morton street.</p> <p>Will traffic calming be introduced on morton street to slow vehicles? The fact there are plans for Coillesdene Avenue seems an admission that the council expect this route to become a rat run.</p> <p>Is that fair? This diversion then affects a far higher number of residents than the number who live on Brunstane Road (including the local councillor!)</p> <p>3) the issue with Brunstane road is the sheer number of owners cars in front of houses never designed to have cars parked on the main thoroughfare into Portobello from the south (predating Sir Harry Lauder road)</p> <p>4) has any traffic survey been carried out to understand what route current users would take if they can't use Brunstane Road?</p>
Object	<p>5) the fact that over 1000 houses are due to be built at Brunstane Farm with one access point into Milton Road East is a concern as a proportion will inevitably be looking to head into Portobello and will use these rat runs too.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to formally object to this proposed ETRO (TRO/21/13) as i feel it will negatively impact on the residents in the surrounding areas.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to formally object to the proposal of TRO/21/13 as I feel it does not solve the traffic issues in this area.</p>
	<p>We are emailing to object to the proposed Experimental Brunstane Roads traffic order for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) Almost without exception, the residents in Brunstane Road were fully aware of the parking situation before they bought the properties.</p> <p>2) The proposed changes will materially inconvenience the residents in the rest of Joppa to the benefit of less than 60 households in Brunstane Road.</p> <p>3) The original reasons that previous orders have been refused still maintain, ie, problems with fire engines and maintenance lorries etc.</p> <p>4) It is unfair that residents in the Coillesdene estate where many of the roads are narrow and not intended for through traffic should carry additional volumes.</p>
Object	<p>5) This order will do nothing to further the council objectives which were quoted on the ETRO such as cycling, walking etc.</p>
	<p>1) I can easily see the reasons for this proposal, and when I do go up Brunstane Road it is usually on a bicycle.</p> <p>2) For heasons of History and Geography Portobello is a bit cut off from Edinburgh, there are only 4 ways in or Out and Brunstane Rd is one of them.</p> <p>3). There is a concentration of retail services at Kinnaird Park. If Brunstane Road is closed more traffic will be sent along the High Street and Brighton Pl. Brighton Pl is already a bottleneck.</p>
Object	<p>4) Has the option of making it one way been considered, up only?</p>
	<p>We are putting in writing that we strongly do not want brunstane road closed to through traffic We live at the bottom of brunstane road and use brunstane road numerous times of the day to get to and from everywhere we go We try to avoid Brighton road and the Harry Lauder road as much as possible due to the busyness of these roads To cut through collinsdene constantly is encouraging it to be a rat race for people in a hurry this is very residential where I allow my children and dogs to be walked as the roads are quieter and safer unlike the main roads, Brunstane road is safe as drivers have no choice to drive slowly due to the passing at the bridge</p> <p>This is a accident waiting to happen changing what already works very well</p>
Object	<p>This will change this lovely residential area in to an unsafe rat race I hope this gets passed on to the appropriate persons That we strongly disagree with the change proposed Please leave alone and save the unnecessary money that's going to be spent.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colloiesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examines the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>At the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road were upset about traffic passing their homes and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about children's safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting including making the road one-way from Milton Road as well as suggestions regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of whom own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there.</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
	<p>I'm writing to object to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road</p> <p>Why not consider one way traffic lights at the bridge on brunstane road which allow traffic to flow easily and safely over the bridge avoiding increased traffic throughout the whole area</p> <p>This closure would mean much busier traffic throughout my area and considering all the new houses to be built in brunstane farm the traffic will be increased even further This will make our streets a rat run from Milton road to portobello and make them unsafe</p> <p>Our streets are in bad enough disrepair without extra traffic - coillesdene crescent was resurfaced not that long ago and holes are already appearing again</p> <p>Also traffic ignores the 20mph and our junction at our end of Coillesdene Crescent already unsafe for crossing</p>
Object	<p>I trust these points will be taken into consideration</p>
	<p>I strongly object to this traffic order. I stay in Morton Street and will be heavily affected. Brunstane Road residents bought their houses knowing that the road was busy. Just put a double yellow down one side of the road.</p>
Object	<p>1. The last time it was closed the traffic build-up was immense. Cars drive over pavements in their haste. 2. When we bought our house we knew that the area was quiet with very little traffic. When the Brunstane Road owners bought they were VERY WELL AWARE that it was a very busy road. 3. If this change goes head the value of our houses will go down, at the same time, the value of Brunstane Road will go up. Please don't insult my intelligence and tell me that this fact has not motivated the Brunstane Road owners. I WILL be seeking legal advice on this matter!! 4. I know for a fact that some Brunstane Road owners don't want the bridge closed. I have heard it through the grapevine that some owners may have some influence re the closure. I hope that this is gossip. 5. Will slow down emergency vehicles. 6. We will also have to contend with extra traffic from the 1,300 new homes to be built nearby. 7. In my opinion you cannot possibly ignore that huge numbers of objections you will inevitably receive from the Joppa residents.</p>
Object	<p>NB As far as I know there have been no accidents of any consequence on Brunstane Road, so that nullifies their "danger" argument. There is more danger on Coillesdene Avenue re children and old folks.</p>
Object	<p>I am against the closure of Brunstane Rd because of the increase in traffic that will come up and down Morton Street, it has always been a quiet street and I would like it to remain that way.</p>
	<p>I would like submit my sponge objection to the closure of Brunstane Road, Joppa.</p> <p>This closure doesn't not Benefit the local area only the residents on the road in question and only serves to put more pressure on the other roads in the area.</p>
Object	<p>The clear option is turning the road into a one way system.</p>
	<p>We have concerns around emergency services access, access to local community and shops (in last closure people went to the Fort or Asda instead of shopping local), a big concern for us was that there isn't really a 'high traffic' problem in the road, there is congestion at rush hour (which could be solved if necessary by one way or one-sided parking), it seems there was a small group of residents who didn't like the congestion but the issue has now seemingly turned 'eco' as in lets make this a low-traffic area. This is to us total rubbish as rather than not drive (and no public transport alternative) people drive miles further, thus adding to pollution. Regularly, turning right into Brunstane road from Milton road east involved a wait of up to 30 minutes as we were involved with the traffic trying to cross the main crossroads and huge unnecessary tailbacks happened for all. So as you might be able to tell, We are against. There were also a very ugly concrete block dumped to block the bridge which ultimately did make us feel cut off from the rest of Portobello and Joppa.</p>
Object	<p>Road closure doesn't feel like it is a genuine solution to a genuine issue (if it really did have eco impact I'd be more in favour, despite personal inconvenience), I feel it adds to a pollution issue and panders to a vocal minority who don't like traffic outside their house sometimes.</p>
	<p>Brunstane Road is a residential street, it's not a promenade. This street is used by local residents and businesses and gives us access to Portobello High Street and the bypass. Locking us in won't help traffic congestion. Closing he road won't help the environment and instead the problem will be moved somewhere else, two streets away to be precise.</p> <p>With a heavy traffic on other main roads, this is yet another alternative and as someone who drives this way nearly every day (I live on Brunstane Road), I can assure you that most drivers are polite and patient and make it work. Just because a few are not following the rules, we cannot punish all. This road is incredibly important for us, local residents, and other solutions, such as traffic lights or widening the road should be explored before closure, which is the simplest and the most damaging solution.</p>
Object	<p></p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>1. The road is one of the few thoroughfares giving access from Portobello to the bypass. It serves that purpose well.</p> <p>2. The plans indicated by the council seem to offer very little in terms of managing other traffic that will be diverted because of this road closure.</p> <p>3. The road at Brunstane was closed previously at the bridge, and cars and vans simply went round to the smaller roads (Joppa terrace, Morton St, Coillesdene Ave) which have lots of kids playing/walking around on them. Understand in these plans all traffic is attempted to be diverted to Milton Road East or Sir Harry Lauder Road, but that will inevitably cause even more congestion on those roads. Which is already substantial, especially at peak times.</p> <p>4. Who is going to police this when people inevitably don't adhere to the signs?</p> <p>5. Ultimately, the action is unnecessary. And will simply move the problem elsewhere. It's a street, not a promenade. Providing a cycle lane or not allowing cyclists on the promenade (on weekends at least) would be a better use of council time and resources for families and dogs who enjoy the beach and promenade.</p> <p>Just a thought.</p>
Object	<p>Objection to Brunstane Road Closure</p> <p>The following are the main reasons I find the closure of this road contradictory to safety, pollution, and the interests of the Portobello community:-</p> <p>1 Lack of Community Accountability -Although one of our councillors directs that previous consultations with the Portobello community aren't to be recognised as a reason to keep this road open, it seems to disregard community involvement when there was a substantial proportion of local people against the closure.</p> <p>2 Pollution - traffic which previously used Brunstane Road will now increase in already busy roads eg Brighton Place, Portobello High St with greater volumes of standing traffic and therefore pollution.</p> <p>3 Safety - although Brunstane Road residents may have a safer road, the traffic in the Collesdene area and in other ratruns (eg East Brighton Crescent / Lee Crescent) will create unsafe areas for residents.</p> <p>4 Consultation - there has been a lack of information for the Portobello community throughout this process. The initial consultation only applied to a very small area of Portobello whereas any road closure affects the whole area.</p> <p>This has not been an open process and has favoured one street in our community - a councillor had identified she'd wanted this for 25 years and I really do not think this is a fair and equitable representation of what our community wanted to happen. Many streets are more congested, more unsafe, have more parking on them and it would be positive if more energy could be applied to these streets!</p>
Object	<p>I cannot understand the rationale behind this TRO other than a desire to close a road. It was always going to happen that when the road was closed for work on the bridge, residents who had a shot at living in a cul-de-sac were going to push for a permanent closure.</p> <p>There is an issue with vehicles passing each other on a narrow road, but kindly do not fail to acknowledge, the main problem is not the bridge. If the bridge was the issue it could be resolved by a set of traffic lights. There are a number of narrow bridges in Edinburgh. Why not close all of them.</p> <p>The real problem is the number of vehicles parked either side of Brunstane Road which are nearly all parked on the pavement. The Council made a proposal to reduce the parking on Regent Street and Malborough Street and end the issue of pavement parking. In this instance the proposal is to close the road and ignore the illegal parking blocking pedestrian access.</p> <p>Another issue with this proposal is the shuffling of traffic along towards Coillesdene. There have been traffic calming measures put in place, but there will be a significant increase of traffic in Coillesdene, This traffic will have to undertake a longer journey, passing by more residences. So is this really a good idea, or is it just bowing to the pressure of a group of residents while putting others to considerable inconvenience.</p> <p>Another issue with the proposal is traffic will be allowed to traverse Coillesdene north from Milton Road. Any vehicles travelling from Portobello will have three options.</p> <p>1. Travel through the Eastfield junction increasing traffic there.</p> <p>2. Through the lights at Bath Street again increasing traffic.</p> <p>3. The worst option of all. Having closed, Baileyfield Road traffic will be increased at the left turn onto the Harry Lauder. Is that really what you want.</p> <p>I have yet another issue with this proposal and that is to do with the rat run through Coillesdene, Argyle Crescent and Windsor Place, Portobello.</p> <p>When traffic builds up on Milton Road, vehicles turn right and head to Portobello through the rat run. Your proposal does nothing to address this, it can only make it worse. This rat run has been an issue for years and is worse than the Brunstane Road issue as vehicles are travelling much faster.</p> <p>Finally I would like to finish with a question.</p> <p>A number of years ago I raised the issue of this rat run after an accident in Windsor Place, I was told that nothing would be done as "Windsor Place came under Joppa, not Portobello and Joppa is not the problem".</p> <p>So why is all this money now being spent in Joppa where Brunstane Road is the burning issue of the day, it is, most assuredly, not in Portobello.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colliedene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip. 2. The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examined the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003. 3. The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria. 4. I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway. 5. Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space. 6. It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria. 7. Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community. 8. By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there <p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposal. My main concern is that the result will be a greater volume of traffic diverted to Brighton Place. I already experience vibrations in my home on Sandford Gardens from heavy vehicles on Brighton Place, and the demand for parking space in the area exceeds supply. I believe some traffic vibrations maybe causing structural damage to properties, including fracturing of stonework. The proposal does not address the issue it raises without merely displacing the issue onto other residents of Portobello.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to oppose the closing of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>I have lived in Portobello for thirty years, and have lived in various streets during that time. I have lived in streets with a dead end - Pittville Street, the top bit of Lee Crescent and now I live in West Brighton Crescent. I have never lived in Brunstane Road as it's always been a narrow street fully populated by cars, and I do use it sometimes but not often for that reason- I do however realise when I use it that it's going to be necessary to give way and take thanks (or not), or thank someone for giving way - either way there is usually some interaction and as I use it so seldom then this is usually friendly, and therefore a positive experience.</p> <p>However I would not choose to live there because it's not a tranquil street, the houses seem close together and there a few parking spaces left, I should imagine. I think if you choose to live there it is unreasonable to think you can stop the traffic going there just because you do so.</p> <p>I also think the more roads that are open, the freer the traffic will run - eg closing Hope Lane South (which isn't even as residential) hasn't helped many people except those in Stanley Street and probably Southfield Place and it has certainly caused more traffic to queue along Milton Road.</p> <p>Of course living off Brighton Place means I have the more convenient option of using Duddingston Park or Crescent to get to Milton Road East rather than Brunstane Road anyway. But it shouldn't be the only way.</p> <p>God help anyone who relies on using Brighton Place as an alternative - it seems just as easily blocked with parking, buses, heavy lorries and fairly frequent closure.</p> <p>I think it (Brunstane Road) should stay open to spread the ever increasing traffic around the area.</p> <p>Maybe more energy should go into planning what will happen when the Strand opens onto Harry Lauder Road ...</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I object to the experimental traffic regulation on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Brighton Place is the main street local children walk up and down to go to primary and high school (and three nurseries) - it is already extremely busy and this will make their walk more air polluted, noise polluted, less appealing to walk on and more stressful and more risk to their physical safety. -Both of my children cross at Brighton Place - how does this diversion of more traffic onto Brighton Place square with its' designation as a safe route to school? -The proposal will also make this very narrow main street Brighton Place less safe on a bike and so will discourage cycling. -Due to the poor job done of the drainage during resurfacing work on Brighton Place, whenever there is rain a pool of water gathers outside my door which means that I have to time when I (and my 6 and 9 year old children) am entering my flat to not get soaked by passing vehicles - a problem that will be made worse by heavier traffic. -The double yellow lines on Brighton Place and the corner of Lee Crescent are ignored by all of the cars picking up takeaway food from La Favorita & Bonoful, and people picking up from Shapes hairdressers making crossing the road at Lee Crescent dangerous - a problem that is only going to be made worse by heavier traffic. -The Coillesdenes have never featured in any council low traffic neighbourhood strategy and there were only ever issues there during the closure of Brunstane Road. -Nobody I have spoken to who lives on Bruntane Rd wants the closure and they are worried about emergency services - how slow it will be for them to all get down Brighton Place (it is slow already so will be horrendous) it is simply to narrow to just allow them priority resulting in increased response times for emergency vehicles. -There is no overall strategy for traffic management in Portobello; -The effect of displacing traffic to the Eastfield junction, onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and onto Brighton Place is unknown; -Increased travel distance and pollution for residents; -Increased rat-running along East Brighton crescent and Lee Crescent a narrow residential street with lots of children. -Restriction of access to the Brunstane allotments and bowling club for older members who have difficulty walking.
Object	<p>Please visit Brighton Place at 8.30am on a school day if you want to see why this should not happen.</p>
	<p>I am writing to object to the experimental traffic regulation on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Due to the poor job done of the drainage during resurfacing work on Brighton Place, whenever there is rain a pool of water gathers outside my door which means that I have to time when I (and my 6 and 9 year old children) am entering my flat to not get soaked by passing vehicles - a problem that will be made worse by heavier traffic. -The double yellow lines on Brighton Place and the corner of Lee Crescent are ignored by all of the cars picking up takeaway food from La Favorita & Bonoful, making crossing the road at Lee Crescent dangerous - a problem that is only going to be made worse by heavier traffic. -The Coillesdenes have never featured in any council low traffic neighbourhood strategy and there were only ever issues there during the closure of Brunstane Road. -Both of my children cross Brighton Place - how does this diversion of more traffic onto Brighton Place square with its' designation as a safe route to school? -There is no overall strategy for traffic management in Portobello; -The effect of displacing traffic to the Eastfield junction, onto Sir Harry Lauder Road and onto Brighton Place is unknown; -Increased travel distance and pollution for residents; -Increased response times for emergency vehicles; -Increased pollution and safety risk to children in Brighton Place. -Increased rat-running along East Brighton crescent and Lee Crescent; -Restriction of access to the Brunstane allotments and bowling club.
Object	<p>-Restriction of access to the Brunstane allotments and bowling club.</p>
	<p>I wish to object to Brunstane TRO/21/13. The council has not included evidence here from previous surveys to demonstrate widespread support (or lack thereof?). The plans simply divert traffic a very long way around and will increase congestion at Brighton Place and by Scotts Garage, where signalling will not cope. As seen during the Brighton place closure, we need all entry/exit points to Portobello functioning and open or the traffic flow worsens significantly. This plan will result in longer journeys and more idling at lights/junctions and only benefit the residents of these streets.</p>
Object	<p>As seen during the Brighton place closure, we need all entry/exit points to Portobello functioning and open or the traffic flow worsens significantly. This plan will result in longer journeys and more idling at lights/junctions and only benefit the residents of these streets.</p>
	<p>I strongly object to the closure of Brunstane Road. I strongly object to the traffic calming measures for the Coillesdene Area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Turning Brunstane Road into a private car park 2. Turning the Coillesdenes into a private car par area when everyone there has driveways 3. Difficult for emergency services to enter these areas 4. Difficult for post services and delivery drivers 5. Build up of waiting traffic on the surrounding roads – one with a High School and access to Brunstane Primary School. 6. Build up – increase of traffic pollution caused by 3waiting traffic. 7. Pushing traffic onto other residential streets in the area. <p>Alternative solution: Please consider – a one way system with cameras (speed) and better speed bumps on Brunstane Road. Allowing traffic to flow into Portobello to help local businesses, and ease congestion.</p>
Object	<p>Please consider – a one way system with cameras (speed) and better speed bumps on Brunstane Road. Allowing traffic to flow into Portobello to help local businesses, and ease congestion.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to state my objection to the proposed measures to close Brunstane Road.</p> <p>I have lived here for over 20 years and see little change over this time in this quiet residential area where people can walk and cycle around easily.</p> <p>Why is this deemed necessary? I am unaware of any recent serious accidents and any change means traffic would inevitably end up somewhere else.</p> <p>Is this proposal the result of heavy lobbying by the residents of Brunstane Road? They purchased their property knowing the area and the house valuations would take this into account.</p> <p>Surely there are solutions other than closure. Why not one way traffic, parking only on one side of the road, designated passing places. Many of the houses already have parking spaces at the side of their properties.</p>
Object	<p>I have already indicated my objections to this on a previous occasion and see no reason to alter my opinion that this is without doubt not the solution.</p>
	<p>I am lodging my formal objection to the above-mentioned ETRO.</p> <p>I request that all the points listed below are considered carefully if they have not been already, and regardless of any previously discussions or communication, a response is clearly communicated to the residents, with any further proposals justified in a way that is fair to all residents, and fully and transparently considers both social and environmental impact of the plans.</p> <p>I would be in favour of a solution that limits traffic access in this whole area to residents and emergent vehicles with no through access, and requires through traffic to use the main roads (joppa road and Milton road east) instead of residential streets where the impact of through-traffic is clearly detrimental and potentially dangerous.</p> <p>Points to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) No mention/allowance has been made about the longer time it will take Fire, Ambulance and Police emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point beside the East Coast railway bridge on Brunstane Road. ii) It is surely unfair that residents living in Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and mid Coillesdene Avenue will have to accept allthe cars/lorries flowing through the area,albeit some one-way. Also residents in Morton Street and Coillesdene Drive (north part) would have to accept some additional displaced traffic flow. iii) No mention/allowance had been made for residents in Eastfield Gardens/Coillesdene Avenue for traffic using their streets as a method of avoiding additional traffic build-up at Eastfield Lights. iv) That speed reduction measures are planned for mid Coillesdene Avenue is an admission that through traffic still using our area will tend to speed to make up for the longer journey time/distance caused by the proposed closure. As our area has a sizeable elderly population and some young families,this is a point of concern. v) Brunstane road has been a main thoroughfare into and out from Portobello for well over 100 years and traffic problems are largely due to their residents parking cars and vans in the carriageway/on the pavement in front of older houses not built with driveways. vi) As far as we are aware, no traffic survey has been carried out to identify who is currently travelling on Brunstane Road, where they are from, going to, and for what reason! Also, what route would they take if this road was closed and the ETRO implemented? vii) Thought should be given at this time to the 1,300 houses proposed for Brunstane Farm where a point of exit will be onto Milton Road East -beside the Cemetery, and some of this new traffic will inevitably wish to travel north through our area.
Object	<p>We feel that the views given by the local and wider community in previous consultations have been disregarded, and that there should be an independent audit of this proposal.</p>
Object	<p>I am absolutely appalled at what is happening in our lovely city as there seems to be unlimited money to waste on road closures and diversions. I am a disabled motorist who would be housebound without my car and it is becoming increasingly difficult to park and drive. Brunstane Road could be made one way without calming measures in Coillesdene which would only give us higher car repair bills.</p>
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colloiesdene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colloiesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colloiesdene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents.</p> <p>Having examines the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year respoting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residennts was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
	<p>I wish to object to the above mentioned TRO on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The problems on Brunstank Road are not the result of traffic but unlawful pavement parking, restricting both pedestrian and vehicular flow. This should inform the council's initial response to the issue in hand, rather than the nuclear option of road closure and traffic displacement to residential areas. 2. It is highly irregular to purchase property in full knowledge of prevailing circumstances, only subsequently to complain and lobby for changes to those circumstances. This is an established principle in Scots case law. For example, if you purchase property under the flight path, you cannot seek to close the airport. Likewise, if you purchase property on what has been a main arterial route for over 100 years, you cannot loby to close that route because you don't like the traffic/parking circumstances 2. The current proposal only serves to transfer the problem to the Coillesdene area which is already subjected to high levels of morning and evening rush-hour, rat-run traffic. 3. The current proposal represents an increased safety risk to residents and pedestrians in Coillesdene Avenue, along which all traffic between Milton Road and Portobello will be diverted under the current propсал. The nature of Coillesdene Avenue encourages speeding traffic often 40 mph and above. (See attached photo of recent RTC.) This particular RTC happened at a stretch of Coillesdene Avenue not covered by the proposed road calming measures. It is only one of a number of collisions and near misses over the years. It is therefore clear that the current proposal would only serve to increase the risk of serious injury to residents, pedestrians and cyclists. As such, it would represent a perverse experiment to close a main arterial route to satisfy a tiny minority of complainants and compromise the safety of residents and pedestrians.
Object	

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to TRO/21/13 on the grounds listed below.</p> <p>Closure of Brunstane Road will only serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the Coillesdene/Morton Street/Eastfield areas. The restricted access into and out of the Coillesdene area that you wish to implement will require traffic to take a longer route, resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. The new Brunstane housing development of 1300 houses is progressing and this will increase traffic on all the surrounding areas, more so if the closure of Brunstane Road goes ahead. There is no mention of the longer time it will take emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point by the railway bridge on Brunstane Road. The statement of reasons says the changes are to encourage sustainable travel such as walking/cycling and promote quiet local neighbourhoods. South Morton Street, in close proximity to Brunstane Road, fulfils the criteria for walking/cycling. Attempting to promote quiet local neighbourhoods in one area using the measures you are proposing just diverts issues to where you are pushing traffic onto and will not make them any quieter.</p> <p>There have been numerous consultations when the views of people have been sought in relation to Brunstane Road and on each occasion the majority response has been NO to a closure. A one way option (South to North) has been put forward at each consultation yet this has always been discounted with no reasons given as to why this option and others e.g. yellow lines on one side of Brunstane Road, speed reduction measures, etc., are not being considered.</p> <p>The main aim of the Council appears to want to give residents in Brunstane Road a private parking place for their cars, vans, motor homes - yet this doesn't seem to be a consideration the Council adopt in other areas. Brunstane Road residents in favour of the closure are more interested in ensuring their vehicles can be parked safely, not the safety of others – you only have to venture along the street to see how many of their vehicles are parked on footpaths with complete disregard for pavement users.</p> <p>It is known, and is stated often on social media posts, that the Vice Convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides very close to Brunstane Road. This person should not be allowed to take part in any of the discussions/decisions relating to Brunstane Road as this is a blatant conflict of interest. The Council have recently received a 'red' rating for their handling of the 'spaces for people' scheme and ignoring warnings and issues raised. The situation with Brunstane Road is receiving the same treatment from the Council – a large majority do not wish the closure to be progressed and their views/suggestions are being ignored. Pro-closure residents are already announcing that the closure is 'in the bag' and the audit report in relation to the Kings Road junction mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. This current consultation is a farce if decisions have already been made regardless of the majority who do not wish Brunstane Road to be closed. The majority who do not want a closure have tried on numerous occasions to put forward alternatives which are discounted, as it appears the only action the Council wants to progress is 'closure'.</p> <p>The traffic situation on Brunstane Road is not unique. There are many other streets within and outwith the area that are narrower, with vehicles parked on both sides, and you don't hear of residents wanting to have their area closed off. Closing Brunstane Road will set a precedent as anyone who doesn't want traffic using their road can ask for the road to be closed. However, unless they have someone with Council connections either living on or nearby, it is unlikely that the support would be forthcoming.</p>
Object	<p>I hope that the issues raised in this formal objection will be considered. There are many other urgent roads and transportation matters that the Council should be attending to instead of providing private parking for one street, the closure of which will have a major impact on more people than just the residents.</p>
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to TRO/21/13 on the grounds listed below.</p> <p>Closure of Brunstane Road will only serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the Coillesdene/Morton Street/Eastfield areas. The restricted access into and out of the Coillesdene area that you wish to implement will require traffic to take a longer route, resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. The new Brunstane housing development of 1300 houses is progressing and this will increase traffic on all the surrounding areas, more so if the closure of Brunstane Road goes ahead. There is no mention of the longer time it will take emergency vehicles to get to residents living north of the proposed closure point by the railway bridge on Brunstane Road. The statement of reasons says the changes are to encourage sustainable travel such as walking/cycling and promote quiet local neighbourhoods. South Morton Street, in close proximity to Brunstane Road, fulfils the criteria for walking/cycling. Attempting to promote quiet local neighbourhoods in one area using the measures you are proposing just diverts issues to where you are pushing traffic onto and will not make them any quieter.</p> <p>There have been numerous consultations when the views of people have been sought in relation to Brunstane Road and on each occasion the majority response has been NO to a closure. A one way option (South to North) has been put forward at each consultation yet this has always been discounted with no reasons given as to why this option and others e.g. yellow lines on one side of Brunstane Road, speed reduction measures, etc., are not being considered.</p> <p>The main aim of the Council appears to want to give residents in Brunstane Road a private parking place for their cars, vans, motor homes - yet this doesn't seem to be a consideration the Council adopt in other areas. Brunstane Road residents in favour of the closure are more interested in ensuring their vehicles can be parked safely, not the safety of others – you only have to venture along the street to see how many of their vehicles are parked on footpaths with complete disregard for pavement users.</p> <p>It is known, and is stated often on social media posts, that the Vice Convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides very close to Brunstane Road. This person should not be allowed to take part in any of the discussions/decisions relating to Brunstane Road as this is a blatant conflict of interest. The Council have recently received a 'red' rating for their handling of the 'spaces for people' scheme and ignoring warnings and issues raised. The situation with Brunstane Road is receiving the same treatment from the Council – a large majority do not wish the closure to be progressed and their views/suggestions are being ignored. Pro-closure residents are already announcing that the closure is 'in the bag' and the audit report in relation to the Kings Road junction mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. This current consultation is a farce if decisions have already been made regardless of the majority who do not wish Brunstane Road to be closed. The majority who do not want a closure have tried on numerous occasions to put forward alternatives which are discounted, as it appears the only action the Council wants to progress is 'closure'.</p> <p>The traffic situation on Brunstane Road is not unique. There are many other streets within and outwith the area that are narrower, with vehicles parked on both sides, and you don't hear of residents wanting to have their area closed off. Closing Brunstane Road will set a precedent as anyone who doesn't want traffic using their road can ask for the road to be closed. However, unless they have someone with Council connections either living on or nearby, it is unlikely that the support would be forthcoming.</p>
Object	<p>I hope that the issues raised in this formal objection will be considered. There are many other urgent roads and transportation matters that the Council should be attending to instead of providing private parking for one street, the closure of which will have a major impact on more people than just the residents.</p>
	<p>I strongly object to TRO/21/13 for an ETRO to close Brunstane Road to through traffic for the reasons listed below:</p> <p>Traffic that would normally travel along Brunstane Road will be displaced along Milton Road East, Joppa Road and Portobello High Street instead, exacerbating to the existing congestion on these roads and adding to air pollution. Traffic from Brunstane Road will also be displaced onto Duddingston Park, Southfield Place and Brighton Place, the only other north/south route in and out of Portobello. This route already suffers high volumes of traffic, queues and congestion, which will be exacerbated by the additional traffic diverted onto this route due to this closure.</p> <p>Many parents, carers and children use Brighton Place and Southfield Place to get to the various schools and nurseries in the vicinity. It is a designated "safe route to school". Adding extra traffic to it will mean it is less safe and will increase the risk of road accidents.</p> <p>This proposal is for the benefit of a few people living in Brunstane Road. There are other solutions to the problems they experience, for example, traffic lights at the bridge, a one-way system or passing places and they should be trialled before a full road closure is considered. Completely closing this road will inconvenience a large number of people who will have to drive for longer distances to get around it, resulting in more congestion and harmful emissions overall, and will have to put up with extra traffic in their neighbourhoods. The results of the council's own survey indicated that 72% of Portobello residents oppose this closure. Please do what is right for the majority.</p>
Object	
	<p>I object to the proposed measures around the Coillesdene triangle.</p> <p>I agree that something needs to be done on Brunstane Road, however I don't agree with full closure and simply moving the problem elsewhere.</p> <p>The no entries, one-ways and traffic calming measures in the Coillesdenes make no sense. These measures force the traffic round an even longer route through the Coillesdenes than without these measures! This means higher pollution, and faster driving as 'rat-run' drivers strive to make up time.</p> <p>The mere fact that a " traffic calming bollard" is planned for C Av means the council is expecting higher volumes of speeding traffic.</p> <p>Moving the problem from Brunstane Road to numerous roads in the Coillesdenes is not a solution.</p>
Object	<p>If Edinburgh Council is serious about quiet low traffic neighbourhoods, traffic must be prevented from cutting through the Coillesdenes altogether.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I have just studied the proposed amendments to be made around the Coillesdene triangle as shown in RT/21/13 There are 2 major points I wish to point out. The first is that at no time over the last 20 years has it even been attempted to use Brunstane Road as a one way road. I have heard it talked about and council people seem to think it has been experimented with but there has still been no one way system tried out. One way heading north would be the more advisable solution as it would rule out the awkward turn out of Brunstane Road onto Milton Road but even this would be better than closing the road altogether. This road has been fully closed on numerous occasions due to bridge works, cable works and the long term closure linked with Brighton Place being closed for a year. So the council has had plenty of opportunity to gauge what will happen with a full closure - but no evidence at all on a one way system.</p> <p>The second point is the closure of all the entrances to the whole of the Coillesdene area off Milton Road. I find this utterly baffling and so environmentally hostile. It means that even the residents of Coillesdene Avenue, Terrace, Drive and Milton Drive, Terrace all of whom live off Milton Road will have to drive past their own road ends and continue on to Eastfield where there are traffic lights and a horrible turn then back along Portobello Road. Even then they will have to climb any of the three horribly steep roads in order to get anywhere near their own street. How much more fuel and emissions does that burn? Come winter and bad weather, all of the mentioned streets and turns will be treacherous.</p> <p>I know the residents of Coillesdene objected to the Brunstane Road closure but I think they will actually be more frustrated by this ludicrous plan.</p> <p>As an example, please tell me how a resident at 48 Coillesdene Crescent would get to Asda and the Fort which are their 'local' shopping centres? Consider how they would go at the moment, then compare that to how they will need to go once the restrictions are made. And bear in mind they would have to make the same journey back again. 😞</p> <p>I would be furious enough if I lived in Coillesdene but I don't. I live at the west end Argyle Crescent so my journey to ASDA or simply getting to Milton Road/Harry Lauder junction is almost three times as long if I have to divert via Eastfield. I'd be obliged if somebody can keep a tally on how many accidents there are going to be at the Eastfield junction once the diversions are put in place.</p>
Object	I cannot see any wisdom at all in totally closing off the whole triangle as it will only lead to more problems instead of fewer.
	I wish to object to the above proposed traffic order. It involves major rerouting of traffic which will increase the volume of traffic in Coillesdene Avenue, solely to enable the closure of Brunstane Road.
Object	The adverse effects substantially outweigh the benefits
Object	I object - closing the road is not solving the traffic congestion issue in the south section, over parking is the issue. If that were resolved the traffic would flow. This closure will also just push the problem of the traffic using this road into other areas.
Object	<p>I would like to register my opposition to the closure of Brunstane Road- I think it should either be one way (top to bottom) or have double yellow lines painted at intervals along it to allow for passing places. I believe that closing it, and imposing restrictions in the Colliesdenes would simply move and increase problems elsewhere, making roads that are currently relatively safe for pedestrians and cyclists unsafe. In particular the main road along the seafront (Seaview) and Milton Road East. The right turn onto Milton Road in particular would be extremely dangerous and pose significant risks to pedestrians and especially cyclists. In addition, people would attempt to find rat runs within the areas of the Colliesdenes that are not shut off, causing inconvenience and risk to these residential areas. Closing Brunstane Road will not reduce overall traffic but just squash it elsewhere.</p> <p>In addition, I think closing the road will have a negative impact on the shops and high street in Portobello. People from Brunstane and east of Milton Road will simply choose to go elsewhere for their shopping, to out of town retail and Musselburgh. This is detrimental to the high street.</p>
Object	<p>I strongly oppose the proposal and wish to make my views known to you.</p> <p>I was very surprised to read CEC data about the volume of road usage on Brunstane Road being twice that on Brighton Place. Having walked extensively on both roads since the first lockdown (March 2020) I am very surprised at your data, as it certainly isn't my experience at different times of day on both roads – Brighton Place appears to have much more traffic and many more Heavy Goods Vehicles and buses</p> <p>Currently the amount of traffic and congestion on Brighton Place is already unacceptable partly due to the appalling, inconsiderate parking which has been allowed to continue on Southfield Place. Once onto Brighton Place, again inconsiderate, illegal parking often caused by delivery drivers and deliveries to the food outlets close to the traffic lights, cause traffic congestion and prevent efficient use of the traffic lights.</p> <p>The traffic lights already need to be reprogrammed to improve the flow of traffic from Brighton Place. Some drivers try to jump the queues at the traffic lights by "rat-running" at speed along East Brighton Crescent and Lee Crescent to force themselves out at the junction by the shops – so get the next change of lights. As we dramatically experienced during the road works on Brighton Place, this situation is going to become more exacerbated if additional traffic is pushed onto Brighton Place by the proposals of TRO/21/13.</p> <p>During the extensive closures around Brighton Place when it was being reconstructed we experienced considerable traffic problems in East Brighton Crescent and Lee Crescent when vehicles couldn't pass other vehicles on the streets and "stand offs" occurred. Sadly there were frequent aggressive exchanges and some drivers were frightened into poor driving attempting to reverse around crescents which are parked on both sides. This is one of the key differences between Brunstane Road (and associated streets) and Brighton Place/East Brighton Crescent/Lee Crescent – in Brunstane Road you can see if traffic is coming and reversing is straight. Brunstane Road doesn't have adjoining streets which can be used as rat-runs but are totally unsuitable for increased traffic.</p> <p>As I previously mentioned, since lockdown I have walked extensively around Portobello, usually pushing a pram. My observation about the restriction on roads near Brunstane Road is that most of the houses on these roads have drives to park in – Lee Crescent only has one driveway in the whole street. The parking is very sparse on the roads where restrictions are proposed. The parking in Lee Crescent, East Brighton Crescent, Brighton Place and Sandford Gardens is over-subscribed as we are very close to the main businesses and shops in Portobello plus an ever increasing number of food outlets which attract people from outwith the locality. There's a bowling club on Lee Crescent with only on-street parking and many of the participants have mobility issues so require their cars to bring them for their recreation. St John's Church and the activities which use it's property create considerable traffic at certain times.</p> <p>I thought the CEC were attempting to support local businesses and people to be more active – so making it more difficult to drive and park near the "CBD" surely is counter-productive?</p> <p>Many cars were damaged and rarely did anyone leave contact details when traffic was pushed onto Lee Crescent/EBC during the road works.</p> <p>I'm extremely concerned about the safety of people walking, cycling and scooting to school/work/for leisure if the traffic is increased by 200%, as your data collection indicated Brunstane Road had twice as much traffic as Brighton Place.</p> <p>The pavement on the crossing from Southfield Place to Duddingston Road/Baileyfield Road is totally unsuitable for prams or wheelchairs – it's tiny and I have to cut further along where there is no dropped kerb. How are wheelchair users supposed to negotiate it?</p>
Object	The pavement on the East side of Southfield Place does not allow a pram and pedestrians to pass without stepping onto the road, unless they are in very close proximity – uncomfortably close in the current pandemic.

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to object to the closure of Brunstane Road to through traffic. These are my reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is an undeniable fact that the traffic that would have used Brunstane Road would be displaced onto Brighton Place, the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello; - increased volumes of traffic, leading to worse queues and congestion; - there is the increased possibility of rat-running around East Brighton and Lee Crescents making it most unsafe for the little children that live there.; - The residents of Brunstane Road might feel a slight alleviation but increased traffic along Brighton Place, a residential Street also, would mean a less safe environment for children and their parents walking, scooting and cycling to and from school on what is supposed to be a safe route to school; - worsened air pollution, which is harmful to human health. This is now a certifiable contributor to deaths. <p>At the moment Brighton Place and Southfield are very prone to jams and traffic hold ups which tail back to Portobello High Street. This causes delays and accidents.</p> <p>I am convinced that the burden of traffic should be shared between Brighton Place and Brunstane Road.</p> <p>Best Regards, Judith Read</p>
Object	<p>It would put an unacceptable volume of traffic onto Brighton Place and Southfield. These roads are full to capacity and there are often jams. There is a lot of schoolchildren making their way along Brighton Place</p>
	<p>I am writing to you to formally object to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road (Traffic Regulation Order TRO/21/13) .</p> <p>I have lived at the Brunstane Road end of Argyle Crescent for nearly thirty years and have direct experience both of traffic flow in my area and of previous closures of nearby roads, including Brunstane Road on several occasions. While I sympathise with the residents of Brunstane Road, I believe that measures designed to improve their lives will have severe adverse effects on a greater number of people who live close by, as well as in Joppa and Portobello more widely. The closure of Brunstane Road will inevitably push more traffic through the main road in Portobello and through the crossroads with Brighton Place, resulting in more traffic jams and delays especially at peak times. Before Portobello High School moved site, Argyle Crescent was a peak-time rat run for drivers trying to avoid the build-up of traffic on the main road and I fully expect this to happen again, both in Argyle Crescent and other streets running parallel to the main road. Argyle Crescent is straight and wide and I worry about the driving speeds that I frequently witness from drivers in a hurry: I really don't want to see more of these dangerous drivers in my street.</p> <p>Your stated aims are to promote quiet local neighbourhoods, to improve exercise local to home and to encourage sustainable travel. As explained above, adding traffic to all the other streets around Brunstane Road would make them less safe for cycling, walking and exercise, thereby defeating the first and third of these aims. I also cannot see how the aim of encouraging sustainable travel would be achieved by the proposed closure.</p>
Object	<p>I sincerely hope that you will reconsider this proposal.</p>
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road (Traffic Regulation Order TRO/21/13) .</p> <p>Brunstane Road has been closed before. From that experience those of us living near Brunstane Road know that the proposed closure will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads, either in the Collesdene area or along Portobello High Street and Brighton Place. There is no evidence that the proposed closure would contribute in any obvious way to the stated aims of promoting "quiet local neighbourhoods", "encouraging sustainable travel" or "improving exercise local to home". These are laudable aims. But it has already been shown that, when Brunstane Road is closed, the areas immediately surrounding Brunstane Road become busier, and less safe for cycling and walking and exercise. Also, for many local residents essential car journeys will become longer.</p> <p>There have been several consultations on this issue over the past few years. Proposals have included making Brunstane Road one-way so as to displace far less traffic, and/or only allowing parking on one side of the road and not on the pavements so the road is safe for pedestrians again. Solutions like these would probably contribute more to the Council's stated aims, but were consistently rejected without much explanation. (In fact, one could argue that a solution that would really contribute to the Council's aims would be to make Brunstane Road car free, rather than turning it into a local parking lot, since the latter solution merely encourages residents and visitors to keep using their cars.)</p> <p>The way the Council has been pressing ahead with this proposal despite plenty of reasonable counter proposals creates a very strange impression: why is the Council so obsessed with traffic in a small street in a far corner of Edinburgh that has had no injury traffic accidents for several years, when there are so many serious traffic issues elsewhere in Edinburgh. I don't know if it is true that a prominent member of the Transport and Environment Committee lives on Brunstane Road and is desirous of better parking conditions outside her front door. But you can see why people start rumours like that: confidence in politicians is already low, and people further lose confidence in the integrity of the Council when their opinions are ignored for years, and ill-thought or badly explained proposals are then pushed on to them, which undermines the Council's standing when in future more important decisions need to be taken.</p>
Object	<p>already low, and people further lose confidence in the integrity of the Council when their opinions are ignored for years, and ill-thought or badly explained proposals are then pushed on to them, which undermines the Council's standing when in future more important decisions need to be taken.</p>
	<p>I understand that the results of the survey conducted (again during an awkward time of day and without any flexibility for residents to object if unable to come to the 'meeting'.) showed that 84% objected to the plan. On top of this, and possibly most importantly, THE EMERGENCY SERVICES OBJECTED. Surely this tells you something - by pandering to this minority of residents, you are directly putting people's lives in danger. Again, the legalities of this are under investigation as despite these overwhelming statistics, you are going ahead. I wonder how this could be considered a democratic process or competent decision?</p> <p>I'm interested in your statistics and facts which show the benefits to the lives of the majority of residents. It does appear that only those 'above the bridge' - the minority - could benefit, effectively creating a private road, whilst not impacting their access in any negative way. Travelling down Brunstane Rd generally is a journey into Portobello which is more likely to be for a walkable journey.</p> <p>Going up Brunstane Rd is generally used to access the Asda supermarket for a weekly shop, Fort Kinnaird or the Bypass, a of which require a car. Public transport is not adequate to make these journeys.</p> <p>The reality is that closing Brunstane Rd will simply move traffic onto other roads in the Collesdenes, and already busy main roads. The restricted access into and out of the Collesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions.</p> <p>For me, a resident in Brunstane Rd, who wanted to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), I will be forced to travel over 1Km on a round trip. I'm struggling to see how this reduces emissions or indeed 'encourages sustainable travel'.</p> <p>A number of alternative suggestions were made at the consultation meeting including placing double yellow lines down one side, or at strategic points to effectively create parking spaces. However, the upper bridge residents objected to this on the grounds that "They would have nowhere to park". Yet these are the same people who want less cars on the road. Many of them own two cars. And again, more importantly, their wish for less cars should NEVER TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convener of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>I'm interested to know where the traffic is supposed to go when the inevitable repair work to Brighton Place happens? This seems to happen periodically, closing the road. With no access via Brunstane Rd and no access from Brighton Place, there will effectively be one road in and out of Portobello. This is utter madness and will lead to horrific traffic jams, where vehicles are stationary for significant periods, increasing emissions throughout Portobello.</p> <p>But, I suppose if it doesn't affect the residents above the Brunstane Rd bridge, then nobody will be put out.</p> <p>The Audit Report for Kings Road junction mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. This proves that the consultation process was a farce, as the decision was a fait accompli, regardless of the opinions of the local community - the very people who use this road as a vital part of their lives.</p>
Object	<p>The Audit Report for Kings Road junction mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. This proves that the consultation process was a farce, as the decision was a fait accompli, regardless of the opinions of the local community - the very people who use this road as a vital part of their lives.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I would like to strongly object to the proposed order (referenced above) regarding the closure of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>The rationale that the proposed plan will reduce traffic and promote healthier methods of transport is fundamentally flawed. Traffic will only be diverted onto other roads resulting in longer journeys and more congestion.</p> <p>Whilst I'm sympathetic to the minority of local residents who vocally support this scheme, I would respectfully suggest that this closure will be to the detriment of the majority of local residents who are unable to use other modes of transportation for essential journeys (not to mention the emergency services).</p> <p>As a local resident I would also like to understand what alternatives have been seriously considered - i.e. restrictions on heavy good vehicles, double yellow lines for passing places etc.</p> <p>Having participated in every survey and consultation on this topic, I've found that the council's procedures appear to be (at best) extremely undemocratic. The whole process has felt like a fait accompli and has consistently ignored the majority views in favour of a small number of vocal residents who would like to see the south end of Brunstane Road designated as a cul-de-sac.</p>
Object	<p>I am surprised at having to make another objection to these unwanted and ill conceived plans as several previous consultations showed 80% opposition from residents in the Coillesdene area. Predictably arrogant and anti-democratic councillors chose to ignore this and carry on regardless. It leaves one to question the point and the money spent on these supposed consultations. What level of opposition is required before councillors pay attention, 100%?. Despite knowing it will make little difference I will restate my objections.</p> <p>There is no problem with excess through traffic in the Coillesdene area except when the council chose to close Brighton Place and Brunstane Road at the same time. To close Brunstane Road again will inevitably lead to more traffic in the Coillesdene area however many roads you shut on Milton Road East to try and stop it.</p> <p>To access Milton Road East from our street Coillesdene Terrace under the proposals would require a long convoluted detour creating pollution and excess traffic on previously quiet streets. When the roads in question were closed recently for City Fibre works this proved to be the case, as well as residents parked cars only allowing one car past at a time.</p> <p>There are many elderly residents, these plans will delay ambulances, cause problems for deliveries and refuse collection, concerns reflected in previous consultations.</p> <p>It is unfair on residents in previously quiet streets (Milton Drive & Milton Terrace) to make their roads major access points for the whole area massively increasing traffic, noise and pollution.</p> <p>Temporary barriers for months will give the area a tacky and tawdry appearance looking closed.</p>
Object	<p>In conclusion the council and its officials should respect the clearly expressed opposition of residents, including the residents association, in the Coillesdene area who have repeatedly stated they do not want this shambolic nonsense imposed on them.</p>
Object	<p>Please note my objection to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road TRO/21/13. As a nearby resident I am concerned that closure of this thoroughfare will lead to an increase in traffic on already congested surrounding streets, in particular Southfield Place and Brighton Place.</p>
Object	<p>I have opposed the closure of Brunstane Road, since it was first mentioned. I am of the opinion that the closure would only benefit the few the car owning residents of Brunstane Road who do not have their own parking (many will have been aware of the situation when they moved to Brunstane Road), while adversely affecting emergency vehicles, and the residents and businesses of nearby streets.</p> <p>I do not think the traffic measures in the Coillesdene area offer any advantages. The ETRO is the latest proposal which will increase journey times, in an area that has already a 20mph limit and therefore increase unwanted emissions from vehicles.</p> <p>I did not comment on the Braid Road and surrounding streets traffic management measures which have caused chaos in that area. Vehicles are constantly arriving at 'unexpected' road closures and many do a 3+ point turn to try and find another way to their destination. I have also seen vehicles mount the pavement and "squeeze through" the blockage - hardly in the interests of road safety.</p> <p>The Joppa Residents' Association carried out a survey of the residents regarding this TRO and 92.4% of the replies (ie interested people) were against it - yet the Council have progressed it to the ETRO stage.</p>
Object	<p>Consultation is a great idea but only if the respondents' views are actually listened to.</p>
Object	<p>I am living on Brunataine Road and have done so for 26 years.</p> <p>There has been a significant increase in traffic using this road as a "Rat Run", "way thru" to Portobello and Milton Road East and the A1.</p> <p>More so, the last couple of years, due, in my opinion to the extra housing at the west side of Portobello "The Strand" with more houses/flats still being built. Also the increase in home deliveries due to the pandemic.</p> <p>I feel the Road should be made local access only, with cameras and fines for those abusing it.</p>
Object	<p>Similar to the the left turn from Asda thru the Jewel.</p>
Object	<p>With reference to the closure of Brunstane Road, I object on the grounds that there has been insufficient consultation and understanding of effect of this closure.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to submit an objection to the low traffic neighbourhood planned at Brunson/Coillesdene.</p> <p>I agree that cars need to be taken off the road, but this scheme does not do that. The current reliability of public transport is such that people will not stop using cars, and all this scheme does is move traffic (cars) about rather than reducing it. It will also result in more vehicles along my road and Brighton Place as the only alternative route to Portobello. My road is already busy enough being still a 30mph road with no traffic calming, compared to all the surrounding streets which have calming and segregated cycle lanes.</p>
Object	<p>There are already low traffic measures in this area. The Council's own initial consultation indicated that residents by and large do not want these measures in place. I believe the emergency services have also objected.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>Firstly it is widely known that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee lives just off Brunstane Rd & is driving this closure forward. Surely this is a conflict of interests & abuse of public office. It does not show CEC in a very good light if action is taken merely with their officials personal interests at heart.</p> <p>I fear that due to the above point the views of the many people using this road will nonetheless be disregarded for the wants of the 'few', which renders this process a farce.</p> <p>Will it be possible for anyone who doesn't want traffic passing their house to simply request that the road be shut? Or does there need to be a councillor living in the street?</p> <p>Secondly, the closure of this road will simply displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colliedene area, will require traffic to take a much longer, convoluted route, which will result in an increase in traffic on other routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions.</p> <p>The road was closed previously & it was evident to anyone travelling around the area of the additional traffic/journey that was involved to get out of Portobello. I believe this was reflected in the outcome of previous surveys/reviews. The previous closure of Brighton Place for well over a year due to relaying cobbles & its closure again recently, coupled with the closure of the road through the old Standard Life site to build houses meant you could literally only get out via the Seafield Rd end or out via Milton Rd at the other far side. I do suspect that we will have seen the last of Brighton place being closed & so the proposed action in Brunstane Rd & the Colliedenes will add to the daily commute.</p> <p>The reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. That's not a very restorative approach. Restorative CEC would say you should do "WITH" people & not do "TO". Simply closing a road with the tag line that people should cycle more doesn't actually make people cycle more. For many people their daily commute mean dropping children at school/nursery in one place & driving to a completely different place for work.</p> <p>These journeys can't easily be done by walking or cycling, within certain timeframes. I live at Bonnybridge Drive, my eldest attends Towerbank PS & I work in Wester Hailes. That'd be a long walk/cycle/bus ride, which would be required at super speed to fit with school/work starting times.</p> <p>At the initial consultation meeting several months ago, the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. I drive up this street & observe regularly that the people there park their cars on the footpath on both sides of the road. This doesn't seem like the actions of people solely concerned with children's safety or buggies or wheelchairs that need to pass by.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "They would have nowhere to park". Many people have more than one car so whilst talking about encouraging cycling/walking more I'm unsure if it's the job of the CEC to provide parking for these residents.</p>
Object	<p>Are the people of Brunstane Rd & surrounding streets, who want it closed, all selling off their cars so as not to be driving in anyone else's street & making it dangerous for kids there or to save the planet?</p>
	<p>I wish to object to the proposal to close Brunstane Road and add traffic calming measures to the Coillesdene Area/Joppa triangle. I gave my comments to the previous consultation and see that my concerns have not been taken seriously as there have been no changes to the proposal and so there are no changes to my objection. As a resident at the furthest end of Coillesdene Avenue, and the most negatively affected by this proposal, I wish for those on the Transport Committee to be aware of my views on this.</p> <p>Taken from the City of Edinburgh Council website...The 'EFFECT' of this proposal is 'Lowering traffic in the neighbourhood'. Please understand that the effects of this order will significantly increase the traffic in my neighbourhood.</p> <p>Taken from the City of Edinburgh Councils 'Statement of Reasons' for this order...'the proposed measures is intended to promote quiet local neighbourhoods, encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home, and to deter motor vehicle through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area.' I can assure you that this proposed order has exactly the opposite effect in my area at the end of the Coillesdene triangle where the displaced traffic will now flow.</p> <p>Concerns</p> <p>I am a cyclist and use my bike to travel to and from Portobello several times a day. I cycle my children to school along these residential streets. I have serious concerns that these proposals will increase the volume of traffic on Milton Terrace, Coillesdene Avenue, Seaview Drive and Seaview Crescent and Coillesdene Drive where there are limited or no traffic calming measures. It will increase the speed of traffic as the proposal says that this can be a negative impact of introducing one-way systems and a reason why it was not an option for Brunstane Road.</p> <p>I appreciate and understand the long-standing traffic problems on Brunstane Road, I have lived in the area for 15 years. I sympathise with the residents on this road but this should not result in the road being fully closed to all traffic except local access. It should be noted in the reason for the issues on this road is also the increase in resident on-street parking. I can imagine it was very pleasant for the residents of this particular road when it was closed to through traffic. They would have had their own car park. It would have also "increased the quality of life...for this section". Now the road has re-opened they want the road permanently closed. What about everyone else in the area? Why is the "preferred option" to permanently close Brunstane Road? Other alternatives must be more beneficial to EVERYONE not just those residents of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>The previous closure increased the complaints from the Coillesdene area when the traffic increased due to displacement of the traffic to/from Joppa/Portobello. As such the proposal now includes closure of Coillesdene Crescent and Gardens. This proposal will now displace ALL the traffic to/from Portobello/Joppa and residents from the top of the Coillesdene area to the bottom end of the Joppa Triangle as clear on the proposed diagram.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The proposal reduces the volume and speed of traffic" in the Brunstane area and the top of Coillesdene Area. However, it displaces it and increases the volume and the speed at the bottom end of the triangle, in my neighbourhood. - The scheme "discourages through-traffic and creates quieter streets for EVERYONE". Again this is only true for Brunstane Road and the top of Coillesdene Area. EVERYONE does not include the bottom end of the triangle, my neighbourhood, where the only open streets will be used by ALL looking for the quickest, shortest route through.
Object	<p>- "The aim of this proposal is to create a quiet neighbourhood". This works for the residents of Brunstane Road and the top end of the Coillesdene area. However, this proposal will take my neighbourhood from being a quiet neighbourhood to being a busy neighbourhood with unnecessary displaced traffic using the</p>
	<p>I wish to object to the traffic order that is proposed for Brunstane Road and Coillesdene area, TRO/21/13, please see below.</p> <p>CEC have failed to consider the impact of the TRO along the top portion of the Coillesdene Triangle.</p> <p>The traffic calming measures stop at Milton Terrace. How does that impact traffic at Eastfield Gardens and the most Easterly portion of the Avenue?</p> <p>These roads within the Triangle are they not?</p> <p>There are already regular complaints about speeding on this section of the road.</p> <p>What possible reason is there for not looking at the impact of the TRO on this part of the Avenue? Is it possibly because CEC doesn't want to know?</p> <p>Please please please use whatever powers are able to force through the Brunstane Road closure in the face of massive public opinion to the contrary, to provide the residents of Coillesdene Avenue, East of Milton Terrace with traffic calming measures and a safe street. Please consider us as part of the wider Coillesdene Triangle. It is a triangle, not a Trapezoid</p> <p>There are so many other points I could write about which have been stated by many of the other residents, but all I really want is for the Traffic Calming Measures to be extended down the length of Coillesdene Avenue to the East, to prevent creating a new rat run/cut through slow traffic, (which is already too fast), and keep our street safe.</p>
Object	<p>YOU CAN DO IT! I BELIEVE IN YOU!</p>
	<p>I wish to object to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road at the bridge over the main line railway.</p>
Object	<p>The evidence that this is part of a well-considered and efficient plan for management of traffic in this area (Portobello) is inadequate.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>We wish to object, to the above order. Whilst we sympathise with the traffic problem being experienced by residents of Brunstane Road, we do not believe the proposed ETRO is the way to solve the problem.</p> <p>Traffic, like water, will always find a way to run. The traffic will still be there and will run through the other residential streets in the Joppa triangle. This ETRO is not decreasing the traffic it is simply moving it to the other streets. This causes resentment by other residents such as us who will be adversely affected.</p> <p>The only way to solve the problem is to prevent traffic altogether from accessing a through route, however devious, in the whole of the Joppa triangle. One possibility is to prevent access to or from the triangle on to the Milton Road. This would force traffic all through to go along the major roads.</p> <p>We are not traffic experts, but we do strongly believe that the present proposal is not the answer to the problem and should be reconsidered.</p>
Object	<p>I object to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>I am a resident of East Brighton Crescent and this will cause additional problems on Brighton Place including increased congestion, pollution and a less safe walking environment. It will also increase the likelihood of East Brighton Crescent/Lee Crescent being used as a rat run.</p> <p>We already have problems with non-residents parking in East Brighton Crescent and the use of East Brighton Crescent/Lee Crescent as a rat run and this proposal would make matters worse.</p> <p>I do hope, for the sake of all local businesses (who are already under pressure) and residents, this proposal does not go ahead.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to express my strong opposition to this proposal for the following reasons</p> <p>The overflow of traffic into the Coillesdenes will be significant. This area has never been a through route and any complaints about traffic management was a result of the temporary closure in Brunstane Road.</p> <p>The serious effect it will have on Brighton Place which is the only other North/South route through Portobello. This road is already congested and is a bus route and the main route for access to the RIE.</p> <p>There has been no exploration of alternatives such as reduced parking on south end of Brunstane Road to ensure traffic standoffs did not happen. To make it one way with serious speed bumps is the obvious alternative. But also there is access to a lane behind the east side which could be explored for residents parking.</p> <p>Signage to discourage any but the most local traffic would help especially white vans.</p> <p>Finally there are many new houses being built in Portobello and Milton Road area this will have a significant effect on the volume of traffic and with the complete closure of Brunstane Road then the effects at the junction of Milton Road and Musselburgh to Portobello Road should be assessed as well as the effects on Brighton Place a significant conservation area.</p> <p>There is a very strong feeling in Portobello against this proposal with many feeling that the council is refusing to listen to local residents. Or are listening to a very few to the detriment of the majority.</p> <p>I hope you will explore the alternatives before finalising this decision</p>
Object	<p>I have lived in Portobello for over 40 years and Brunstane Road has always been open as a link from Abercorn Terrace to Milton Road. Undoubtedly there are traffic problems at times but perhaps this could have been solved by preventing entrance to 'white vans' etc other than for delivery to residents allowing a thoroughfare for only for private and public service vehicles.</p> <p>A trial one-way system should also have been tried before considering closure/</p> <p>It feels to me that closure of the road would lead to one small section of the community (Brunstane Road residents who knew of the traffic problems when they bought their homes) is being favoured against another much larger community the Coillesdenes who's home owners would not be expecting increased traffic flows such as will occur by the closure when they bought their homes),</p> <p>Additionally I feel that this proposal would also add to traffic volume increase in Brighton Place which is already, at times, over-congested with 'clog, ups' as much as Brunstane Road is at times - in fact when the buses are running at peak times more congested.</p> <p>I strongly object to this TRO.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to state my objections for the road closures concerning Brunstane Road.</p> <p>We feel closing the road will cause more traffic to use Brighton Place and cause more pollution. My son suffers from asthma so more cars, vans and lorries using Brighton Place and surrounding will be detrimental to him and other children walking to and from school.</p> <p>We live in Rosefield and the traffic on Brighton Place has got so much more busier already. Drivers going so fast when road is clear too. So I do think it would be a bad idea to permanently close Brunstane Road.</p>
Object	<p>I object to the order.</p> <p>I regularly drive through Brunstane Road and by closing it off both sides will mean having to drive through roads such as Coillesdene Crescent a road which became extremely congested when you last closed off Brunstane Road!</p> <p>I objected to the order as did the majority of respondents, I am extremely surprised that despite this it appears to be going ahead. I am unsure how it got to this stage.</p> <p>Having driven up and down Brunstane Road so many times, it makes complete sense to make it one way travelling North towards the bridge, Joppa Station Place is on the other side of the bridge.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>A consultation exercise on these proposals was carried out last year with local residents in the area covered by the Association of around 200 households which comprises: Brighton Place, East and West Brighton Crescents, Sandford Gardens, Rosefield Place, Rosefield Avenue, Rosefield Street and Rosefield Avenue Lane. Leaflets were delivered to each household. In addition e-mails were sent out asking for residents' view, along with posts on the Association's Facebook page. Seventy-six responses were received with 92% against the proposal and 8% in favour.</p> <p>Overall it is clear that throughout this process the views and concerns of people in this area have not been taken into account. We were initially stonewalled in what looked like a deliberate policy of keeping people in this area in the dark, in stark contrast to the residents of Brunstane Road who seem to have the ear of officers and councillors. Only through persistent letter writing have officers engaged with. We have already been told that total closure is the option that has been decided upon so this consultation feels like a hollow exercise.</p> <p>The issue of the closure of Brunstane Road was discussed at the Brightons and Rosefield Residents' Association AGM in November 2019 and a number of concerns about the proposals were raised. I wrote to the officer in charge at the time, Graham E Hall, but did not receive any response for about two months. Further letters generated incomplete responses. Requests for a meeting about this issue and how it would impact this area were ignored. This request seemed reasonable as Brunstane Road residents have had at least one (and possibly more) meetings when officer and councillors visited the home of a resident to discuss the issue. However our association was not accorded any such privilege and then the Covid lockdown happened so it was no longer possible to hold face-to-face meetings.</p> <p>The statement of reasons for the ETRO says that: "The introduction of the proposed measures is intended to promote quiet local neighbourhoods, encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home, and to deter motor vehicle through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area."</p> <p>This has a very different emphasis from the statement of reasons given in the wording in July 2021, i.e. that: "The trial proposes to address long-standing traffic problems due to a combination of the narrow road width, increasing volumes of traffic and the general increase in the physical size of vehicles on Brunstane Road. This has resulted in numerous instances of traffic congestion, anti-social behaviour by drivers and conflict with residents whose cars have frequently been damaged. Residents in the Coillesdene area note concerns over increased traffic as drivers reroute due to the closure of Brunstane Road, so additional traffic calming measures have also been included in the trial scheme in the Coillesdene area".</p> <p>The move to close Brunstane Road has been driven by a group of residents in Brunstane Road engaging in a campaign of sustained lobbying over a long period of time. To present the proposed closure as something intended to create "quiet neighbourhoods" in the Coillesdene area and Brunstane Road is completely disingenuous.</p> <p>The vast majority of Coillesdene residents oppose the closure of Brunstane Road and the other measures proposed by this ETRO as found by the Council's survey conducted late in 2020. Section 4.15 of the report of 28 January 2021 to the Transport and Environment committee states that: "Of residents who indicated that they lived at a Joppa Triangle postcode (excluding Brunstane Road) (295 responses), 18% (52 responses) were in favour of the proposal and 82% (241 responses) were not in favour of the proposal." This makes it very clear that by and large the only people who are in favour of this closure are some of the residents in Brunstane Road; it will benefit a tiny minority of Portobello residents and cause disruption and problems for a much larger group of people.</p> <p>We reported the concerns of residents in the Brightons and Rosefield Residents Association in response to the Council's survey last year but as it is clear that they were not listened to and as the Council has decided to press on with this deeply unpopular move it is worth re-stating them.</p>
Object	TRAFFIC IMPACT ON BRIGHTON PLACE AND THE SURROUNDING AREA
	<p>Portobello Community Council: Brunstane Road and the Coillesdenes, with the proposed experimental closure of Brunstane Road to vehicle traffic, have been a frequent item on the agenda of Portobello Community Council.</p> <p>It is our statutory role to "... ascertain, co-ordinate and express to the local authorities for its area, and to public authorities, the views of the community which it represents, in relation to matters for which those authorities are responsible..." – accordingly we undertook an online consultation, with an explanation of the proposed physical measures and interventions to raise awareness and to ascertain the views of the wider public within Portobello on these plans. The results were used to inform a discussion at the November 2020 meeting of the community council. An action was agreed to object to the proposal, while highlighting variances in the results, and forward on the fuller consultation results to the City of Edinburgh Council. We ask you to consider these as part of this current process.</p> <p>We note the change in Statement of Reasons to that which were previously given to the community council however, we believe the scheme has not changed from that which we consulted on.</p> <p>We would like to highlight those results here. [Graphs included in the objection from The Portobello Community Council are available to view at the link below.]</p> <p>Portobello Community Council undertook a consultation on these plans, running from 10 to 27 March 2020. We received 441 responses, with 18% supporting the proposal, while 80% were against.</p> <p>The vast majority of the responses received were from within our community council boundary, with only 40 responses outwith or withholding their postcode. We further broke down the results into areas more specifically impacted by the proposal: Brunstane Rd bottom section (37 responses), Brunstane Rd top section (39 responses), Coillesdenes (67 responses) and other areas to the south of the closure (e.g. Brunstane Rd S, Gilberstoun; 64 responses). These areas showed broad agreement with the overall result, except for the Brunstane Rd top section. Together these specific areas make up half of the total response.</p> <p>In conclusion our survey indicated that not only were 82% of those responding against the proposed ETRO but 79% of those living in the Coillesdenes were also against the proposal.</p> <p>Our consultation also asked for opinions on alternative interventions, and gathered many valuable comments on those, the specific proposal, and other community concerns related to the proposal. These should be reviewed. Our full consultation results are at:</p>
Object	http://www.portobelloc.org/pccpn/2020/08/31/brunstane-rd-joppa-triangle-results/
Object	<p>We write to formally object to the proposed 'Brunstane Road' TRO/21/13 for the following reasons: 1) No mention/allowance has been made regarding the much longer time it will take Fire, Ambulance and Police emergency vehicles to reach residents living north of the proposed closure point beside the East Coast main railway line bridge on Brunstane Road. 2) It is surely unfair that residents living in Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and mid-Coillesdene Avenue will have to accept all the cars/lorries flowing through the 'Coillesdene' area albeit some one-way only. Also residents in the northern parts of Morton Street and Coillesdene Drive will have to accept more of the traffic from the displaced traffic currently using Brunstane Road. 3) No mention/allowance has been made for residents in Eastfield Gardens/Coillesdene Avenue(east end) regarding traffic using their streets as a method of avoiding additional traffic build-up at the Eastfield junction lights.4) That speed reduction measures are proposed for mid-Coillesdene Avenue is an admission that vehicles will try to speed to make up for additional time/distance spent caused by this proposal. This is of concern to the elderly and those residents with young families who live there. 5) Brunstane Road has been a main thoroughfare into and out of Portobello for well over 100 years and traffic problems there are largely due to residents parking their cars and vans in the carriageway and on the pavement in front of houses not built with driveways to keep vehicles parked off the road. 6) No traffic survey has been done, as far as we are aware, to identify who is currently using Brunstane Road, where they have come from and going to, and for what reason. Also what route would they take if this proposal goes ahead? Surely this information is important knowledge to know before any decision is taken to implement this proposed TRO. 7) In our survey 90.7% of those responding used/owned a vehicle. 92.4% were against the closure of Brunstane Road on its own although this dropped to 73.4% against if changes similar to those proposed in this ETRO were implemented. It is still however a considerable majority against this proposed TRO. It is hoped that these points will be borne in mind before any final decision is taken on the implementation of this TRO.</p>

Response	Comments
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colloiesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examines the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>At the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road were upset about traffic passing their homes and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about children's safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting including making the road one-way from Milton Road as well as suggestions regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residents was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of whom own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there.</p> <p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>As a resident of Portobello, I must stress my dismay that Edinburgh City Council sought residents' opinions on proposed traffic amendments on Bunstane Road to gauge opinion, only for you to decide that you knew better than the residents that this will impact.</p> <p>Your consultation exercise, with 1050 responses. 27% were supportive of the proposal, with 72% against.</p> <p>While I fully understand that Brunstane Road has always been a major artery between Milton Road and Portobello High Street, the alternatives are 'rat-runs' into quieter streets next to Brunstane Road thus causing significant additional strain on the communities in those streets, as well as the additional pollution this will cause.</p> <p>You will note that Police Scotland, the Fire Brigade, and the City Council Refuse collection services have all stated (as in your committee report of 28th January this year) that such a road closure will cause issues as well as potential delays to emergency services. One only needs to join the queue of traffic at the traffic lights at what was a very practical roundabout on the start of Sir Harry Lauder and Duddingston Crescent to know how impractical the removal of the roundabout was to aid the movement of traffic and how vital Brunstane Road is and always was.</p> <p>I have read many of the comments from residents (as enclosed in your January report), and of those that said YES to the closure, I note the majority are cyclists.</p> <p>While I fully agree that cyclists are a major part of the City Council blueprint for the city, they do not contribute to road tax, that cars and motorised vehicles do as part of the cost to the upkeep of the roads we all access. Nor are cyclists critical to the wider community access where the demographics are of an aging population where mobility scooter and vehicular access is far more vital.</p> <p>The sixty thousand pound cost for an eighteen-month trial closure is a waste of our money and a blatant continuation of a council that does not listen to its residents (72% against over 27% for) as the agenda is set by people who apparently know better. There is no point to consult if you have already decided on the outcome.</p> <p>If this plan goes ahead and fails, I will seek fundraising within our community for a legal review of how transport plans are adopted in the wake of a resounding local community rejection of your plan. I believe residents of Leith are also unhappy with similar road and transportation plans.</p> <p>Implementation of policy on transportation is only practical if you garner the support for it, or that the infrastructure we need is already in place to replace what you remove. I do not believe that is the case in this plan of action.</p>
Object	<p>I ask that you strike down this plan and listen to the electorate who you represent.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Portobello and Joppa have a unique logistical location in that they are bounded on one side by the Firth of Forth, this limits access to the area from 3 directions instead of 4. By implementing these suggestions, you will effectively limit access to the area by motor vehicles to just 2 main directions.</p> <p>Sustainable travel is laudable, however, the fact is we are all living longer and as such, the elderly within our community are very dependent on vehicular accessibility. Mobility and disability issues mean public transport is not feasible for many. These proposals are discriminatory against the less able bodied in our community.</p> <p>These measures will only increase distances travelled for essential journeys and subsequently increase emissions.</p> <p>It would make much more sense to stop right hand turns from Brunstane Road onto Milton Road in the first instance.</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make an objection to the outlined Traffic Regulation Order covering changes around the Brunstane Road Area based on the following:</p> <p>1 - The council has state in numerous occasions that decreasing car traffic and increasing active travel is a key goal. Closing Brunstane Road to cars does nothing to further thus objective and in fact mat increase pressure at key junctions such as Seafield.</p> <p>2- Closure of this road will displace traffic onto other roads in the area which are under similar pressure.</p>
Object	<p>I strongly object to this proposal and hope you will take these views into consideration</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I am 81 years of age and have a connection with this area for this length of time. At one time (late 60s early 70s my husband and I lived at 79 Brunstane Road with a gate onto the Park (old Quarry). It was a very busy road even then and also dangerous. I myself avoided a serious accident with my children, Two children in the pram (one three who had just had a leg operation, with the baby between his legs and me taking the other child's hand, as even then cars came up or down the bridge at speed. One of the wheels of the pram came off the pavement as the pavement is so narrow and I just managed to save a very serious accident with a car speeding towards me. This bridge pavement over the bridge is still a problem as drivers still put their foot down just to get over the bridge - usually frustrated because of the chaos of cars at the south side of the bridge.</p> <p>My suggestions are:</p> <p>Why do you not take a strip of land off the Park/Quarry to give the east side of Brunstane Road a lane at the back which would allow them to park their cars either in their back garden or in the lane with a couple of turning points north and south- may be with space to build a line of garages. It would not involve massive costs by just fencing off from the park with greenery on the park side. No parking on the East side of Brunstane road either permanently or during the day. Because of the railway on the west side you are unable to do the same. Costs I am sure most houses would be happy to pay something towards having a permanent parking area.</p> <p>As I am 81 years old and I do not like using Brunstane Road as it is difficult to turn onto the main road to go to the Fort or Asda. The main road light system also makes it difficult to turn right if there is a tailback going west. Also, speeding cars going east do not help.</p> <p>Why has it not been considered over the years to make Brunstane Road the down/north route and make use of Queens Bay for the up route. Changing the pedestrian bridge to a vehicular one could have been done years ago probably the cost shared with the Railway</p> <p>I go up and down through the Coillesdenes as for me at 81 it is less stressful than the Brunstane route. In no way is this over-burdened with traffic as we are being led to believe. Most houses have driveways for a start so the roads are clear. There are also a variety of ways to get to the Milton Road with excellent vision both east and west. There are also not as many L-drivers as there used to be and less traffic than the Durhams and Southfields. From Bellfield Street there are about 7 routes to the exit road using the Coillesdenes to get to the Fort.</p>
Object	<p>The traffic on Abercorn Terrace has greatly increased over the last 10 years. Closing Brunstane Road and access to the Milton Road via the Collesdenes is only going to make this worse. Very few cars even do 30mph after Portobello and the same in the other direction.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colloiesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>Additionally, traffic will be forced into an area sheltered housing for people with mobility issues.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. It would also appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 years. The argument against yellow lines is nonsense as it is not the duty of the council to provide parking and those parking on the pavement should be issued with penalty notices as this is against the law and this behaviour penalises blind, disabled and those with push chairs.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to object to these proposals on the following grounds</p> <p>As the proposals block off access via Brunstane Road between the Musselburgh Road and Milton Road the traffic that would have used Brunstane Road will be displaced onto Brighton Place which is the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello. This is already very busy and increased volumes of traffic will lead to worse queues and congestion.</p> <p>The increased traffic will mean a less safe environment for children and their parents walking, scooting and cycling to and from school on what is supposed to be a safe route to school. The inevitable rise in air pollution will affect the health of the children going to both Portobello High School and St. John's Primary School and Nursery.</p>
Object	<p>I can also foresee greater difficulty for both Ambulance and Fire Services attending any emergency in the Coillesdene area. According to newspaper reports this has already arisen in parts of London where this sort of traffic control has been trialled.</p>
Object	<p>I am writing to object to the above traffic order. I do not believe that what has been suggested will be safe. My parents live on the east end of Coillesdene Avenue and they provide childcare for my toddler. I am very concerned that this stretch of road will become unsafe. By making Milton Terrace the first opportunity to get into the Coillesdene area when driving East from the junction of the A1, I know that there will be cars who use this as a rat run to avoid driving any further. Taking the left turn from Milton Road East (MRE) into Milton Terrace, then right onto Coillesdene Avenue will remove the need to drive the full length of MRE and to sit at the traffic lights at the end of MRE. These cars will go faster than 20 mph because they already do this and they will have been inconvenienced already by having to drive further to get from MRE to Portobello. The traffic calming measures stop before this last section of Coillesdene Avenue and it is dangerous to do this. Why should this part of the street be left with nothing to stop inconvenienced drivers from flying along it to get to the quickest exit down to Seaview terrace? I think it will be dangerous and I am worried about my child. There are several other children in this stretch of Coillesdene Avenue and I regularly see them cycling, scooting, running about and having fun in a healthy way outdoors with their friends. I feel that they will be at risk also and it will remove some of the security people have in this street. It is fairly quiet, with regular cars but it is not a rat run. I lived there for a long time and I have seen it be a rat run due to road closures such as traffic accident/roadworks and cars sped along it as it is wide and pretty flat apart from the last part. What has been suggested as part of this traffic order will mean that this will become a rat run all of the time and this is a worry. Also, the end of Coillesdene Avenue does not have a great vantage point when trying to exit down to Eastfield/Seaview Terrace. All of the excess traffic will make this even more unsafe as cars can't see properly to exit safely and people may take risks just to be able to get on with their now much longer journey.</p> <p>With regard to the closure of Brunstane Road, I feel that this is extremely unnecessary. I walk and drive this route every week and have never witnessed nor been part of any issue with regard to road rage or damage to parked cars. I feel that it is ridiculous to lose this road as a way to connect Milton Road East with the East side of Portobello. I would support it becoming one way as a trial as I have seen it become very congested on Milton Road East if there are cars waiting to exit from Brunstane Road and cars looking to drive onto Brunstane Road from MRE. I feel this would be safer for people in cars, pedestrians and cyclists and also would maintain some access for emergency services whichever way it remains open. It doesn't make sense to me to block it completely as a first option, why wouldn't that be a last resort? This closure has been heavily rejected at every turn, and I fail to see why it is being pushed through.</p>
Object	<p>The fact it is now be labelled as a traffic calming measure as opposed to the original plan of a road closure to prevent car damage and road rage is unfortunate when you look at my points above. The last section of Coillesdene Avenue will not benefit from any of these measures to calm traffic and will likely see the worst of the frustrations of car users.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I am writing to raise the issue of the Brunstane Road closure and the impact on disabled people (who can neither walk nor ride a bike)</p> <p>The Public Sector Equality Duty states that the council and all public bodies have a duty to ensure that anyone with protected characteristics under the law (Equality Act 2010; Scottish Public Sector Equality Duty) is not disproportionately disadvantaged in any way by the actions of that public body.</p> <p>The closure of Brunstane Road impacts on the ability of disabled people (plus the vulnerable elderly, the chronically unwell, pregnant women and women with small children) who in Portobello/Joppa and who need to drive to Brunstane Station, Asda, Fort Kinnaird etc without incurring considerable additional financial costs to drive the extra distances involved.</p> <p>Please forward a copy of the Equality and Rights Impact Assessment for the proposal - along with a full explanation and justification of why disabled people (and others with protected characteristics) can be disadvantaged by these additional costs at a time when social security payments are being cut and fuel prices are soaring.</p> <p>I appreciate the issues for people on Brunstane Road and think that other measures should be taken rather than closing the road: perhaps phased traffic lights by the bridge over the railway that would allow traffic to pass through a green light heading south (uphill) and reach the top of the hill within a single phase while those travelling north are held stationary by a red light at the southern end might be more suitable (and it might stop impatient people who just use it as a short-cut from gaining any time by using Brunstane Road).</p> <p>In addition, if the road is blocked for through traffic on a permanent basis, how are the trucks that collect refuse and recycling going to access the bins of those who live on the south side of the bridge? they can come down the hill... but how will they get out again? the same applies to removal lorries and delivery trucks: access is required for all of those and it is not possible for them to access Brunstane Road to the south of the bridge without having to reverse out of the street...which is utterly impractical. What happens when one truck wants to get out just as another wants to come down the hill?</p> <p>The other option to traffic lights at the bridge might be some kind of liftable barrier at the same location with a pass that gives drivers access that could be issued to local people, disabled people and essential commercial (or local authority) drivers.</p> <p>Whatever, to close Brunstane Road is illegal in relation to disability access under the Equality Act and Public Sector Equality Duty...and impractical in terms of bin lorry access, recycling lorry access, removal lorry access and delivery van and lorry access.</p>
Object	<p>Perhaps if the lack of supermarket deliveries and the need to take their own rubbish and recycling to the top is explained to the residents of Brunstane Road, they might like to reconsider the proposed closure.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to voice my objection to the proposed changes to brunstane road as they will simply create a similar problem in the collisdene area where there are a far higher number of elderly people and children. Milton terrace for example often has cars parked on one or both sides which makes it very difficult for cars to pass as it is but as the volume of traffic is very low it is not currently an issue. The changes are also bad for the environment as the de tour means people will be travelling further and therefore emissions will be higher. Making brunstane road one way seems a far more sensible solution.</p>
Object	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <p>Closure of this road will merely serve to displace traffic onto other roads in the greater Colliedene area, including roads. The restricted access into and out of the Colloiesdene area, will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, thus resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions. An example of this would be, a resident in Colliedene Crescent who intended to drive to Asda (a common journey, with no public transport alternative), will be forced to travel a minimum of 1Km on a round trip.</p> <p>The council should be prioritising the limited funding it claims to have, to target areas which have a record of injury accidents. Having examines the road accident statistics, it would appear that there have been no injury accidents on Brunstane Road North in the past 5 year reporting period, the last , minor, accident was in 2009, and prior to that date, 2003.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>I attended the initial consultation meeting several months ago, and the whole ethos around the proposal was because some of the residents on Brunstane Road North were upset about traffic passing their homes, and were concerned about the safety of their children. A recent visit showed that these residents are not so concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.</p> <p>Various suggestions were made at the initial consultation meeting regarding placing double yellow lines down one side, however, the main concerns from residennts was that "The would have nowhere to park". It is not the place of the council to provide residents, many of who own more than one car, with parking space.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p> <p>Having read the Road safety Audit report for the Kings Road Junction Improvements, Which CEC seem to be dragging their heels with, I note that the Audit Report mentions that Brunstane Road is to be closed. Thus rendering the consultation process a farce, as the decision has already been made regardless of the opinions of the local community.</p> <p>By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road be closed, however, it is unlikely that the same support would be given to any other neighbourhood, unless they have a councillor living there I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
Object	<p>I write to voice my objection to this proposed TRO. . The reasons for my objection are the same as many hundreds of other objectors. Namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •It is unnecessary •Other methods of dealing with the few problems that exist are preferable •The CEC own consultation show that the great majority of those consulted do not want the closure •The closure will benefit only those who live in the road but will greatly inconvenience many hundreds if not thousands of local residents like me who depend on this route •It will lead to significant traffic congestion elsewhere. <p>In short, I urge the Council to think again.</p>
Object	<p>I would like to object to the ETRO to close Brunstane Rd and sections of the Coillesdenes.</p> <p>The rationale in the statement of reasons takes no account of the impact of such a change on the the wider community, quieter streets for small proportion of households and congestion for the majority of households living on or near the east field stretch and Brighton Place. Traffic jams and pollution for homes along the high street/Abercorn Terrace/Ormelie Terrace/Joppa Rd and Seaview as a result of the displaced vehicle journeys with the routes into Portobello completely restricted.</p> <p>Where does pollution feature in your sustainable travel with the added distance to all these journeys (people will not be walking or cycling, just driving further)?</p> <p>What impact will this have on the safety of these roads with everyone forced down limited routes?</p> <p>This proposal has repeatedly been opposed by a majority of the local community and it will have a real impact on the already congested streets in Portobello. If you are going to consult the community then you should listen when we respond.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to make a formal objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order for Brunstane Road and surrounding areas.</p> <p>Whilst I acknowledge that something has to be done to ease the difficulties experienced in Brunstance Road this shouldn't be at the benefit of Brunstane Road residents but the detriment of residents in all surrounding area.</p> <p>Better solutions exist, for example, Brunstane Road could benefit from being one direction, leaving the rest of the Collesdene area alone.</p> <p>Closure of Brunstane Road will displace traffic onto other roads in the Collesdene area. The restricted access into and out of the Collesdene area will require traffic to take a longer, convoluted route, resulting in an increase in traffic on many routes and higher levels of vehicle emissions.</p> <p>There would be a very significant increase in the volume of traffic using Milton Drive (as the only exit from the Collesdene area for anyone travelling North). This is a concern as I have 2 young children (one of which is Autistic) that will be put in danger every time they leave home. We will be disturbed by the noise and pollution.</p> <p>The exit from Milton Drive to Milton Road East is particularly difficult, with a large hedge meaning cars often edge out into the path of the buses using the bus stop immediately beyond. This will likely cause a number of accidents.</p> <p>The entrance in to the Collesdene area will be through a residential area heavily populated by elderly and infirm, putting them at greater risk.</p> <p>The Statement of reasons is flawed, in that the reasoning given is "To encourage sustainable travel" such as walking and cycling. As things stand, South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road fulfils this criteria.</p> <p>It is widely known within the area, that the vice convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office. The council have a mechanism for targeting their limited funding where it will provide the greatest benefit, and this fails to meet any of the criteria.</p>
Object	<p>I hope the points raised are taken seriously, and that no further public money will be spent on this proposal when there are far more urgent matters for CEC Roads and Transportation to attend to.</p>
	<p>With reference to the above reference number and the closure of Brunstane Road I would like to register my objections in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>The closure would lead to a big increase in traffic on to Brighton place. An area already struggling with existing traffic.</p> <p>Air quality and rat running is already a significant problem. The council has already invested in creating a cycle way and safe route to the schools. This would greatly increase incidents and accidents.</p> <p>Add to that the council's plans to redirect HGV's off Sir Harry Lauder road and we have a recipe for disaster.</p>
Object	<p>In conclusion there are very few artery routes in to Portobello - Close one - you do not help the problem you simply consolidate it elsewhere. The council invested heavily in new setts for Brighton Place but that is as based on traffic levels at present. All will be undone.....</p>
	<p>I wish to lodge my objections to the above TRO which is all very well for the well-being of the residents of Brunstane Road but it is to the detriment of many other Portobello residents. Closing this road will divert traffic up or down Brighton Place causing extra pollution, danger to the hundreds of school children/parents//toddlers who travel 5 days x 3 per week to and from Portobello High School and St John's Primary School and even more traffic chaos. You have already permitted additional parking in Southfield Place/ partially closed Stanley Street without any thought to the traffic jams being created. If as being mooted, HGV vehicles will also be diverted up Brighton Place, what was the point of spending a fortune on re-laying the setts and the inconvenience caused for months during work in progress? Once again, think of the added pollution. We were in favour of the setts.</p> <p>I hope for once objections are taken into account and you are not going to bulldoze this through. The number of times objections have formed the vast majority of public opinion but a controversial proposal has gone ahead anyway, should be nothing but an embarrassment to the planners. This coupled with the fact that at least one councillor actually lives in Brunstane Road and another lives in an adjoining street, does not sit well with me.</p> <p>I completely understand concerns re pollution, but please do not move this problem from one street to another.</p> <p>Please also take into consideration the dangers caused to drivers suffering physical health problems trying to avoid road obstacles/high speed bumps.</p>
Object	<p>To sum up, I am totally opposed to this latest TRO which we all know will remain in place once implemented.</p>
	<p>As a general principle I suggest that the Council does not implement closure of the bridge in Brunstane Road. There are several reasons:</p> <p>I like many others have not been using buses because of COVID risks. We should let the pandemic pass before implementing road changes as it is very likely that bus use will increase and car use will decrease as/if/when the pandemic eases. The current usage is not typical of what we can expect in the future.</p> <p>I fully support a major reduction in transport emissions and think there are better ways to do this than close Brunstane Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Improve the bus service, e.g. more express buses, electric or hydrogen power -Support the move to electric cars, by improving electric infrastructure and charging congestion fees for petrol/diesel cars (particularly heavy and low mpg vehicles) -Continue to support cyclists with better road surfaces and more priority for cyclists <p>Closing the bridge has other draw backs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Increased CO2 caused by longer journeys via Eastfield or Brighton Place -Increased pollution for people on the main roads -Limited access for emergency vehicles
Object	<p>Just about the only people who may benefit from the closure of the bridge are those living in Brunstane Road. That is a tiny percentage of the population of Portobello and Joppa.</p>
	<p>My reasons for objecting are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed closure has already gone out for public consultation and the feedback was overwhelmingly against the proposed closure. 2. The request for the closure was at the behest of "a number" of residents of a section of Brunstane Road who enjoyed an area free from through traffic while a temporary traffic order was in place for essential bridge repairs. The traffic issues in the street can be largely attributed to residents parking vehicles on both sides of their street which is a long established right of way in the area. 3. The solution for the problem perceived by the residents of Brunstane Road should be resolved in Brunstane Road by means of enforced traffic regulation if necessary. This may affect a "number of residents" in Brunstane Road but would not impact hundreds of other residences in the adjoining areas which this proposed order would undoubtedly do. 4. The proposed plan does not only adversely affect the residents of the Collesdene area but also those north of the bridge in Brunstane Road. All those residents will be forced to have restricted access/egress to their homes, but also suffer from increased response times from emergency services and no doubt increased traffic volume. 5. The residents of Brunstane Road purchased their houses in the full knowledge that the road they chose to live on was a through road to and from Portobello. The solution may lie in the provision of off-road parking and traffic regulation such as restricted or no parking in the street allied to traffic calming. We have seen the total ban of parking in other streets in the area to facilitate safe road use.
Object	

Response	Comments
	<p>I oppose the proposal to permanently close Brunstane Road at the railway bridge, for the following reasons :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The majority of the people with allotments just off Brunstane Road live north of the bridge. Many are in the older age-group and require transport to carry produce home. The alternative route via Eastfield junction, Milton Road and then Brunstane Road south of the bridge, would increase the journey time, petrol consumption and pollution. 2. Brunstane Bowling Club is in the same location and access closure from north of the bridge would have the same effects. 3. If a medical or fire emergency arose in the area, particularly in Brunstane Road itself, emergency services might have to go the long way round, depending on where they were coming from. 4. Closure would result in an increase in traffic through Brighton Place, which is already busy and a regular bus route.
Object	<p>For these reasons, I consider that a comprehensive traffic survey is required before any such action is taken.</p>
	<p>I wish to log my formal complaint regarding the above proposed Experimental Traffic Order. The above proposal will affect myself and numerous friends and neighbours in a "Negative" way. I have a number of concerns about the new proposal which will clearly "only" benefit the residents on Brunstane Road. These plans will seriously have a dangerous and negative affect on the Coillesdene and Joppa area. I noted the flyer that was created by the (BRG) "Brunstane Road Group" and this clearly defines the benefits for this "very small" group of people. However the (BRG) and the (Edinburgh Council) are totally ignoring the serious affects for families in Coillesdene and Joppa area around 500 homes. I have listed below some of the serious problems you are proposing in your new plans as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Dangerous Enviroment: You propose to create a more dangerous environment for Children – Walkers – Cyclist – Disabled 2) Negative Property Prices: The proposal will have a Negative effect on property prices but improve the Brunstane Road area. Numerous neighbours and myself bought our houses knowing the location gave us a driveway and road space outside our houses for visitors and it was relatively safe. Please note Coillesdene and Joppa already have our normal traffic and "Learner Drivers" who use the area and we accept this when we bought our houses.. 3) Parking Brunstane Road: Residents knew what they were buying at the time and they cause their own problems by parking cars and big vans on the road. Some of them have driveways which is fine but the majority park on the street. 4) HGV Using Brunstane Road: I understand from the (BRG) that HGV are using Brunstane Road and some lorry drivers are breaking the law. If this is the case then improve the "Traffic Signs Visibly" and state cars only access also take action against offenders with a few fines and it will soon stop this problem. 5) Access To Milton Road: Myself and numerous neighbours have excellent access to Milton Road and you propose to stop this in your new plans. Please consider we all bought our houses and paid the prices we did knowing the factors involved. <p>Summary If this proposal was to go ahead I would state again it would seem that the "Small Group" of residents in Brunstane Road are to have all the benefits and a total disregard for Coillesdene and Joppa and surrounding areas. If the problem is so bad then change the road layouts so that all through traffic has to use the main roads at Baileyfield Road and the main road from Portobello to Musselburgh. This way access to Brunstane and Coillesdene and Joppa can only be for residents only. If the new housing scheme proposed for 1300 houses is to have access to Milton Road then the Coillesdene and Joppa area will dangerously become a "RAT RUN" If this cannot happen then leave things as they are but put up proper access signs on Brunstane Road to prevent for big Vans and HGV</p> <p>Please give the above serious thought before you make a "nice" area to live become a "nightmare".</p>
Object	<p>I hope the above is clear on my thoughts but it is also the thoughts of hundreds of people who really care about where they live.</p>
	<p>Broadly I'm supportive of low traffic neighbourhoods, and as a resident of Eastfield Gardens, I've enjoyed the benefits of living on a quieter street and want other people to also have this privilege.</p> <p>Eastfield Gardens is next to the proposed changes and I was surprised to see it hadn't been considered as part of the overall plan. I can see the rationale - the proposed changes act to prevent moving the existing cut-through along Milton Road and onto other streets. My concern is that in missing out Eastfield Gardens, the plan overlooks the potential for our street to become a cut-through, as people chop off a difficult and traffic lighted junction to get onto the promenade.</p> <p>Already we have a small number of people using our street this way, often driving at some speed. I am concerned closing Brunstane Road will increase this.</p> <p>I appreciate the traffic has to go somewhere! I wonder if it would be possible to add in traffic calming measures, similar to those proposed for Coillesdene Avenue, to disincentivise drivers from using our street in this way.</p>
Object	<p>I appreciate that on paper it may look like people would just continue to the junction - we already know from experience that this isn't always the case, and if the volume of traffic increases, so will the numbers of drivers who will take the option to cut off that corner.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>To say that I have watched events unfolding over months with growing concern would be an understatement. There are so many points that could and should be raised with regard to this matter but I shall limit myself (for the present) to what I consider the main ones.</p> <p>></p> <p>> Firstly, there is the question of the consultation process and the very clear outcome that 72% of respondents were against the proposal and in a smaller, yet equally valid consultation, the members of BRRA were 92% against. In both consultations the public highlighted the issues that would arise if the proposal were to go ahead - greater congestion, pollution, negative impact on health and quality of life and lack of access to Portobello businesses and community on a far larger scale than if the road were to remain open. As such the grievous affect on health and well-being would be on a far reaching basis for a much larger majority of the public.</p> <p>></p> <p>> There is surely also a wider question of democracy here - or do the needs and wants of the few outweigh those of the many? This would seem a rather questionable premise or could it be that public consultations are simply seen as a tick box exercise?</p> <p>></p> <p>> On a related note, little mention has been made of the impact of such a decision on Brighton Place which, despite a newly refurbished road, is even more congested than before and where public transport is regularly snarled up for lengthy periods. Or that this route is designated to be a safe route to school? Before any proposals are agreed I would like to see a proposal to alleviate this situation as a priority and before a serious accident occurs.</p> <p>></p> <p>> Secondly, it is clearly noted that both the Police and Fire Services have expressed concern at the proposed closure - these are the professional bodies we put our trust and often our lives in, yet their views seem to have been reduced to one or two lines. In reality, any delay could potentially result in serious injury or even death. Surely our decision makers are not in favour of jeopardising not only our general health but are willing to run the risk of possible fatalities?</p> <p>></p> <p>> Thirdly, a point is made in the report that the decision to close is in line with 'a people centred approach to promote health, happiness and well being.' A worthy aim but, as the points above illustrate, any decision to close the road would be diametrically opposed to this philosophy.</p> <p>></p> <p>Last but not least, is the cost - whatever the estimate this is money that, in these most difficult of times, should be being directed towards helping the health and well-being of the community by spending wisely on schools and hospitals and to feed the less fortunate. hom it may concern.</p> <p>The above was part of a response I made prior to the January Committee meeting which I went on to watch with alarm. Basically the fact that there was overwhelming objections was ignored and the suggestion made we ' did not know what was good for us'. Also it did appear to the observant that a decision to temporarily close the road had already been made.</p> <p>I simply do not understand what makes this road so special that it merits closure - putting other road users and residents at major disadvantage. Portobello needs more access and a holistic traffic management approach - not this one.</p>
Object	<p>Please note my ongoing concerns and major objection.</p>
	<p>exercise in order for the Council to meet their statutory requirements.</p> <p>One of the reasons given for the TRO being put in place (let's be honest, it will not be temporary once put in place. It will be permanent like the cycle lanes and double yellow lines scattered all over town) is to provide a quiet area for the residents of Brunstane Road to enable them to walk and cycle. Very good for them but this will be at the expense of the residents in other streets primarily Brighton Place when the majority of the displaced traffic will be diverted. It cannot be a coincidence that at least one Councillor lives in Brunstane Road and another very nearby. We have a Councillor near us whose help we can never count on, because she had no car and advocates cycling and walking.</p> <p>I understand that there is also a proposal to ban HGV vehicles travelling through Portobello from turning left at the Kings Road junction. How are these vehicles going to reach the Sir Harry Lauder Road? Again, up Brighton Place? What logic is there in spending £800,000 re-laying the cobbles only to divert the Brunstane Road traffic and possibly HGVs up Brighton Place. Are planners actually being paid to come up with these schemes?</p> <p>Turning now to the current situation which will only be worsened by the Brunstane Road TRO. At the tunnel or bridge at Southfield Place, currently there is a Give Way in operation, obviously because the road too narrow to take cars heading in both directions at the one time. Traffic heading north is favoured. There is currently chaos because cars are also allowed to park in Southfield Place. The only solution to cope with the increased traffic diverted through Brighton Place will be to install traffic lights at the tunnel. This will lead to cars backing up all the way down to Portobello High Street or all the way up to and beyond Bailyfield Road. Think of the pollution this will cause. Even more important than the pollution is that literally hundreds of school children travel up and down Southfield Place and through the tunnel 5 days a week. From Portobello High and St John's Primary. The increased traffic will increase the danger to these children. Let it not take a child's death before common sense prevails.</p> <p>For once do the correct thing and consign this proposal to where it belongs. The waste paper bin.</p> <p>I wish to submit my objections to the Brunstane Road TRO, and sincerely hope that mine, along with a large number of other Portobello residents' objections, are actually taken into account this time. Too often similar proposals submitted by the Council get bulldozed through and the objection process is merely a paper exercise in order for the Council to meet their statutory requirements.</p> <p>One of the reasons given for the TRO being put in place (let's be honest, it will not be temporary once put in place. It will be permanent like the cycle lanes and double yellow lines scattered all over town) is to provide a quiet area for the residents of Brunstane Road to enable them to walk and cycle. Very good for them but this will be at the expense of the residents in other streets primarily Brighton Place when the majority of the displaced traffic will be diverted. It cannot be a coincidence that at least one Councillor lives in Brunstane Road and another very nearby. We have a Councillor near us whose help we can never count on, because she had no car and advocates cycling and walking.</p> <p>I understand that there is also a proposal to ban HGV vehicles travelling through Portobello from turning left at the Kings Road junction. How are these vehicles going to reach the Sir Harry Lauder Road? Again, up Brighton Place? What logic is there in spending £800,000 re-laying the cobbles only to divert the Brunstane Road traffic and possibly HGVs up Brighton Place. Are planners actually being paid to come up with these schemes?</p> <p>Turning now to the current situation which will only be worsened by the Brunstane Road TRO. At the tunnel or bridge at Southfield Place, currently there is a Give Way in operation, obviously because the road too narrow to take cars heading in both directions at the one time. Traffic heading north is favoured. There is currently chaos because cars are also allowed to park in Southfield Place. The only solution to cope with the increased traffic diverted through Brighton Place will be to install traffic lights at the tunnel. This will lead to cars backing up all the way down to Portobello High Street or all the way up to and beyond Bailyfield</p>
Object	

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to oppose the closure of Brunstane Road on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of surveys, including the Councils own survey, have found that the vast majority of local residents (over 80%) oppose the closure of Brunstane Road. If the Council has any ambition to promote engagement with voters and any regard for both the wishes of the majority of the local residents and basic democracy then it should cancel plans to close Brunstane Road and respect the wishes of the majority of local people. • Closure would result in an increase in congestion and pollution on the surrounding streets and an increase in traffic in the Colliedene area. • Brunstane Road closure would result in a decrease in people walking and cycling in the Colliedene Area (even with traffic calming measures) and an increase in Air pollution. • Closure of Brunstane Road puts children in the Colliedene area at greater risk of both air pollution and road traffic accidents • There is no history of major accidents on Brunstane Road. Why waste funding on closing it when the money could be better spent elsewhere (Kings Road Junction?) • The closure of Brunstane Road would push traffic along the Colliedene area to the detriment of the residents • The traffic calming measures will do nothing to alleviate the problems the vast increase in traffic will bring both in the reduction of air quality for a larger number of residents than those who will benefit from the Brunstane Road Closure and in the nuisance and inconvenience which again will affect a far greater number than those who will benefit in Brunstane Road. • A dangerous rat run will be created in Eastfield Gardens. The proposals contain no traffic calming in this small street. The closure of Brunstane Road will result in a huge amount of increased traffic as drivers use it to travel between Milton Road East and Joppa Road, missing out the traffic lights at the end of Joppa. This was the case when Brunstane Road closed previously and nothing was done to alleviate the problem despite the issue being raised with local councillors and the Traffic Dept. <p>Finally, it is common knowledge that the Vice Convenor of the Council's Transportation Committee resides just of Brunstane Road and will benefit greatly from this closure. It is, in my opinion, an abuse of her position and a clear conflict of interest that she has been allowed to have an influence on this matter.</p> <p>Why should a vocal and influential minority force a change that is against the demonstrated wishes of the local community (over 80% opposed)?</p>
Object	<p>In the interests of fairness and democracy I urge you to cancel the proposed closure of Brunstane Road</p>
Object	<p>We are writing about our concern over the proposed closure of Brunstane Road, Portobello. We live on Brighton Place and if Brunstane Road is closed Brighton Place becomes the only north/ south axis in and out of Portobello. At peak times there is already considerable chaos as buses try to pass one another in a very limited space – often causing considerable tail backs on to the High Street. More traffic on Brighton Place will further exacerbate the situation and increase the air pollution.</p>
Object	<p>It concerns me greatly that this action has been ill thought out. I am concerned about the volume of traffic impacting on an already congested Park Avenue, the council have already shut the road Stanley Street down the side of Portobello Golf Course, (supposedly to make easier access to the Figgate Park for pedestrians?) increasing the volume of cars and lorries. Displacing even more vehicles will only make this problem worse. Southfield Place and Brighton Place have become almost one way due to the volume of traffic. Will this action not have a direct impact on them? Brunstane Road is an essential access road from Milton Road onto the High Street, I believe that emergency vehicles will have a very difficult route in the event of an emergency.</p> <p>New houses being built all over Portobello and the surrounding area will increase the volume of traffic and make matters worse. Portobello High street does not need extra traffic from St Harry Lauder Road travelling east, which will inevitably happen if Brunstane Road is shut.</p> <p>Have other options been seriously considered?</p>
Object	<p>I write on behalf of Portobello Amenity Society. Portobello Amenity Society strongly opposes the proposed closure of Brunstane Road. Brunstane Road and Brighton Place are the only north-south roads between Milton Road and Portobello High Street. Closing one will inevitably increase traffic on the other with increased congestion, increased rat-running around East Brighton Crescent and Lee Crescent and increased air pollution on a route used to access local schools. Brighton Place is already frequently congested, and buses often have to take turns to get past bottlenecks. The impact of the Baileyfield housing development also needs to be taken into account as residents living on the south side of the site will have to exit onto the Sir Harry Lauder Road where no right turn is permitted. Traffic wanting to head west to the Seafield junction will have to turn left along the Sir Harry Lauder Road, under the railway bridge, down Southfield Place and Brighton Place then along Portobello High Street, thus adding to congestion. Closing Brunstane Road would create considerable problems for users of both the Brunstane Road allotments and the Bowling Club. Most of the allotment holders, many of whom are elderly, live north of the bridge. Vehicles are needed to transport plants and compost and closing the road would mean greatly extended trips to and from the allotments. Brunstane Bowling Club is in a league and in many other competitions which means that bowlers from all over come to visit. Most bowlers are elderly and closing the road would create difficulties accessing the club.</p> <p>Brunstane Road is the main access to the A1 for Portobello residents. Closing Brunstane Rd would add distance to journeys to Milton Rd and the bypass. It would also increase times for emergency journeys to the Edinburgh Royal Infirmary. We note the concerns of the emergency services regarding greater response times but note there is no response from the ambulance service. This is particularly important given Portobello's older population and the popularity of the beach. If the proposals go ahead, the junction between Milton Road East and Eastfield at Scott's Garage will need re-planning to accommodate more cars turning right into Milton Road East. There has been no traffic modelling for this junction to assess traffic flow and therefore no changes to Brunstane Road and the Colliedenes should be made until the impact of doing so is known. In the deputation to the Transport and Environment committee of 12th November, Brunstane Road traffic calming group claimed that: "Brunstane Road is a key link in Edinburgh's cycling network as it connects national cycle network Route 1 'The Innocent Path' to the Promenade and CEC's own route No 10." The society believes that this is incorrect as the existing, well sign-posted route from Cycle Route 1 is the most direct route into Portobello. Rather than close Brunstane Road, the society believes that consideration should be given to other options which would alleviate the problems that Brunstane Road faces such as a one-way system, parking restrictions, or traffic lights at the bridge. Before any closures are decided upon, a full traffic survey should be undertaken for the whole of Portobello and Joppa to arrive at a sustainable solution for the whole area. Traffic other than local traffic should be barred from all possible areas and calming measures such as chicanes introduced to stop drivers speeding and taking shortcuts. Improved signposting should ensure that The Sir Harry Lauder Road becomes the main route for through traffic and not Portobello High Street. The population of Portobello is increasing, especially with the development at Baileyfield, and the society believes that existing access routes to Portobello should be maintained rather than reduced.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I wish to register my objection to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road, on the following grounds –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routing traffic via the Eastfield junction will only increase journey times for local and other road users. This is environmentally uneconomical. • Traffic attempting to access Portobello will no doubt also be directed via Duddingston Park and Southfield Place. As you should already know, Southfield Place is currently a bottleneck due to parking on both sides of the street, making the passing of two buses impossible. • Traffic will avoid the traffic lights at the Baileyfield Road/Duddingston Park/Duddingston Road/Southfield Place junction by using Park Avenue as a rat-run. • Park Avenue is very busy already with foot traffic to and from Portobello High School. Children going to and from PHS will be placed at unnecessary risk. • The recent temporary traffic lights at the Duddingston Park/Milton Road junction have demonstrated that Park Avenue and Park Lane are used as short cuts from Milton Road to Southfield Place and onwards to Portobello High Street. Closure of Brunstane Road will only make this worse. • Park Avenue is also a “quiet residential street”, so why shift traffic into this street.
Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Hope Lane option has already been closed for “Spaces for People”. Have you any idea how many people actually walk on that street. Not many, at all.
	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed road closures of Brunstane Road and adjacent Coillesdenes.</p> <p>This has been pushed by a cabal of local residents who have lobbied the council. Despite overriding resistance from Portobello residents, the council are instigating these closures. I would question the process under which the council have progressed this!</p> <p>The vast majority of respondents to consultations are opposed to the closure of Brunstane Road for the following reasons :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - that the traffic from Brunstane Road would be displaced onto Brighton Place and Southfield Place, the only other north/south axis in and out of Portobello; - increased volumes of traffic, leading to worse queues and congestion; - increased traffic would mean a less safe environment for children and their parents walking, scooting and cycling to and from school on what is a safe route to school; - worsened air pollution in the area, which is harmful to human health; - Extra traffic forced onto Milton Road, A1 - significant artery - which runs beside our new high school. This is an accident waiting to happen and kids pouring out of school onto an increased A1 is awful. <p>This is a short sited, plan. The poorly understood affect of creating a traffic island of Portobello by effectively creating a ring road of traffic will be devastating.</p>
Object	<p>Please listen to the results of this consultation!</p>
	<p>I object to the closure of Brunstane Rd for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) traffic will be diverted to the other main route into Portobello i.e. Brighton Place which is also in a residential area and used by many children walking to local primary & high schools & nurseries, making this road much busier, more polluted & less safe 2) traffic heading east will then have to pass along the high street, again making this busier, more polluted & less safe or pleasant for pedestrians & shoppers 3) if hgvs can not turn into Harry Lauder Rd as suggested, this traffic too will head up Brighton Place 4) traffic down Brighton Place will rat run round East Brighton Crescent & Lee Crescent as it did when Brighton Place was closed, making this busier, more congested & less safe.
Object	<p>Please, until there is a low traffic plan for the whole area, don't divert all the traffic down our end of Portobello.</p>
	<p>I am writing to you to express my serious concerns about the proposed Brunstane Low Traffic Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>I am a resident of Eastfield Gardens and it seems obvious to me that our street for some reason has been excluded/overlooked/ignored by those that have created this plan. I am sympathetic to the needs of the community with regard to safety and quality of life but this plan seems to improve the things for the majority at the expense of the minority living on Eastfield Gardens. There will be a huge impact on the residents of this street. It is currently used by many as a shortcut between Milton Road East and Musselburgh Road. It can be very dangerous trying to cross the road and exiting driveways with traffic driving at speed up and down. It is a small and narrow residential street that is not capable of being used as a rat -run to avoid the traffic lights at the bottom of Milton Road East. This situation will be made far worse if this plan is implemented in its current form. All the other shortcuts have been dealt with by the plan with the exception of Eastfield Gardens. This will inevitably lead to a significant increase in traffic using the only shortcut left, Eastfield Gardens. Safety and quality of life for the residents of our street will be significantly affected.</p> <p>Why wasn't Eastfield Gardens included in the plan and given similar traffic measures to all other streets in the neighbourhood? It would be a significant improvement to our street to have one end blocked off in a similar fashion to the others included in the plan. This would be an effective solution to the anticipated problem of a large increase in traffic on our street and I am sure that all the residents would be in favour of this happening.</p>
Object	<p>I look forward to hearing your response to these concerns and hope something can be put in place to avoid the carnage that this plan will cause to the residents of Eastfield Gardens.</p>
	<p>I wish to OBJECT to the proposal to close Brunstane road and the proposed road changes to the east of Brunstane road.</p> <p>There has been no consideration taken as to the traffic flow to the west of Brunstane road. Traffic wishing to go to Portobello high street will have to use Duddingston Park and Park Avenue, joining Southfield place and continuing to Brighton Place, which is a safe route to school for pedestrians and cyclists. Traffic flow around Portobello High School will increase, it would appear that no consideration has been given to this.</p> <p>Stanley street was closed, this would appear to have increased traffic on Park Ave and Duddingston Park. There are traffic calming measures and a 20 mph speed limit on Park Ave. which is very rarely adhered to.</p>
Object	<p>Please can consideration be given to the overall traffic flow around Portobello and not just one area.</p>
Support	<p>I wish to support the proposal to close Brunstane Road due to the sheer weight of traffic impeding the safety of pedestrians and cyclists along it. It is a daily negotiation to keep safe whilst it is used by sometimes inappropriate vehicles (eg HGVs) as a rat run with 20 mile an hour speed limits regularly being flouted.</p>
	<p>I am writing in favour of Brunstane Road Closure. Last year I lived in the street for 10 months and the road quite frankly was a nightmare. Often there were incidents of road rage, aggression and abusive behaviour. My car was damaged and I dreaded every time I had to enter or leave the street by car due to what might wait for me.</p> <p>As cars need to park on the pavement to let the busy traffic through and to avoid damage to vehicles, this obstructs the path for pedestrians, push prams and wheelchairs. Ambulances also struggle to pass when required as the road is often gridlocked with traffic.</p>
Support	<p>Full road closure is necessary to prevent a major accident or incident.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I'm writing about the proposed closure of Brunstane Road (TRO/21/13) to through traffic.</p> <p>I just want to say that I fully support this scheme, and I look forward to more road closures in Portobello.</p>
Support	Edinburgh is miles behind other cities in reducing traffic, so it's good we're seeing some progress at last.
Support	I used to be neutral on this traffic order but now I strongly support it. There has been a recent pattern of rat running cars and vans mounting and driving down the pavement at some speed. It has gone from being a nuisance to a danger.
	<p>I live on Brunstane Road, albeit at the Joppa Road end.</p> <p>I feel this closure will do much to promote a quiet local neighbourhood and improve the living conditions for the residents. The traffic fumes in this residential street need to be reduced. There are nearly 2000 vehicles a day travelling along a street with over 100 residents. I believe this closure is in compliance with the City of Edinburgh Council's stated policy objectives on a clean environment.</p> <p>The narrow street was built at a time when horses and carts were the mode of transport. It was not designed to accommodate resident parking along with the passage of cars or the width or weight of heavy goods vehicles that we see regularly see travelling down the street.</p> <p>I appreciate that this closure will affect car users travel time as they will have to follow a different route. Taking a different route could put a 2 minute extension onto drivers' journeys. I say could because using Brunstane Road is not always a 'short-cut' - there are frequent traffic jams when you encounter a vehicle coming towards you and this can often lead to heated exchanges and dents, scrapes and other damage to parked cars, as drivers misjudge the space available. To attempt to avoid this, some motorists park partly on the pavement, which in turn affects wheelchair users and pram pushers who have to move onto the road, affecting their safety and in conflict with the Council's policy on equal access. There have been enumerable instances of road rage and this are a constant source of alarm to residents and families with young children.</p>
Support	I am strongly in favour of the proposed traffic order.
	<p>I feel Brunstane Road is becoming increasingly unsafe, noisy and polluted.</p> <p>There is a growing volume of traffic using Brunstane Road and this is causing a number of problems for both residents and the community.</p> <p>Brunstane Road is increasingly being used to get between Portobello and the A1/city bypass as the main thoroughfares of Sir Harry Lauder Road and Milton Road become more and more congested. The traffic coming from the Milton Link, a 40mph road, has very little transition to the 20mph limit of Brunstane Road and as a consequence, driver behaviour is to drive as quickly as possible, presumably still in the mindset of 40-70mph travel. The only barrier to achieving very high speed are the speed bumps but these are very gentle and driver behaviour is often to ignore their presence and accept the minor scraping resulting. Although not quite the same situation travelling from Portobello, many drivers accelerate up the hill as hard as their vehicles can manage, ignoring the 20mph limit. This can often be very noisy and cause noticeable structural vibration, especially since Brunstane Road is used by many lorries, coaches and other large vehicles.</p> <p>Although not visible, the hard uphill acceleration, especially by large diesel vehicles must be generating maximum pollution.</p> <p>Brunstane Road is used by many families, children and students to travel to schools, the beach and all the facilities in Portobello. It is an ideal cycling link between the Innocent cycle path and Portobello. As a frequent bicycle user, I find Brunstane Road to be an often hostile area as drivers frequently overtake and cut in sharply, often to then brake hard as the road narrows. There is a narrow, blind-summit railway bridge halfway up Brunstane Road and drivers often overtake on this bridge, leaving very little room for anyone on a bicycle. I watch as schoolchildren on bicycles are swamped by high volumes of large vehicles with no regard for the safety of these vulnerable road users.</p>
Support	
	<p>As residents of Brunstane Gardens we would like to comment on the proposal to close Brunstane Road for 18 months. The following are some of our thoughts -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When the street was built over 100 years ago it was designed for very little traffic and now cannot cope with the volume of vehicles passing through. With the residents' cars parked on either side of the street there is only a narrow channel which is difficult for cars to access, let alone the heavy goods vehicles which are directed here by their satnav. systems or using it as a shortcut to and from Portobello. 2. The current Council policy of returning streets to the community would be supported by this measure. The air quality would be markedly improved for residents, especially young children. 3. Very few residents in the area have not witnessed at least 1 example of road rage or traffic hold ups where they have to endure bad language which can appear threatening to many. 4. As so many cars are regularly damaged their owners have resorted to parking on the pavement which makes it difficult for wheelchair users and pram pushers. 5. Under the proposed closure there would also be very limited access to the Coillesdenes, meaning that traffic would be diverted, avoiding the "Joppa Triangle". This should not add more than a couple of minutes to the entire journey, even less if there is a hold up while vehicles negotiate parked cars on Brunstane Road. 6. Since the Covid pandemic it is very obvious that people are unwilling to walk past other pedestrians on the narrow pavement over the railway bridge. Whilst some will wait for others to cross the bridge many are using the road, creating the potential for accidents.
Support	We hope that the points we have made will be seriously considered in the report to the Transport and Environment committee and we look forward to an improved air quality and safer environment when the road is closed.
	<p>I am in favour of the proposed changes as I believe the underlying principles are sound. We should strive to reduce motor vehicle traffic in quiet residential areas of the city, and restore the priority of pedestrians and cyclists to these streets.</p> <p>I feel an experimental TRO makes sense as it allows for the evaluation of the changes to take place and further improvements or changes made at a later stage.</p>
Support	I would ask that proper data is gathered before, during and after in relation to traffic flows in the affected areas.

Response	Comments
	<p>Having lived in Brunstane Road for over 30 years we we would like to support the proposal to close Brunstane Road to through traffic and adopt the mitigating traffic measures the surrounding Coillesdene area streets.</p> <p>We list our supporting comments below regarding the Brunstane Road closure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The amount of "non stopping" commercial and HGV traffic passing up and down the road has increased dramatically over recent recent years. This road is not suitable for the size, width and weight of the vehicles using it, leading to continual damage to parked cars. It would appear that the developing and continuing use of SATNAV leads to drivers following the "directed" route from the A1 down into Portobello. It is vital that through commercial traffic is channelled onto the surrounding main roads where it can be accommodated safely. 2. We have witnessed car transporters, mobile cranes and buses using Brunstane Road. This not only blocks the road but stops any emergency vehicles accessing properties. If HGV's try to reverse, it is unlikely that the drivers can clearly see children and pedestrians as they struggle to cross the road between the parked cars. This could have very serious consequences. 3. The narrow hump back bridge creates blind spots and the safety of the increased number of cyclists heading up and over the bridge to join the Musselburgh/Edinburgh cycle routes must be of concern. Drivers have been seen to race over the bridge to get there "first". Making the road "one way" would in our opinion increase traffic speeds and create more problems for the residents. 4. The noise levels, and probably the pollution levels, in the area have increased as we also have to Portobello Bypass situated immediately to the west of Brunstane Road. 5. The inadequate pedestrian provision in the vicinity of the bridge is dangerous and some action to alleviate the problems should have been undertaken before now. There is an obvious increase in pedestrians using the bridge, some prams and mobility scooters are too wide for the pavement and end up having to share the road space - not a good situation. 6. The overall operation and safety of the four way junction at the south end of Brunstane Road needs to be assessed under a safety audit. With the increased number of vehicles/cycles/etc exiting onto the Milton Road, and the proximity of the bus stop and the main lights controlled junction some 100m away, it is a highly congested area at peak times and there have been a number of accidents. 7. The new flats in Joppa Station Place have increased traffic flow and now there are proposals to build a considerable number of new houses on the south side of Milton Road East which will make the Brunstane Road/Joppa triangle situation worse if mitigating measures are not undertaken at this time. <p>All in all the quality of residential life in the Brunstane Road area has been undermined over recent years. Through traffic is king and locals have had no say in what has happened. The new railway station, the further education college, the extension of the nearby schools and more recreational use of the area have rightly increased the amount of pedestrian and cycle traffic and this should be welcomed and applauded by all.</p>
Support	<p>Based on the above we fully support the Council and the local residents in bringing forward this Traffic Order.</p>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1). Over the years the amount of traffic using this route has increased significantly. 2). There has been a huge increase of very large trucks using this route. 3). The route is very narrow at points and there are numerous times it is barely passable and the cause of numerous accidents. 4. Considerable damage is happening to neighbours cars as a consequence. 5. Many cars have to park up on the footpath and this causes major problems for mothers with prams especially on bin day. 6. Heavy trucks must cause long term damage to the bridge over the main London to Edinburgh rail route. 7. This narrow neighbourhood road was never designed to take such heavy traffic use.
Support	<p>We understand that this is a complex issue as there are few routes linking Milton Road East to Joppa Road. This shortcut has become increasingly difficult and treacherous to use. We think your proposals are the only sensible solution.</p>
	<p>I welcome the proposed changes outlined in the Traffic Order. Since I moved here in 2007 the Bridge on Brunstane road has been closed to traffic twice. On each occasion it substantially improved conditions on Brunstane road and in the more recent closure we saw substantially greater use by residents and visitors cycling or walking to the beach with a substantial reduction of noise, traffic congestions and petrol/diesel fumes, which I believe is in line with Council Policy</p> <p>This is principally a residential road with but it also connects Joppa and East Portobello with Portobello High School so is used by young people to get to and from School.</p> <p>I also have some safety concerns. Since the bridge reopened there has been an increased use of Brunstane Road by vans and trucks. The speed reductions measures are not effective and the speed limit is often not adhered to. The narrowness of the road creates bottlenecks at the junction to Milton Road with traffic often being forced back on to Milton Road. The constant traffic on this very narrow road poses a danger to cyclists who use it to link to Cycle Route 1.</p>
Support	
	<p>I would like to comment on this traffic order. Although I welcome the idea of the area becoming a low traffic neighbourhood - my concern is that the present measures do not go far enough.</p> <p>The blocking of Bruntsane Road at the bridge would work well for me - I enjoyed the lack of traffic to use it as an excellent cycle route from the area to join the Innocent bike path into town or out towards the QMU and beyond when it was closed during the work being carried out on Brighton Place. However the increased traffic, at that time, on Coillesdene Crescent and Gardens was not welcome (and is addressed in this order). I can also recognise the concerns about access for emergency vehicles to the area north of the railway bridge when the block is in place and this does need addressing.</p> <p>The block at the Milton Road East and Coillesdene Crescent junction is a really good idea. This is an awkward junction to use in a car and you are very exposed as a pedestrian crossing the road - so I would welcome this on its own, let alone as part of this order - and in stopping the traffic at this point it significantly enhances a large residential area by reducing the traffic within it.</p> <p>I can see the concern from residents on Milton Drive, Milton Terrace and Eastfield Gardens that they will have increased traffic levels - Eastfield Gardens could well become a "rat run" to avoid the lights at the bottom of Milton Road East. This is where I don't think the order goes far enough. I think further traffic calming measures on Coillesdene Avenue are needed along with a one way system at its east end + on Eastfield Gardens. I'm no expert on this but it should be possible to further deter through traffic to better effect than the present plan allows for.</p> <p>At the same time I do recognise that access to Portobello from town can be awkward especially from the east and the A1 - the turning from the east end of Milton Road East onto Seaview Terrace is often blocked by cars attending the busy garage at the junction and at the west end of Portobello the right turn from Sir Harry Lauder Road isn't great. It would make sense to enhance the vehicular access to Portobello High Street/Joppa Road/Seaview Terrace by looking at the traffic light intervals in the first instance as a further disincentive for drivers to try and use the area affected by this order for through journeys.</p> <p>I look forward to the implementation of an amended order and welcome the council's promotion of quiet neighbourhoods and enhancement of sustainable and active travel - please be even bolder in your plans!</p> <p>>> I've just returned from a cycle trip and, as has happened previously, found the junction at the east/bottom end of Milton Road East anxiety provoking.</p> <p>Going down Milton Road East and heading east is not an issue - if the intention of this traffic order will be to make this junction busier. The problem comes when you're travelling west and turning from Edinburgh Rd/Eastfield onto Milton Road East. From having an excellent wide road with a bike path on Edinburgh Road - the first section uphill on Milton Road East is quite restricted and a few times now I've had cars uncomfortably close when passing me. This won't get any easier as the junction becomes busier - and in connection with my request for you to look at this junction in my previous e-mail this is another aspect that warrants attention.</p> <p>The road surface in the area of the junction is becoming dangerously uneven and potholed for cyclists so it's an excellent opportunity to really look at this junction and how it could be improved because the council does need to do something soon.</p>
Support	<p>Thanks for your further consideration.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>Please find my comments below which outline the many issues that are affecting the accessibility and overall safety of Brunstane Road;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The volume of traffic has vastly increased over the years but the road size and layout has remained which has caused countless traffic jams, constant damage to cars and poor access for people in wheelchairs and the emergency services. The road was built hundreds of years ago and is simply not able to safely accommodate the amount of traffic it now sees each day. •As children living on Brunstane Road, it was a scary place to socialise with friends. Angry drivers breaking speed limits and ignoring road etiquette meant that we were always chaperoned by our parents when visiting friends as the rate of collisions and reckless driving was too much of a concern. About 20 years ago, myself and a group of residents came together and approached our local councillor to air our concerns about the dangers of the road and how it was limiting our independence as children but unfortunately nothing came of this. •There have been hundreds of altercations on the road now which is very unsettling for the residents. Almost every day there are horns beeping, drivers arguing and traffic jams building as people charge up and down the road with no consideration for other drivers or the people living there. This can be frightening and has even resulted in physical fights and foul language exchanges until one driver eventually had to back down under the pressure.
Support	<p>I hope these comments can be considered when reviewing the potential closure of the road.</p>
	<p>I very much support the proposal set out in the Joppa triangle which includes the closure of Brunstane Road at the railway bridge.</p> <p>I have numerous reasons for this. My son, who has additional support needs, cycles to school every morning up Brunstane Road and over Milton Road to join the cycle path. A significant number of vehicles do not obey the 20mph speed limit and nor do they give cyclists the required 2m passing space. The latter because the road isn't wide enough and so rather than wait patiently they force their way past. It would be so much safer if this road was part of the cycle network and even better for it to be linked up with Portobello prom cycle path.</p> <p>The road isn't wide enough for 2 way traffic so it's not uncommon to come across a stand off between drivers. I have personally seen this escalate to bad language and hand gestures. All witnessed by my children, who unfortunately think it's hilarious. It's not, it's really very inappropriate and not something any parent wants their children to see coming from supposed adults.</p> <p>When frustrated drivers come over the bridge it's not uncommon for them to speed up seemingly well beyond the 20mph limit. My children are old enough to be alert to this when crossing the road and getting in/out of the car. There are younger children living on the street and it should be a safe place but is not. Let's not have an accident involving a child, please.</p>
Support	<p>I accept that should these changes be made to the Joppa triangle then I will have a slightly longer journey when I am in the car but this is something I often do anyway to avoid the stand offs.</p>
	<p>I am writing to express my wholehearted support for the proposed trial traffic measures in Joppa/Coillesdene.</p> <p>The council has a policy of returning streets to the community and objectives about encouraging cycling. I am in support of these priorities across the city. The proposed measures are consistent with them.</p> <p>Brunstane Road and the Joppa triangle are residential streets, not main roads. The amount of traffic on Brunstane Road is completely inappropriate, particularly for the narrow southern part of the road, which is effectively single-track.</p> <p>Drivers perceive it as a short cut, but the saving of time will often be slight given the severe congestion on Brunstane Road and the generally free-flowing traffic on the much wider Joppa Road and Milton Road. The impacts to the people who live on Brunstane Road are out of proportion to the time benefits to the drivers.</p> <p>The situation in Brunstane Road affects not just residents but pedestrians and cyclists (I am regularly both of these). In the southern part of the street both are very much second-class citizens, having to squeeze into the little space left by vehicles, moving or parked.</p>
Support	<p>Cities have been designed around cars for decades. I am excited by Edinburgh City Council's efforts to make the city a more human place, and support those efforts absolutely.</p>
	<p>With reference to EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC ORDER 202_ - TRO/21/13</p> <p>I am writing to fully support the introduction of the proposed measures to promote quiet local neighborhoods, encourage sustainable travel (walking and cycling), improve exercise local to home, and to deter motor vehicle through traffic in the Coillesdene and Brunstane Road area.</p> <p>It will improve the quality of life for myself and my family reducing danger, stress, pollution and increasing our general well being.</p> <p>In addition I believe it will improve the quality of life for all residents in the proposed area.</p>
Support	<p>I thank you for this proposal.</p>
	<p>I am writing in support of the Brunstane Road traffic order to close the road. I have lived on Brunstane Road since 2007 and have witnessed a huge increase in cars using our road. I believe the living conditions for residents should outweigh the convenience of those passing through. Our street was built over 100 years ago at a time of horses and carts. Its narrow street, small front garden design and the railway bridge were never designed to accommodate the amount of cars using our road as a short cut in and out of Portobello. The bridge was definitely not built to take the size and weight of heavy goods vehicles that currently use it, including articulated lorries.</p> <p>Brunstane Road sits in the Joppa Triangle and the traffic issues need to be addressed across the triangle. Aside from closing Brunstane Road, the traffic deflection measures are required in the Coillesdennes. Driving around the Joppa triangle could put a mere 2 minutes onto your journey. This imagined time saving using Brunstane Road as a "short cut" is lost when you encounter a vehicle coming the other way in the street or get stuck at the railway bridge or south end at the Milton Road East junction and you have to wait for a friendly motorist to let you out.</p> <p>With nearly 2,000 vehicles a day travelling through a street of just over 100 residents, the air quality from traffic fumes in this residential street needs to be reduced, again in compliance with the Council's stated policy objectives on a clean environment. The Council also has objectives related to encouraging more use of bicycles. During the previous road closure of a year it was noted the increase in cyclists using the street. We as a family stopped driving into Portobello and instead used our bicycles or walked. This street is an important link from Cycle Route 1 to the Promenade and this should be promoted.</p> <p>Road rage is a constant source of alarm to residents and families with young children who should not have to endure the bad language that erupts in the street. At weekends, in particular, or sunny days, we are witness to people outside their cars screaming at one another, as no one can get passed and no one is willing to move their cars. Moreover, those who are against the road closure argue that an accident has never happened on Brunstane Road – with that logic, does that mean that an accident has to happen for the road to close? My own children wouldn't put that argument forward as an acceptable argument to keep the road open!</p> <p>Every week a parked vehicle is struck by passing traffic trying to squeeze through tight spaces and misjudging the space available. This causes much distress to the owners. It also causes the parked cars to encroach on the pavements making it difficult for wheelchair users and pram pushers to use the pavements. Surely this is in conflict with the Council's policy on equal access.</p> <p>There are so many things involving both soft and hard landscaping that can be done in the street to change it from being dominated by traffic to becoming a safe, welcoming community asset and residents can't wait to try out their ideas on how to improve living here. There are other streets in Portobello that are suffering due to the strangle hold of the car. It is hoped that the successful return of Brunstane Road to its community could pave the way for other streets to improve their environment by following a similar course of community led initiative. The Council has a policy of returning streets to the community and this proposal complies with that policy.</p>
Support	<p>For those reasons, I would like to support the closure of Brunstane Road.</p>
	<p>I am writing to support the temporary (to hopefully permanent) closure of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>The road is used as a cut through which often leads to congestion and damage to vehicles as the road is too narrow to sustain the size of modern vehicles that are being driven on it. When the temporary closure happened previously there were a large number of people (my family included) who started using bikes to get into Portobello which we stopped doing when the road reopened as the speed and volume of traffic increased again.</p>
Support	<p>Hopefully the right decision will be made and we can look forward to a cleaner greener environment.</p>

Response	Comments
Support	<p>I am writing in support of the proposed closure of Brunstane Road to vehicle traffic in conjunction with the traffic management proposals in the Collisdene Area.</p> <p>Having lived in Brunstane Road for a number of years I am well aware of the problems associated with the volume and speed of traffic and the bottle neck created by the narrow railway bridge. There are more vans and lorries using the street as a short cut due to sat nav technology.</p> <p>I have concerns for the safety of children living in the street and those who walk or cycle to school. It is very stressful for parents or guardians accompany the children.</p> <p>When Brunstane Road was closed due to the road works at Brighton Place life in Brunstane Road changed dramatically. Neighbours got to know each other better and it was possible to talk in the street without the interruption of traffic noise. Cyclist, especially children could pass safely. The daily school commute was safer and less stressful for children and parents alike. More people were walking. It was good to see disabled people becoming more confident on their mobility scooters without fear of meeting vehicles. They had a clearer route and better visibility to make progress on their journey.</p> <p>With this traffic proposal for Brunstane Road and the Joppa Triangle the whole community in and around Brunstane Road would benefit, making the area safer for active travel and a better healthier place to live.</p>
Support	<p>I have lived at this address which is just south of the bridge for 40 years.</p> <p>I think the proposed closure of Brunstane Road and neighbouring traffic measures is a good course of action and I support it.</p> <p>During the time I've lived here I have noticed that the amount of traffic on Brunstane Road has increased, especially vans and lorries, with an increase in noise, fumes, traffic queues and jams.</p> <p>I have witnessed many traffic incidents at the bridge mainly unreported minor bumps but also potentially more serious accidents and incidents of road rage.</p> <p>I and my neighbours have had their cars damaged by other vehicles that have failed to stop whilst they have been parked outside their house on the narrow road with little room to pass.</p> <p>I have raised two children at this address and traffic speeds and behaviour have definitely impacted on their freedom and my concern.</p> <p>I have noticed the concerns of other parents about the safety of their children from traffic whilst they are escorting them on Brunstane Road either on foot or cycle.</p> <p>During previous closures of Brunstane Road the road obviously had a lot less traffic, less noise and less fumes. Anecdotally friends in Coillesdene said there was more traffic but nothing near the levels and problems we had experienced in Brunstane Road.</p> <p>Interestingly during previous road closures more children appeared walking to school either with minders or without, and the accompanying adults were less stressed as there was less danger from traffic. More bicycles appeared, being cycled by adults and unaccompanied children. People with mobility scooters also started to use the road.</p> <p>During previous road closures residents became more neighbourly being able to meet and talk outside without constant interruptions from traffic, children were able to enjoy more freedom and there was a definite increase in community.</p> <p>The benefits that the Brunstane Road community enjoyed during previous temporary closures would be enjoyed again if the road was closed as part of the proposed ETRO but this time they would be enjoyed by the wider area because of the additional traffic measures proposed for the 'Joppa Triangle'. I am sure that these benefits would be noticed and acknowledged by everyone if the proposed ETRO was approved and the whole 'Joppa Triangle' community would wish that the road closure and other measures become permanent.</p>
Support	<p>We understand, and accept the council's plans to calm traffic in the area. We have concerns, however, about the plan's impact on Seaview Crescent which already sees considerable, and often fast moving, rat-run traffic coming down Milton Drive and Milton Terrace from both Milton Road East and from the Coillesdene area. We note, and appreciate, the plans to create two road narrowings with movement priority signs on Coillesdene Avenue to slow traffic, but are concerned at the lack of similar provision on the parallel Seaview Crescent. Can we request that such traffic-slowing measures are also applied to Seaview Crescent to forestall the likely increase in speeding traffic the plan will in all probability create.</p>
Support	<p>I have lived here for over 35 years and on occasion when Brunstane Road has been temporarily closed, the traffic through our area is horrendous. With all the increased housing in the area and down the coast it is the time now to seriously consider traffic management in the area.</p> <p>Coillesdene Crescent is used as a rat run by inconsiderate drivers who speed and shout abuse at locals. Sat navs direct vans and lorries up and down the street as a shortcut to Portobello and Granton. We have had accidents and traffic jams for the first time in 35 years. It's getting really dangerous. I am in my 70s and have Parkinson's. There are lots of older residents and conversely small children. The speed, noise and air pollution from the traffic is really bad. I live on a corner plot and my garden sits close to the front road. At times I simply can't sit out any more and with my Parkinson's can't really go out and about elsewhere like I used to. This might seem insignificant but my garden is one of my last pleasures in life.</p> <p>I think at this stage you are ready to implement the ETRO proposals which should really help resolve the issue. If you get 6 objections you need to take the proposals back to committee. Please keep it top of the agenda and don't delay. This has been ongoing for ages now (literally years) and it keeps being pushed back while we continue to suffer. And please do not pay heed to the people who object on the grounds they want to use a residential street like a main road to save a few precious minutes. Like everything, they will get used to the changes once they are implemented.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>☑ Primarily to return the residential street I live on (Coillesdene Crescent) into what it was originally planned – a quiet road for the local residents who live here and not meant as a main traffic artery</p> <p>☑ Reduce rat run traffic through Coillesdene Crescent</p> <p>☑ Reduce volume of traffic</p> <p>☑ Reduce traffic noise</p> <p>☑ Reduce air pollution</p> <p>☑ Reduce unsuitable heavy goods vehicles from using residential streets</p> <p>☑ Increase safety for children</p> <p>☑ Increase safety for older residents (including my husband who has mobility issues)</p> <p>☑ Increase safety for cyclists</p> <p>☑ Reduce the speeding traffic (50mph clocked in a 20mph limit)</p> <p>☑ Reduce 'boy racers'</p> <p>☑ Reduce verbal abuse from drivers to local residents</p> <p>☑ Reduce traffic jams at the top of Coillesdene Crescent (the first experienced in the 35 years we have lived here when Brunstane Road was temporarily closed)</p> <p>☑ Reduce damage to parked cars (over £1000 damage to my parked car this year from a hit and run driver who didn't stop / previous crash a couple of years ago wrote my car off completely)</p> <p>☑ Overall, reduce the emotional stress of heavy/speeding traffic going past our front door making life in a quiet residential neighbourhood at times simply unbearable</p> <p>In addition, please note my specific primary reason for supporting the proposals is in anticipation of the increased traffic that will with certainty flow through the Joppa triangle when the New Brunstane development is built - 'if we think it's bad now, just wait til a few extra 1000 households drive through the area'!</p> <p>As a heads up, someone in the planning office who is looking after the New Brunstane development should prepare for serious discussions into why no quantitative analysis was done on the number, speed and likely routes of traffic exiting the New Brunstane development onto Milton Road. I watched the webcast of the meeting online where it was approved and the additional traffic was discussed in a vague way but without quantifying the impact on the Joppa triangle streets specifically. It is inconceivable to expect this traffic to turn right and go towards Musselburgh to get to Portobello/Granton. Likewise it is unlikely it will go all the way up to Brunstane Road. It will undoubtedly travel down Milton Terrace, Coillesdene Crescent and Coillesdene Gardens. This proposal is therefore doing 2 things: resolving the current issues and pre-emptively mitigating against the issues that New Brunstane will bring. Note, a lot of residents aren't visualising what this means and I do strongly believe that a lot of the objectors would feel differently if we were discussing this post the New Brunstane completion.</p> <p>New Brunstane is made up of East and West areas with a proposed road connecting the two. This road is ear marked as allowing buses and cyclists but no cars. In other words the design has built into it the specific avoidance of creating a rat run from Milton Road East to Newcraighall. All we are asking is that you give the Joppa triangle the same courtesy. If my house was built in 2021 and not 1931 we simply wouldn't be having this conversation, since the Joppa triangle would already be a completely no through area for cars.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the local Coillesdene Resident's Association who dislike the Council's proposal and prefer the Mini Holland option will be formally objecting to this ETRO. The chair is a friend and neighbour. However I would like to point out that they do not speak for all their members and likewise not all residents are members – I am a member and I completely disagree with their stance to object. I think it is short sighted. They believe New Brunstane will be “years away” and “we can worry about that later”. They have actively discouraged residents from considering New Brunstane when forming opinions - their questionnaire specifically told people to disregard this consideration. Therefore they are acting on members' views which are not completely informed.</p> <p>I'm not sure I can officially do this but I would like to formally object to the consideration of objections from people who's only rationale for objecting to the proposal is simply based on 'I don't want to take a few extra minutes to drive on the main roads'. If these objections are to be accepted then please ensure that all road closures, one way streets, speed bumps etc. across the whole of Edinburgh are reopened and removed, since that rationale could be used to object to every single traffic management solution ever implemented! :-)</p>
Support	<p>I would like to express my support of the closure of Brunstane Road and traffic control measures in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Having grown up and lived on Brunstane Road for the last 19 years it is clear to me that the increase in our use of motor vehicles and the ever increasing size of these vehicles has left Brunstane Road unfit for purpose and it simply cannot continue to be used as a rat run, causing a continuous stream of accidents and near misses. Not to mention the need for residents cars to be parked in a way that renders footpaths unusable for fear of having their vehicles damaged.</p> <p>I believe the benefits felt from the Brunstane Community when the road was previously closed during the replacement of the sets on Brighton place will be mirrored in this new proposal with areas such as coillesdene benefiting from the much needed traffic management.</p>
Support	<p>I would like to register my support for the traffic calming proposals for closing Brunstane Road and traffic calming in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>If the full closure isn't achievable then making Brunstane Road one way from north to south would be at least an improvement.</p> <p>Currently the volume of traffic is unacceptable causing long delays and dangerous driving and excessive road rage incidents.</p> <p>I live down a lane off the main part of Brunstane Road and on multiple occasions there have been near misses while I have been trying to turn onto Brunstane Road with speeding drivers and large lorries trying to negotiate our road.</p>
Support	<p>Just a quick email to show my full support to the TRO/21/13 Brunstane, Lowering traffic in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>As a resident in the Coillesdene area I am really happy to see this initiative to lower the traffic volume going forward. I think this is a great opportunity to improve pedestrians and cyclist safety in the streets in the area, also promoting active travel and in general improving the quality of life of the residents.</p> <p>I am aware that not everyone is in agreement and some people have reservations but no one was happy when we had a recent increase in traffic volume due to drivers using the residential streets as a rat run when the Brunstane road was closed and the Coillesdenes left opened. The TRO is a great opportunity to test the plan and see how it works. At the end of the testing period we could analyse what has worked what hasn't and what can be improved.</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I have been a resident of Brunstane Road for almost 15 years. In all this time, I have never been more frustrated, upset or afraid as now. The level and nature of traffic that travels up and down Brunstane Road has progressively built over this time to an unsustainable and unsafe point in 2021.</p> <p>I have [young children], who attend Towerbank Primary School. We either walk or cycle to and from school every day. And every day I live in fear that a speeding van, articulated truck or frustrated car driver hits us and kills us. This may sound alarmist but it is a genuine fear. Brunstane Road should be a quiet residential street, where people can feel safe to ride their bikes and cross the street without this constant fear. But it isn't. It is a rat run for all shapes, sizes, and nature of vehicles, all desperate to shave a few seconds off their journey time, without any consideration for the physical limitations of the street or the residents' property or well being. The street is not designed to have this level or nature of traffic travelling through it without any regulation. And it is getting worse.</p> <p>The 20mph speed limit is rarely adhered to, the traffic calming measures and unsuitability for articulated vehicles are consistently ignored, and the increasing volume of traffic and size of vehicle has made damage to resident's vehicles and likelihood of a more serious incident inevitable. The volume and nature of traffic means that confrontation is commonplace between opposing drivers racing to try and get up or down the street before another stream of traffic arrives. Rather than considering the speed limit, they drive as fast as possible to try and 'make it through' before being faced with other drivers blocking their path and intent on not giving an inch.</p> <p>When I have gestured or asked for speeding vehicles to slow down or for me to be allowed to access the drive of my house, I have personally been faced with tirades of foul mouthed abuse and even physical confrontation - sometimes in front of my children. I once had a bunch of flowers ripped from my hand and stamped on and was physically pushed into my front hedge by a driver who skidded to a halt and got out of his vehicle when I gestured to slow down as he was driving at 50mph over speed bumps in a 20mph zone.</p> <p>This activity and these actions are not occasional. They are constant. And they are getting worse as more drivers are sent down Brunstane Road by satnavs. There is rarely a day that passes when there is not a stand off between vehicles meeting each other at the mid-point of the narrower part of Brunstane Road, both sides refusing to move. Or damage to residents' vehicles. Objectors to the proposed closure of Brunstane Road who state that it will be an inconvenience and lose them 2-3 minutes of time are not taking these regular delays into consideration and most certainly do not have to live in the street and be subjected to this constant law breaking and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>A neighbour recently had the bumper ripped from her car by a passing vehicle that did not stop or leave a note. The people who do not live in the street and object to the proposed closure do not have to live with this. We do.</p> <p>When Brunstane Road was temporarily closed during the Brighton Place works, it was like living in a different street. The stress and fear lifted, there was less damage, and more bikes taking advantage of the convenience of the street to travel through from the Innocent pathway. It should be like this always.</p> <p>There will be some inconvenience to having the road closed at the rail bridge. We live 'above' this and will not be able to drive straight down to Portobello. Residents at the bottom will have to take a less direct route to travel south. But this is a very small price to pay vs. the benefits to quality of life that all residents of Brunstane Road will experience.</p>
Support	<p>Please please close Brunstane Road so that objectors can see that their perceived inconvenience will be minimal and so that residents can stop living in fear and reclaim the quality of life we need and deserve.</p>
Support	<p>I am in favour of diverting traffic away from brunstane road/ coillesdenes. However I do think there was a better proposal put forward as the current Order is just moving the traffic further along the streets of coillesdene. What is needed to solve the problem is a no through road from Milton road east down to joppa road/sea view terrace.</p>
Support	<p>As a resident of the street, we witness the negative issues daily and are glad that the council are actively reviewing the situation to find a solution.</p> <p>The main points which support reviewing a change to the existing situation are as follows: Issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antisocial behaviour: Due to the limited width of the road and lack of passing places traffic jams are a constant occurrence. Understandably people become frustrated which leads to antisocial behaviour. This ranges from sounding car horns to face to face confrontations and in extreme cases residents/drivers having to direct traffic. • Pollution (noise/air): Due to the lack of passing places people often speed up through the road in fear of being caught in a "standoff". Due to the gradient, this increased exhaust output as well as engine noise. Unfortunately due to the dense layout of the terraced houses, the fumes and noise are not able to dissipate so their effects are amplified by the road setting. • Pedestrian access: The path over the railway bridge is smaller than what a standard footpath should be which results in people taking to the road instead of waiting, which is clearly unsafe. • Bicycle risk: We have noticed an increase in cycle traffic on the road as people leave the Route 1 network to get to Portobello (as it is the fastest route). During peak road usage times, cyclists can be seen squeezing past oncoming traffic or taking risks instead of waiting for the road to clear. Whilst people should be more patient and wait, the road/congestion conditions cause people to take risks. • Car damage: Due to the tight nature of the road, car scrapes and damage is a weekly occurrence. If the damage was totalled up it would likely be in the many thousands. <p>I appreciate people outwith the area do not want the road closed as it would lead to an increased distance to drive in the car. However, I think there are overarching mitigating circumstances that justify the closure, such as.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety: The road has not yet had a serious accident. If yellow lines were implemented for a passing place, this would increase the speed of traffic, which is against policy and also increase the risk of an accident so I don't believe this is feasible. Similarly the same issues arrive if made one way. • Reduce pollution: The proposed alternative route would likely incur fewer stops and starts and would be better suited to the current and future traffic volume. • Policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The council LDP seeks Edinburgh to be a place where you do not need to own a car to get around. Brunstane Train station is located at the top of Brunstane Road, there is limited parking for cars which means people generally have to walk or cycle there. Brunstane Road is the main access from Portobello so closure would improve the safety of the journey and encourage people to change their mode of transport whether on foot or bike. o The proposed LDP also states "where the streets are for people, not cars, and accessible and pleasant places to safely walk, wheel and cycle around" closure of the road align with this statement. o Place 33 in the LDP is for the Brunstane development. One of the main development principles is "Particular attention should be given to the proposed new junction on Milton Road East, and the management of additional traffic generation onto Milton Road East and Newcraighall Road including associated improvements to pedestrian cycle crossing facilities." At present access through the Collisdeans or Brunstane Road is the fastest route and current issues are only likely to be exacerbated. o Road closures have successfully been undertaken in other areas of the city so why would Brunstane Road not be considered? o The Main Issues Report for City Plan was called Choices for City Plan, it set out the main choices for the new plan, including the Council's preferred options for change and other reasonable alternatives. As discussed one of the main headline choices was "A city where you don't need to own a car to move around" <p>2. Delivering community infrastructure</p>

Response	Comments
Support	<p>I would like to voice my support of this TRO. I personally feel that Brunstane Road, as it stands, poses a danger to both pedestrians and cyclists, as well as being known as a bottleneck for traffic coming in and out of Portobello.</p> <p>As a mother and dog owner, I must walk down Brunstane Road to get into Portobello, access public transport, take my child to nursery and walk my dog. I do not feel safe on this road due to numerous factors:</p> <p>1) there is insufficient space for pedestrians to walk over the bridge as it's limited to pavement space on one side, and the railing means there is no option for more than one person to pass at a time. With a buggy and a dog, I cannot walk on the pavement if anyone else is there, forcing either myself or another pedestrian onto the blind hill which is very dangerous. You cannot see traffic coming up the hill, and once you've committed to walking over the bridge on the road there is no safe place for you to move to if a car comes. Therefore you end up with queuing pedestrians attempting to pass over the bridge. It's not safe, especially for those with young children.</p> <p>2) the road is not fit for the number of vehicles using it. There are daily incidents of road rage due to traffic not being able to flow up and down the south end of Brunstane Road. This means that, by the time traffic reaches the bridge, drivers are frustrated and travelling at a faster rate than they should be - endangering pedestrians and cyclists. Also, the emission you can smell when one of these "stand offs" is taking place can be unbearable.</p> <p>3) although we live on Brunstane road, we have a driveway so are not personally parking on the street. However, when friends and family have visited we've had incidents of their cars being hit by passing traffic much more frequently than you'd expect on a residential street. We've also had many instances of traffic jams and "stand offs" meaning our driveway is completely blocked by queuing traffic making it impossible to exit in an emergency.</p> <p>I appreciate that by closing Brunstane Road, traffic will be pushed along other routes, however those roads are much better equipped to deal with the volumes of traffic than a narrow road like Brunstane is. The journey, from a time perspective, will not actually be any longer once you factor in the amount of time spent queuing on Brunstane road due to incompetent drivers and "stand offs". I myself will have to take a longer route on days where I have to drive my child to nursery, but the inconvenience of that slightly longer route will be worth it to know that I can safely travel by foot or bike any other time I have to make the journey, and will encourage me to walk/cycle more often than drive.</p> <p>I'd like to close my email with an image of an incident that happened today directly outside our home on Brunstane Road. This vehicle was badly damaged by a passing car - no note was left and the owner of this car is now facing the bill alone. On how many other streets do you have to worry on a daily basis that your parked car will be damaged beyond use?</p>
Support	<p>The decision to enact this TRO is hugely important to the residents of Brunstane Road.</p> <p>The only comment I will make in support of the TRO is that if the TRO is supported we plan to stay at our address for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>However if the TRO is not supported it would be our intention to leave this address as traffic congestion and road rage incidents have made living in this street as intolerable.</p> <p>There is ever increasing frustration with the number of large and articulated vehicles which leads to congestion, road rage and delays.</p>
Support	<p>The house I live in on Brunstane Road was built over a hundred years ago, and the street laid considerably earlier, during the era of the horse and cart. It was never designed, with its narrow width and small front gardens with no options for driveways, to accommodate motorised vehicles of the size and frequency experienced now in the 21st Century.</p> <p>In the 30 years I have lived here I have watched this relentless growth of traffic passing through, which has been exacerbated over the past decade with the advent of Sat Nav and increased home delivery services now bringing more and more heavy goods vehicles down our small street as the perceived shortest route between the Promenade, or High Street, and anywhere south of the city.</p> <p>The inevitable congestion and traffic jams bring increased air and noise pollution to our residential street. It also brings road rage between drivers and causes the residents here, including their children, to witness really bad language and behavior by so called adults. Finally the damage to resident's parked cars caused by poor driving skills is running at one vehicle hit every week. No community should have to suffer this abuse for the sake other peoples convenience. A convenience that is actually a fallacy. This is not a sustainable position.</p> <p>I totally support the solution, which is to divert traffic away from the residential streets of Brunstane Road and the Coilesdenes area and cause them to use the major traffic route around the Joppa Triangle. There is no short cut and time saved by driving through the Joppa Triangle if you get caught up in a traffic jam. In addition you can wait a long time to get out of Brunstane Road onto Milton Road East. It would also be much less stressful for those drivers not to enter this residential area and to use the major traffic route around the Joppa Triangle.</p> <p>Our community is well aware that the proposed 18 month closure is an experiment and we are bursting with ideas on how to improve our local environment but that can only happen when the through traffic ends and the car stops being regarded as king.</p>
Support	<p>I am writing to express strong support for the proposals to close Brunstane Road and amend traffic flow through the Joppa Triangle.</p> <p>As a resident of Brunstane Road my quality of life will be greatly enhanced by these changes.</p> <p>It will allow the road to belong to the residents and community again rather than being the narrow conduit for a large volume of traffic including trucks and industrial vehicles. The benefits to the air quality of the street will be significant and it will also allow residents to interact with each other more easily enhancing the pleasure of living here.</p> <p>It will provide a safer environment for cyclists and pedestrians using the street. During the previous closure it was heartening to see increased pedestrian and pedal traffic and the road provides an excellent link from the John Muir Way, cycle route 1, and public transport to the beach. This is a welcome and vibrant addition to the street.</p> <p>There will also be less damage to parked vehicles. Most residents have experienced damage at least once to their vehicles and very often drivers continue on their way without leaving their details. It is expensive and frustrating. Coupled to this is the aggression and abuse between drivers or towards residents when traffic has backed up. Everyone will live more comfortably without that and children will hopefully realise that such aggression does not need to be part of everyday life.</p> <p>It is easy for me to comment on Brunstane Road because I live there but I have no wish to move the traffic to my neighbours in the Coilesdene area so I also support the proposals there. Keeping traffic on the main roads will not add significantly to travel times for drivers and this proposal could provide a model for improvement to traffic flow elsewhere in Portobello.</p>
Support	<p>I don't live on Brunstane Road but the appalling language of drivers every weekend when there are numerous incidents can be heard by my kids in our garden at Brunstane Gardens is dreadful.</p> <p>In addition when I walk up the road with my dogs every day there has been a vehicle damaged by passing cars and the speed and size of vehicles including HGVs using the road is a disgrace.</p> <p>I fully support the closure.</p>
Support	<p>When we moved to our house in 1988 there was no Harry Lauder Road , Fort Kinnaird or all the other houses and flats that have been built since then.</p> <p>Our street was built in 1905 and the road was made for horses and carts and is not suitable for the 2000 vehicles that use it daily.</p> <p>We are in the middle of two roads and a railway which makes the air pollution terrible.</p> <p>Our cars have been damaged as the other people who use our road have to squeeze past, as you can see from the videos that have been sent to you, also the abuse we have to suffer from some motorists is terrible.</p> <p>The closure will be good for cyclists who will be able to feel safe when using the road.</p> <p>We look forward to the day you tell us our road will be closed.</p>
Support	<p>I am emailing in support of the proposed TRO . I have lived in Brunstane Rd for 26 years and brought up my family here , The traffic in the street has grown progressively worse in that time. I have had my car damaged on numerous occasions which is upsetting but it is the abuse from drivers trying to negotiate their way down this street with speed that is now unbearable, intimidating and at times threatening. I have heard many within the larger Portobello community glibly stating that I 'shouldn't have bought a house in this street if I don't like the traffic' . Indeed, I would not buy my house now as the street is an unsafe environment for small children, thankfully my children are now grown. The increase in traffic in the last 26 years is enormous. The road was never designed to accommodate this level of traffic and it is untenable for the residents to be expected to put up and shut up. .</p> <p>I have also heard the opponents of the TRO stating the one way would be 'more convenient' . I am firmly opposed to this as an option as it will simple increase speed with that 'convenience', resulting in even more damage to vehicles and further risk to pedestrians and cyclists .</p> <p>I have also heard my neighbours saying that if the TRO is not granted they will be forced to sell . There is s strong support network within this street despite its difficulties. I know that CEC want this community support to be encouraged so please grant this TRO .</p>

Response	Comments
Support	<p>I support the Brunstane/Coilesdene measures detailed in your papers.</p> <p>As a resident of Brunstane Road for over 20 years, I have seen the traffic gradually increase on our street with the added impact of the arrival of bigger cars, more delivery vans and more cyclists having to share a space not designed for that volume of traffic.</p> <p>I would like for the future, like all residents of Portobello and Joppa, to be able to park our car in our street and find it undamaged the next day and not having to so frequently witness road rage and intimidating behaviour, which I am anxious, one day, will end badly.</p>
Support	<p>Yes, initially some people will miss the shortcut, (which is so rarely one as, most of the time, cars get stuck on the street) but it will give us all a nudge to try an alternative to the car. I have starting walking more and took up cycling when travelling in the local area.</p>
Support	<p>The reasons why I support these proposals are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The circumstances that climate change present to us are not good. One thing I have control over is if I have a car and as I do, how often I drive it. I therefore choose to drive it as little as possible and use my bike more because the amount of traffic in Edinburgh generally is frightening. I am in the process of getting a ULEV green car. I see that people have got into habits of driving their cars too often and for unnecessary short journeys. Brunstane Road is a classic example of the impact of this behaviour. This includes the impact on the air quality in this area. I have read the Edinburgh City Council City Plan Environmental Report 2030 which sets out the methods for a sustainable future. This gives me hope but it takes action, not just words. We have to help people find a better way to travel and make it easier for them to walk or cycle or other wheel. These proposals for a road that clearly demonstrates the problem we are all faced with and could be a catalyst for change in this Portobello and Joppa. Linking Brunstane Road to cycle route 1 is a really positive way Edinburgh City Council can keep moving the sustainable plan forward. • The volume of traffic using Brunstane Road is untenable (nearly 2,000 vehicle's a day) and only closure will change this. There are only about 100 residents on this road. I cannot see any other way. However I fully recognise that this will have an impact on other roads in the area, primarily the Coillesdene's which is why the foresight of including these proposals for the Joppa Triangle is progressive and positive. • Unfortunately residents of the Joppa Triangle are as a result of the volume subject to threats, aggression, fear of violence and numerous, regular damage to vehicles, the vast majority of this is on Brunstane Road. Young children are regularly witnesses to this behaviour. A residents camper van was recently hit and run leaving a bill of several hundreds of pounds of damage to fix plus loss of a planned holiday. All of this has resulted in a number of calls by residents to the police, wasting time, public money and causing stress to residents and other road users. One occasion was when a resident was getting a delivery, this meant the delivery van had to block the road for a total of 8 minutes. A driver of one of the cars that had to wait a few minutes got out of her car and threatened the resident, abusing her verbally resulting in the resident fearing for her safety. There are many other examples but this behaviour just cannot continue so stopping this continuous flow of traffic will remove the problem. The main roads available to drivers will not get blocked in the same way. • People's perceived journey time being reduced by using Brunstane Road is often misled given the above point on volume and blockages. While drivers fight with each other and try to intimidate others to move no one is getting anywhere. Drivers using this road as a cut through to get to Asda or Fort Kinnaird quicker is not a reason to keep things as they are. • Due to the volume of traffic on a road this size other users have less space causing other potential hazards such as wheelchair users, prams, runners, cyclists etc. There simply is not the space available to these road users. • Drivers in a very uncaring way use the Coillesdene's as an alternative cut through causing similar problems. The majority of residents in those streets are older and have become fearful which is unacceptable. • The additional housing being built across the other side of Milton Road will only increase the amount of traffic substantially and these problems will get worse for the whole of the Joppa Triangle. • Positive changes to use could be: cleaner air, greater use of wheels, less car insurance cost increase, community initiatives such as planters, electric car charging points. There is so much we can do. This is the time for real action and could be the councils example of how people's lives in our area could be improved. I support the proposals 100%.
Support	<p>I fully support and welcome the proposals that have been made for the closure of Brunstane Road and the amendments to the Coillesdene's (collectively known as the Joppa Triangle). The reasons why I support these proposals are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The circumstances that climate change present to us are not good. One thing I have control over is if I have a car and as I do, how often I drive it. I therefore choose to drive it as little as possible and use my bike more because the amount of traffic in Edinburgh generally is frightening. I am in the process of getting a ULEV green car. I see that people have got into habits of driving their cars too often and for unnecessary short journeys. Brunstane Road is a classic example of the impact of this behaviour. This includes the impact on the air quality in this area. I have read the Edinburgh City Council City Plan Environmental Report 2030 which sets out the methods for a sustainable future. This gives me hope but it takes action, not just words. We have to help people find a better way to travel and make it easier for them to walk or cycle or other wheel. These proposals for a road that clearly demonstrates the problem we are all faced with and could be a catalyst for change in this Portobello and Joppa. Linking Brunstane Road to cycle route 1 is a really positive way Edinburgh City Council can keep moving the sustainable plan forward. • The volume of traffic using Brunstane Road is untenable (nearly 2,000 vehicle's a day) and only closure will change this. There are only about 100 residents on this road. I cannot see any other way. However I fully recognise that this will have an impact on other roads in the area, primarily the Coillesdene's which is why the foresight of including these proposals for the Joppa Triangle is progressive and positive. • Unfortunately residents of the Joppa Triangle are as a result of the volume subject to threats, aggression, fear of violence and numerous, regular damage to vehicles, the vast majority of this is on Brunstane Road. Young children are regularly witnesses to this behaviour. A residents camper van was recently hit and run leaving a bill of several hundreds of pounds of damage to fix plus loss of a planned holiday. All of this has resulted in a number of calls by residents to the police, wasting time, public money and causing stress to residents and other road users. One occasion was when a resident was getting a delivery, this meant the delivery van had to block the road for a total of 8 minutes. A driver of one of the cars that had to wait a few minutes got out of her car and threatened the resident, abusing her verbally resulting in the resident fearing for her safety. There are many other examples but this behaviour just cannot continue so stopping this continuous flow of traffic will remove the problem. The main roads available to drivers will not get blocked in the same way. • People's perceived journey time being reduced by using Brunstane Road is often misled given the above point on volume and blockages. While drivers fight with each other and try to intimidate others to move no one is getting anywhere. Drivers using this road as a cut through to get to Asda or Fort Kinnaird quicker is not a reason to keep things as they are. • Due to the volume of traffic on a road this size other users have less space causing other potential hazards such as wheelchair users, prams, runners, cyclists etc. There simply is not the space available to these road users. • Drivers in a very uncaring way use the Coillesdene's as an alternative cut through causing similar problems. The majority of residents in those streets are older and have become fearful which is unacceptable. • The additional housing being built across the other side of Milton Road will only increase the amount of traffic substantially and these problems will get worse for the whole of the Joppa Triangle. • Positive changes to use could be: cleaner air, greater use of wheels, less car insurance cost increase, community initiatives such as planters, electric car charging points. There is so much we can do. This is the time for real action and could be the councils example of how people's lives in our area could be improved. I support the proposals 100%.
Support	<p>I am pleased that we are now getting to the stage where we will hopefully see action regarding the unacceptable volume and speed of traffic using the area as a shortcut to and from Portobello!</p> <p>We who live on Brunstane Road are subjected to a daily onslaught of road rage, foul language, damaged to our cars and our property from pollution and vibration from the huge lorries going up and down the street to make deliveries to various supermarkets in the wider area!</p> <p>It's not uncommon to be pinned against or in your car waiting for a gap in order to open the door and get in or to get out!</p> <p>The street was designed over 100 years ago and was built to accommodate horse drawn vehicles and as such is not wide enough to deal with two way traffic and parked cars! As a result of the narrowness we have to park our cars on the pavement to try to avoid them being damaged! This impacts the use of the pavement by pedestrians, wheelchair users and people pushing buggies !</p> <p>Cyclists have a particularly dangerous journey on Brunstane Road where inconsiderate drivers regularly force them off the road in between parked cars due to lack of space on the road and an unwillingness to wait until it's safe for both to pass!</p> <p>We are fully aware that moving the traffic out of Brunstane Road and into the residential streets of the Collisdenes is not the solution!</p> <p>Simply restricting the large volume of commuter and commercial traffic from our streets and onto the main roads which are able to cope with it would immediately improve our quality of live , mental well-being and physical health with the decrease in pollution!</p> <p>I urge the council to press on with this temporary order as surely this is how traffic must be managed in a modern city which appears to be forward looking?!</p>

Response	Comments
	<p>I have lived in this neighbourhood for nearly 30 years and have experienced and witnessed Brunstane Road becoming a dangerous and stressful road to live on. This is due to the large volume of vehicles (approximately 2000 per day) using this arterial route. A previous exercise to appoint speed bumps has had no impact whatsoever on the volume or speed of traffic. This approach has failed.</p> <p>In the 1990's, resident children initiated a survey and gathered responses from residents which they presented to the local Councillor at that time. They highlighted their fear from a child's perspective attempting to cross the road safely or use bicycles, due to the high speed of vehicles. Sadly this was not taken seriously.</p> <p>Two decades later, we now find ourselves living in an increasingly polluted area from traffic fumes which this Victorian road was never built for and it appears to be even more dangerous for everyone now. As the Council advocates the use of bicycles (and this road is cycle route 1) it is encouraging to see people attempting to use it as thus but stressful to witness the difficulties and dangers cyclists encounter when up against careless, impatient and abusive drivers.</p> <p>Hardly a day passes when there isn't 'an incident/incidents' involving motorists challenging each other as to who is in the right/wrong whilst they snake their way up and down Brunstane Road. Listening and watching the exchanges is highly stressful and their language and behaviours wholly inappropriate. As a resident, I have been verbally abused by motorists whilst attempting to placate some situations. This is totally unacceptable and detrimental on the mental health of residents.</p> <p>There is a mound of photographic and video evidence available to the Council demonstrating the frequent damage to resident's vehicles to which the Police have been notified. Trying to avoid damage to our vehicles and allowing access to them results in pavement parking which is obstructive for pedestrians, wheelchair users and buggies.</p> <p>The option/ threat of painting double yellow lines or issuing parking permits is spurious and would only serve to shift the problem elsewhere. We have responsibly and sympathetically liaised with local Coillesdine residents who have their own concerns about 'rat-running' through their streets and as a result, have optioned the "Joppa triangle" which directs traffic on to the main roads built to accommodate such.</p> <p>Closing Brunstane Road at the railway bridge would continue to enable delivery of goods and services but more importantly, the safe access of emergency vehicles. Frighteningly, as it stands at the moment, any emergency could not be attended promptly if the road is in utter chaos which it frequently is.</p>
Support	I urge the traffic committee to address this very long standing issue and proceed with the TRO to close Brunstane Road at the railway bridge for the safety and mental well being of the people who live with it on a daily basis.
Support	I have stayed [on] Brunstane Road Edinburgh for 47 years and the volume of traffic is now enoromus. The road was never meant for very large hgv vehicles that travel up and down the road. At the top end (which my house is) the road appears to narrow and there is not enough room for traffic to pass each other. Then they end up damaging our cars. My car is not 2years old and already been smashed into 4 times. This is not acceceptable !! I very much agree with the road being closed at the railway bridge and hopefully residents can enjoy a very much quieter street.
Support	<p>There are a number of reasons why I consider this to be an extremely important step in making the Joppa Triangle a safer area with traffic levels that are sustainable, manageable and capable of being supported by the road network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The traffic issues need to be addressed across the triangle – the current proposal does this and takes provides a solution not only for Brunstane Road, but the wider Coillesdene area through the proposed traffic deflection measures. •Driving around the Joppa triangle could put a mere 2 minutes onto a journey from the Harry Lauder Road / Milton Road junction to Portobello High Street. The imagined time saving using Brunstane Road as a "short cut" is lost when, as often happens, the traffic becomes grid locked either in Brunstane Road itself or at the Milton Road East junction. •As a result of the traffic congestion, road rage is a constant source of alarm to residents and families with young children. I have witnessed multiple road rage incidents in the street, involving bad language as well as threats of violence and damage to property. Our children should not have to see or hear this. •Brunstane Road was not designed to support the levels of traffic that are now using it (surveys have showed that nearly 2,000 vehicles a day are travelling through a street of just over 100 residents). It is a narrow street and the small front garden design was never designed to accommodate both residents' parking and the volume of traffic passing through as a shortcut to Milton Road / Harry Lauder Road. In particular, I have witnessed an explosion in the number of heavy goods vehicles that are using the road as a rat run. The size and weight of these vehicles is completely inappropriate for the street. •The poor air quality as a result of traffic fumes is unacceptable in a residential area and needs to be improved, in compliance with the Councils stated policy objectives on a clean environment. •Residents' vehicles in Brunstane Road are constantly being struck by passing traffic that, due to speed or congestion, is attempting to squeeze through tight spaces and misjudging the space available. This causes much distress and financial loss to the owners. It also causes the parked cars to encroach on the pavements making it difficult for wheelchair users and pram pushers to use the pavements. •The Council has a policy of returning streets to the community and this proposal complies with that policy. The Council also has objectives related to encouraging more use of bicycles. During the previous road closure of a year it was noted the increase in cyclists using the street. It is also notable that the previous closure of the street (which lasted around a year) did not result in any recorded adverse consequences for residents beyond the Joppa Triangle. •Local people's wellbeing should be given priority over through traffic – the living conditions for residents, particularly in the south end of Brunstane Road, should outweigh the convenience of those passing through. The local residents have many ideas for hard and soft landscaping that would radically change the street from one dominated by through traffic to being a safe, welcoming community asset. The street is an important link from Cycle Route 1 to the Promenade and will be strongly promoted. •I hope that the passing of the order will lead to the successful and permanent return of Brunstane Road to its community and that this could pave the way for other streets in Portobello improving their environment by following a similar course of community led initiative.
Support	<p>Addressee 2:</p> <p>There are a number of reasons why I consider this to be an extremely important step in making the Joppa Triangle a safer area with traffic levels that are sustainable, manageable and capable of being supported by the road network:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The traffic issues need to be addressed across the triangle – the current proposal does this and takes provides a solution not only for Brunstane Road, but the wider Coillesdene area through the proposed traffic deflection measures. •Driving around the Joppa triangle could put a mere 2 minutes onto a journey from the Harry Lauder Road / Milton Road junction to Portobello High Street. The imagined time saving using Brunstane Road as a "short cut" is lost when, as often happens, the traffic becomes grid locked either in Brunstane Road itself or at the Milton Road East junction. •As a result of the traffic congestion, road rage is a constant source of alarm to residents and families with young children. I have witnessed multiple road rage incidents in the street, involving bad language as well as threats of violence and damage to property. Our children should not have to see or hear this. •Brunstane Road was not designed to support the levels of traffic that are now using it (surveys have showed that nearly 2,000 vehicles a day are travelling through a street of just over 100 residents). It is a narrow street and the small front garden design was never designed to accommodate both residents' parking and the volume of traffic passing through as a shortcut to Milton Road / Harry Lauder Road. In particular, I have witnessed an explosion in the number of heavy goods vehicles that are using the road as a rat run. The size and weight of these vehicles is completely inappropriate for the street. •The poor air quality as a result of traffic fumes is unacceptable in a residential area and needs to be improved, in compliance with the Councils stated policy objectives on a clean environment. •Residents' vehicles in Brunstane Road are constantly being struck by passing traffic that, due to speed or congestion, is attempting to squeeze through tight spaces and misjudging the space available. This causes much distress and financial loss to the owners. It also causes the parked cars to encroach on the pavements making it difficult for wheelchair users and pram pushers to use the pavements. •The Council has a policy of returning streets to the community and this proposal complies with that policy. The Council also has objectives related to encouraging more use of bicycles. During the previous road closure of a year it was noted the increase in cyclists using the street. It is also notable that the previous closure of the street (which lasted around a year) did not result in any recorded adverse consequences for residents beyond the Joppa Triangle. •Local people's wellbeing should be given priority over through traffic – the living conditions for residents, particularly in the south end of Brunstane Road, should outweigh the convenience of those passing through. The local residents have many ideas for hard and soft landscaping that would radically change the street from one dominated by through traffic to being a safe, welcoming community asset. The street is an important link from Cycle Route 1 to the Promenade and will be strongly promoted. •I hope that the passing of the order will lead to the successful and permanent return of Brunstane Road to its community and that this could pave the way for other streets in Portobello improving their environment by following a similar course of community led initiative.

Response	Comments
	<p>I would like to inform you of my strong support for this Traffic order.</p> <p>This is a sensible approach to addressing the traffic issues in the Joppa Triangle as a whole, thinking of the entire community, rather than just the street I live on.</p> <p>As a parent of 2 small children, I worry about the health effects of 2,000 vehicles travelling through our street each day. This complies with the council policy of creating a clean environment. My children have also been witness to multiple instances of road rage and erratic high speed driving due to the street being used as a rat-run 'short cut', when it simply is not of an appropriate width to manage the non-resident traffic trying to use it. Furthermore, using Brunstane Road is often no faster than the alternative routes as cars wait for single-vehicle passing. Cars are frequently damaged on the street in hit-and-runs where people misjudge the street size passing other cars. I myself have had to have 2 vehicles repaired for this in the last 2 years. People's wellbeing should be given high priority, and the living conditions of residents should outweigh the convenience of those passing through.</p> <p>The council has a policy of returning streets to the community, and this proposal complies with that policy. There is strong community spirit on our street, and this was especially evident, for example, during the COVID pandemic, where a piper paraded the street during the clap for carers. The street benefitted greatly from the temporary closure during the Brighton Place traffic works, and everyone commented how the quality-of-life was better at that time, due to the calming of the street.</p> <p>Brunstane Road is a key link between Cycle Route 1 to the promenade, and this should be promoted, in alignment with council policy to promote green travel. Closure of Brunstane Road would greatly improve cyclist safety, and I myself have had several near misses on our street due to dangerous overtaking attempts by impatient car drivers, whilst I cycle to my house.</p>
Support	Please let this Traffic order go ahead. Whilst some will object due the 'inconvenience' it will cause, this will soon be forgotten, and it will make a huge difference for the local community.
	<p>I am writing to support this closure, as a resident of Brunstane Road for over 25 years the housing and retail developments that have taken place in the surrounding area have placed the Joppa Triangle in the centre of a challenging situation regarding traffic. Vehicles of all types including heavy good vehicles continually make use of roads to access Portobello and Milton Road when it is clear these roads are not appropriate. In addition, the demographics of the Joppa Triangle are have changed considerably with many families with young children now living in the area. Closing Brunstane road and making access via the Collisdene roads difficult coupled with enforcing access to Portobello to be via Eastfield or Sir Harry Lauder road will benefit the wider area considerably and reduce the numerous small accidents and incidents of road rage considerably.</p>
Support	Finally I would note that with Scotland hosting COP26 this traffic order would assist in reducing congestion in the wider area considerably
	<p>I'm fully supportive of this positive action on Brunstane Road. As a resident on the street for 10 years I have both experienced and witnessed damage to vehicles and abusive drivers as a direct result of increased traffic on the street. Many sections of the street, particularly between the railway bridge and the junction with Milton Road, are not compatible with parked cars and a two way street system. If there are vehicles coming in the opposite direction, often they have no room to pass and it leads to either one of them trying to squeeze past (often damaging vehicles in the process) or a stand-off to the point where one vehicle has to reverse to an area where they can pull in to let the opposing car past. This can lead to huge frustrations for drivers which usually spills over into verbal abuse and, in some instances, physical threatening behaviour. These are not infrequent or isolated incidents, they are daily occurrences and there have been numerous examples cited to the council over the years (and in the recent past as part of this TRO) to back this up. In fact, there has been an increase in damage related incidents to resident's vehicles as more and more vans and lorries are using the street, probably due to the fact their sat nav directs many along the street as the quickest route. In some instances the damage to vehicles has been significant and in many cases it's not reported to the owner as the driver leaves the scene without leaving a note on the affected vehicle.</p> <p>Aside from damage to vehicles, traffic jams and angry motorists there has been an increase in the number of vehicles speeding up and down the road to avoid getting stuck. With many children on the street it's alarming that the 20 mph limit is often broken and it feels like it's just a matter of time before a kid crossing the road is hit. Plus with more of us encouraged to use bikes (especially children to get to school) it is becoming increasingly dangerous to do so. Closing the road to vehicles would be a welcome change to encourage more of us to walk and use our bikes and scooters to get around. My kids would feel a lot safer if this TRO was successful.</p> <p>The closure of the road at the bridge to vehicle access is a welcome step to stem the flow of traffic and stop it becoming a cut through for many motorists. Doing this in conjunction with the other traffic management proposals as part of this TRO shows a real sense of community to try and tackle this problem beyond just Brunstane Road and not just moving a problem to another street in the area.</p>
Support	The traffic issues on the road are obviously very upsetting for many residents as it's a daily grind of manging the increased traffic and the resultant vile behaviour of many frustrated motorists.
	<p>I am writing in support of calming traffic measures planned for Brunstane road. As a resident on this street I witness daily violent arguments and traffic jams, and have had vehicles Subject to damage. With 2 young children I worry constantly about their safety on their street due to people driving down our road at ridiculous (illegal) speeds, with nothing to prevent this except from inevitable traffic blocking, which leads to the aforementioned rows and road rage.</p>
Support	<p>I am very much in favour of the proposal and strongly support the Council taking these steps. My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>The Council has a policy of returning streets to the community and this proposal complies with that policy.</p> <p>Today more than ever we need to recognise that the car is not more important than environment and people's wellbeing - which should be given a greater priority.</p> <p>Brunstane Road was built over 100 years ago at a time of horses and carts. Its narrow street and small front garden design was never designed to accommodate cars, both residents parking and those passing through. It was certainly never intended to take the size and weight of heavy goods vehicles that currently use it.</p> <p>Brunstane Road sits in the Joppa Triangle and the traffic issues need to be addressed across the triangle. Aside from closing Brunstane Road the traffic deflection measures are required in the Collisdenes.</p> <p>Driving around the Joppa triangle could put a mere 2 minutes onto your journey. This imagined time saving using Brunstane Road is lost when you encounter a vehicle coming the other way in the street or get stuck at the south end at the Milton Road East junction and you have to wait for a friendly motorist to let you out.</p> <p>With nearly 2,000 vehicles a day travelling through a street of just over 100 residents the air quality from traffic fumes in this residential street needs to be reduced, again in compliance with the Councils stated policy objectives on a clean environment.</p> <p>The Council also has objectives related to encouraging more use of bicycles. During the previous road closure of a year it was noted the increase in cyclists using the street.</p> <p>This street is an important link from Cycle Route 1 to the Promenade and should be promoted.</p> <p>Road rage is a constant source of alarm to residents and families with young children who should not have to endure the bad language that erupts in the street.</p> <p>Every week a parked vehicle is struck by passing traffic trying to squeeze through tight spaces and misjudging the space available. This causes parked cars to encroach on the pavements making it difficult for wheelchair users and pram pushers to use the pavements. Surely this is in conflict with the Councils policy on equal access.</p> <p>There are so many things involving both soft and hard landscaping that can be done in the street to change it from being dominated by traffic to becoming a safe, welcoming community asset.</p>
Support	There are other streets in Portobello that are suffering due to the strangle hold of the car. It is hoped that the successful return of Brunstane Road to its community could pave the way for other streets to improve their environment by following a similar course.

Response	Comments
Support	<p>Addressee 2:</p> <p>I am very much in favour of the proposal and strongly support the Council taking these steps. My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>The Council has a policy of returning streets to the community and this proposal complies with that policy.</p> <p>Today more than ever we need to recognise that the car is not more important than environment and people's wellbeing - which should be given a greater priority.</p> <p>Brunstane Road was built over 100 years ago at a time of horses and carts. Its narrow street and small front garden design was never designed to accommodate cars, both residents parking and those passing through. It was certainly never intended to take the size and weight of heavy goods vehicles that currently use it.</p> <p>Brunstane Road sits in the Joppa Triangle and the traffic issues need to be addressed across the triangle. Aside from closing Brunstane Road the traffic deflection measures are required in the Colliedennes.</p> <p>Driving around the Joppa triangle could put a mere 2 minutes onto your journey. This imagined time saving using Brunstane Road is lost when you encounter a vehicle coming the other way in the street or get stuck at the south end at the Milton Road East junction and you have to wait for a friendly motorist to let you out.</p> <p>With nearly 2,000 vehicles a day travelling through a street of just over 100 residents the air quality from traffic fumes in this residential street needs to be reduced, again in compliance with the Councils stated policy objectives on a clean environment.</p> <p>The Council also has objectives related to encouraging more use of bicycles. During the previous road closure of a year it was noted the increase in cyclists using the street.</p> <p>This street is an important link from Cycle Route 1 to the Promenade and should be promoted.</p> <p>Road rage is a constant source of alarm to residents and families with young children who should not have to endure the bad language that erupts in the street. This will only get worse and cause a serious incident which we can out seek to avoid now.</p> <p>The current traffic is an almost 24 hour problem, the 24 hour nature of Asda/Asda delivery vans means that the road is used throughout the night. The Post Office use it @ 05.00 to reach the Portobello sorting office. The Councils re development of "new brunstane" for housing will lead to serious gridlock at the top A1/Milton link/Brunstane Road /Brunstane Road (North) junction.</p> <p>Every week a parked vehicle is struck by passing traffic trying to squeeze through tight spaces and misjudging the space available. This causes parked cars to encroach on the pavements making it difficult for wheelchair users and pram pushers to use the pavements. Surely this is in conflict with the Councils policy on equal access.</p> <p>There are so many things involving both soft and hard landscaping that can be done in the street to change it from being dominated by traffic to becoming a safe, welcoming community asset.</p> <p>There are other streets in Portobello that are suffering due to the strangle hold of the car. It is hoped that the successful return of Brunstane Road to its community could pave the way for other streets to improve their environment by following a similar course.</p>
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I am in support of the proposal to close Brunstane Road to through-traffic and to limit the through-traffic within the Joppa area. • I understand that closure of this road to through traffic has been debated for many years. I have only lived here for the past 6 years but even in that time have seen the volume of traffic increase, particularly the number of HGV vehicles. GPS gadgetry has exacerbated this as drivers seek the quickest route to avoid the main roads. This is also causing regular damage to residents' cars. • Emissions from through traffic, especially when the street becomes blocked are a health hazard to residents, pedestrians and cyclists. • Those living on Brunstane Road, a residential road which narrows from Joppa Rd to Milton Rd, deserve a safe and quieter street. The current plan before the council will start to make this possible. If successful it could be a model for the greater Portobello area and, indeed, other Edinburgh suburbs. • The traffic lights and configuration of the junction at the north end of Milton Rd where it meets the A199 may need attention as the turning circle for large HGVs coming from Portobello is extremely tight. The numbers of HGVs may also increase if they are no longer allowed to turn left from Portobello High St onto the Harry Lauder Rd which I believe is under discussion due to recent cyclist fatalities.
Support	<p>I fully agree with the proposal to close Brunstane Road to through-traffic and to limit the through-traffic within Joppa generally.</p> <p>It is long over-due.</p> <p>The problem of congestion, verbal abuse, and vehicular damage has worsened since people stopped reading maps and started to rely on their GPS.</p> <p>Of particular concern is the number of HGVs using Brunstane Road for deliveries to Portobello.</p> <p>Traveling via Joppa Road and Milton Road take 80 seconds longer, and therefore closure of Brunstane Road and other roads within Joppa is not a burden on commuters.</p> <p>You may have to tune the arrangements along Milton Road as I can see "short cuts" that could save some people 15-20 seconds, so they will take them.</p> <p>Closing all of the entrances to Milton Road is a solution similar to that used by many medium/large cities.</p> <p>On the whole I think it is a good start to something progressive.</p>
Support	<p>I wish to add support to the proposed plan to close Brunstane Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since I moved here 35 years ago, an increased number of young families have moved into the street, I fear for the safety of young children. • Traffic is not only overwhelming in number of large vehicles, but traffic travels at high speeds not suitable for a narrow residential street. • With online delivery, there has been a huge increase in the number of vans and lorries, usually parked in the middle of the street while making a delivery - this often causes bad tempers and complete jams both ends of the street. • The plan is not exclusively about closing Brunstane Road as many residents, including myself, are keen that traffic is not displaced to the Colliedenes, as this would be counter productive and unfair to our neighbours in Joppa. • The plan supports the Council's strategy for improving public transport and public health through encouraging exercise, cleaner air and quieter streets and it is obvious that the plan will encourage cycling, as it will complete the link to the track near Asda and Innocent Railway. I often cycle to Haymarket using this route, but the most dangerous part of the whole journey is getting out my house in Brunstane Road. • Residents are heartily fed up of bashed wing mirrors and knocks to cars which are expensive to repair. • Because of the narrowness of the road, cars park on the pavement. On bin days it is impossible for wheelchairs and prams to get by - this is dangerous as people are forced onto the road • It is common sense that since we are in the middle of a climate change emergency, we must change how we move around our environments. Closing Brunstane Road will be an important contributor to a city wide strategy to create a cleaner safer environment for future generations.
Support	<p>I write in support of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood Proposals for the Brunstane area.</p> <p>I live at Brunstane Road, and the current situation is untenable. We continue to experience incidents of road rage outside our house on a regular basis; I've heard female drivers called "f***ing b**ches" on numerous occasions by men angry that they are stuck. My kids are older now so the swearing does not bother me as much as it did when I first reported this to you, but they shouldn't have to experience this angry sexism. I drive, but would happily take the inconvenience of having to go round the long way if it meant an end to constant jams and fighting.</p> <p>The most important reason for closing the road, however, is the shift we all have to make as a society to cutting individual car usage, and embracing active travel and public transport. Anyone who thinks we can prevent catastrophic climate change without this shift is simply not being realistic.* Active travel/public transport needs to become the norm for everyone that can cycle/walk/use the bus; cars should be used only for emergencies, or by people with disabilities. The council needs to facilitate this massive societal shift as best it can.</p> <p>When the bridge was shut previously, cycling and walking became so much more safe and pleasant. I used my bike more often and felt safer doing so. I was happier letting my kids cycle down the road. As Brunstane Road links the bike path and the prom, it would be fantastic to promote it as a safe route to encourage more cyclists and to keep them safe.</p> <p>I would be in support of a camera on the bridge so that emergency vehicles or people in an emergency situation (rushing someone to hospital) could drive over the bridge.</p>

Response	Comments
Support	<p>I am a resident of Brunstane Road of 8 years and I am firmly in support of the TRO for numerous reasons;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My primary concern is of safety. It is typical to observe a driver who has been frustrated by having had to wait for a stream of cars to pass the then accelerate and speed down the remainder of the road in a race to get to the end before another car approaches from the opposite end. With this type of driving it is only a matter of time that someone is hit & injured when attempting to cross the road. With the high number of families with young children living on and walking along the road this is a major worry. • In relation to the above the level of aggression, foul language and impatience exhibited by 'frustrated' drivers is unbearable. I am sure most people would not find it acceptable to bear witness on a daily basis to this behaviour happening right outside their property and in plain sight of theirs and other children. • I am fully supportive of any scheme in and around Edinburgh that promotes the safer use of alternative means of transportation, especially walking & cycling. It seems obvious that linking the Sustrans cycle route 1 from Brunstane Road South through to the Prom would promote greater use of cycling & walking. Presently cyclists are held up just as much as motorist on Brunstane road, negating any advantage that cycling has over a car. When the road was closed for a period of months a while ago the relief and lack of stress was palpable amongst all the residents and non-motorists, pedestrians & cyclists who use the road. • Due to the narrowness of the road and lack of any off-street parking and the dense residential housing (a majority of the properties are terraced) the road is just not suitable as a major artery connecting the A1 through Joppa to Portobello. Milton road with its 4 lanes is obviously the most appropriate route to manage the flow of traffic from the A1. • With further residential development planned or nearing completion in the area then any traffic model would naturally predict a rise in the use of cars and traffic down the well known and used 'rat-runs' such as Brunstane Road. • We have one car for our household and this has been regularly damaged/scraped by other cars when they attempt to either pass side by side or when they leave themselves too little room to manoeuvre out of a small space when letting other cars past. I have only witnessed one driver having ever stopped to ask who owns a car that they've damaged which indicates that the financial burden of repairs to resident's cars damaged by careless drivers is put upon the blameless owner. • I fully support minimising traffic being pushed through to the Collisdenes. This is an issue wider than Brunstane Road and were the closure proved to be a success it could be a model to roll-out in other blighted areas.
Support	<p>I live [on] Brunstane Road. Sometimes I feel like a helpless brick trapped in the chimney of Portobellos car rage. Unbelievable really, for a neighbourhood that purports to value its green credentials.</p> <p>I have been made aware that you are seeking comments in relation to the TRO planned for Brunstane Road & the Joppa Triangle. I am a resident of Brunstane Road of 8 years and I am firmly in support of the TRO for numerous reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My primary concern is of safety. It is typical to observe a driver who has been frustrated by having had to wait for a stream of cars to pass the then accelerate and speed down the remainder of the road in a race to get to the end before another car approaches from the opposite end. With this type of driving it is only a matter of time that someone is hit & injured when attempting to cross the road. With the high number of families with young children living on and walking along the road this is a major worry. • The rage and irresponsible behaviour sometimes extends to cyclists. On a dark November night last year my daughter was about to open the car door to exit. It should have been okay as she was on the footpath side, but... Thankfully I saw a flash of movement in my mirror and stopped her just in time. Had she opened the door, it would have been messy as an angry cyclist, frustrated at what was going on on the road had mounted the pavement AT SPEED to get by! • In relation to the above the level of aggression, foul language and impatience exhibited by 'frustrated' drivers is unbearable. I am sure most people would not find it acceptable to bear witness on a daily basis to this behaviour happening right outside their property and in plain sight and full earshot of their own and other neighbours children. • I am fully supportive of any scheme in and around Edinburgh that promotes the safer use of alternative means of transportation, especially walking & cycling. It seems obvious that linking the Sustrans cycle route 1 from Brunstane Road South through to the Prom would promote greater use of cycling & walking. Presently cyclists are held up just as much as motorist on Brunstane road, negating any advantage that cycling has over a car. When the road was closed for a period of months a while ago the relief and lack of stress was palpable amongst all the residents and non-motorists, pedestrians & cyclists who use the road. • Due to the narrowness of the road and lack of any off-street parking and the dense residential housing (a majority of the properties are terraced) the road is just not suitable as a major artery connecting the A1 through Joppa to Portobello. Milton road with its 4 lanes is obviously the most appropriate route to manage the flow of traffic from the A1. • With further residential development planned or nearing completion in the area then any traffic model would naturally predict a rise in the use of cars and traffic down the well known and used 'rat-runs' such as Brunstane Road. • We have one car for our household and this has been regularly damaged/scraped by other cars when they attempt to either pass side by side or when they leave themselves too little room to manoeuvre out of a small space when letting other cars past. I have only been asked once if I owned the car that had been hit. On that occasion it was my neighbours and they are in the minority of the people living here who have not had to fork out from their own pockets for repairs. It is ugly. • During the height of the pandemic and even still, I, when using the road as a pedestrian, will step out to allow pedestrians coming in the opposite direction pass safely. This is not safe or treated with any respect by those using the road in their armoured vehicles. In fact, I would think in these darker months that it simply cannot be done. • Articulated vehicles rampage...yes, and then sometimes encounter similar sized vehicles with similar attitudes coming in the opposite direction. When eventually one or other decides to back off, the parked cars are in a heightened state of danger and frequently come off the worse, just for being there. • I appreciate that some may view the closure of Brunstane Road as an inconvenience. It will be, for everyone, myself included. But it cannot be left open, on so many grounds. • I fully support minimising traffic being pushed through to the Collisdenes. This is an issue wider than Brunstane Road and were the closure proved to be a success it could be a model to roll-out in other blighted areas.
Support	<p>I wish to support the order for the closure of Brunstane Road at the bridge and to bring in the corresponding road proposals for the "Joppa Triangle".</p> <p>We have lived in the street for 30 years during which the volume of traffic using the street has increased substantially. Virtually no car in the street has escaped damage from drivers trying to squeeze through. There are regular "Mexican stand-offs" when impatient drivers are unwilling to let others through, and frequent use of bad language.</p> <p>When we first moved in, there were a lot of elderly residents with only one or, perhaps, no cars parked on street. The street now has many more families all of whom have cars, so parking on the street means there are few places for cars to pull in.</p> <p>Only last week one resident had half her bumper pulled off by a motorist who chose not to stop or leave any details. That is the sort of thoughtless behaviour residents have to endure.</p> <p>It will be inconvenient for residents to have the road closed but that is preferable to the current, unacceptable situation. I have no doubt there will be opposition to the closure but that will most likely be from people who do not live on the street and do not appreciate what residents have to put up with on an almost daily basis.</p>
Support	<p>When the road was last closed on a temporary basis, whilst Brighton Place was being resurfaced, the quality of life on the street was much improved with both pedestrian and cyclists able to use the street without the risk of injury or harassment from thoughtless motorists.</p>
Support	<p>I am writing in support of traffic calming measures on Brunstane Road. The road is far too narrow for 2 way traffic up the top end (Milton Road end), leading to many road rage incidents, queues & congestion, bumps and damage to residents cars. Vehicles sometimes also go at some speed up the road to try and avoid getting stuck, which is dangerous in a street with many children.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my views</p>
Support	<p>Writing as a resident of Brunstane Road to endorse concern over the volume of traffic on Brunstane Road. It is unsafe, leads to repeated log-jams on the road including numerous loud verbal confrontations and has led to damage of the vehicles parked on the street - we've had four or five bumps and scrapes in the last year or so, and neighbours all have the same. These are almost certainly under-reported as it's generally not worth the insurance hassle. Even if the road were not closed, a particular issue is large vehicles such as goods lorries using the street, which exacerbates many of the above issues.</p>

Response	Comments
Support	<p>I am disappointed and distressed that the residents of Brunstane Road have by Council demand we live in a literal war zone.</p> <p>The road is used as a shortcut, but one wonders how short a cut it is with so much traffic, it regularly becomes jammed at each end. Huge articulated lorries even 12 car transporters are advised by google maps, it will take 1 minute quicker than using Harry Lauder Road.</p> <p>How short a cut is it when we the people must suffer so much, polluting the very air we breathe as the traffic comes to a standstill, but still running their engines. The pavements are so narrow that any social distancing means that someone must step into the road, our children and elderly residents take their life in their hands by just crossing the road. I am sure the noise of revving engines and blowing of horn must rate on a richter scale somewhere.</p> <p>We not only endure fighting in the street, foul language and abuse which is escalating, we have on a daily basis damage to our cars as frustrated drivers held up by the traffic not moving, try squeezing past each other. The perpetrators regularly leave the scene of the accident.</p> <p>I am sure that any person on the committee who lived or had an elderly relative living this way would make it a priority for residents only.</p> <p>This road must have been wonderful when there were horse drawn carriages, but it is not fit for the purpose of modern life.</p>
Support	<p>I am writing in support of the ETRO to close Brunstane Road to through traffic. There are any number of reasons in favour of closure. Among them being:</p> <p>1) the welfare and amenity of residents Traffic counts by residents consistently show upwards of 2,000 vehicles a day run through the street. And yet there are just 100 residents in the whole street. This is a ridiculous state of affairs, given the widely acknowledged damage to health that tailpipe emissions and noxious substance emitted from tyre wear and brake dust does to lungs, particularly those of young children who are right at the level of exhaust pipes.</p> <p>2) the mental and physical health of residents Road rage, anger, foul language and a casual disregard of residents means walking out your front door always comes with a nagging doubt that you'll be cursed at or walk into another face to face yelling match by angry drivers locked in a Mexican stand off by refusing to negotiate their passage down a long, narrow Edwardian street never designed for the motor vehicle. In addition, car owners inevitably check their cars every day for new damage from passing vehicles. Such concern forced car owners to park in the kerb, narrowing the pavement. This situation was acute during lockdown when it was impossible to safely physical distance and walk down the street over the very narrow bridge over the railway.</p> <p>3) delivering CEC's own policies Quite rightly your own policies tackle the above issues by clearly stating that places are for people, not passing drivers. Your policies to improve air quality, reduce emissions and create 20 minute neighbourhoods are spot on and in line with Scottish Government policies. Not putting through the ETRO would be about you abandoning your own, democratically tested and approved policies. If you don't put through the ETRO you abandon us to people who put their perceived convenience ahead of public health and the wellbeing of residents. People living on Brunstane Road cannot continue to be the collateral damage for people driving their cars when they know they risk being stuck in traffic on the street.</p> <p>4) Edinburgh as an active city Brunstane Road is a link from National Cycle Network 1 to Portobello Promenade. During the height of Covid it was used by a very large number of people walking and cycling. Numbers have continued to be high. This is a good thing and to be encouraged. Closing the street to rat run car drivers will lock in this welcomed traffic.</p> <p>5) Edinburgh as a fair city Streets dominated by through driving cars are dominated by drivers and out everyone else at a disadvantage. This is a chance to give space to people. Indeed this ETRO is a model that should be rolled out across similar streets throughout the city.</p>
Support	<p>I am a resident and in the 24 years that I have lived here, I have seen a considerable increase in not only the volume of traffic but the type of vehicles. This road was never designed for the size and weight of the heavy vehicles that use Brunstane Road every day as a short cut. During peak times, the street is a rat run with traffic backed up dangerously on the Milton Road as cars, vans and coaches get stuck when facing oncoming traffic. The resulting road rage from frustrated drivers, who are not willing to take the extra few minutes to drive round the Joppa triangle is so prevalent and aggressive, that I regularly have to take my work calls to a different part of the house and apologise for the expletives coming from the street.</p> <p>I have also been sworn at and threatened when attempting to leave or access my home in my car by other drivers who believe that they have the right of way. This can be frightening and intimidating and having young children or elderly persons in the car is not a deterrent.</p> <p>Commonly, I see vehicles mount the kerb when driving down Brunstane Rd from the Milton Road, when there is a gridlock of cars waiting to turn right. This is extremely dangerous for mothers with prams and also for the local children walking to school.</p> <p>I live at the top of Brunstane Road, where in peak times my family and I are exposed to the car fumes and it has gotten so bad that I cannot open the windows in the front of the house. Surely this is not a good example of the council's policy objectives for a cleaner environment.</p> <p>When the road was closed in the past, it was a joy to see so many families enjoy cycling down Brunstane Road which is a main link from cycle route 1 to the promenade. Currently, the road is too dangerous for families to cycle so they generally cycle on the pavements which means that there is less room for pedestrians and prams. Surely this is not in line with the council's policy to promote more cycling.</p> <p>Finally, the damage to cars in the street is so common that I no longer get scrapes and dents repaired, as there is no point.</p>
Support	<p>The closure of Brunstane Road, would make a positive difference to the quality of life for the residents of Brunstane Road and I believe encourage other streets in the surrounding area to reclaim their streets for the benefit of the whole community.</p>
Support	<p>My partner and I live on Brunstane Gardens with our young family. We use Brunstane Road daily to take our daughter to nursery in Portobello. We would like to cycle/walk up Brunstane road more often, however we feel unsafe doing so during busy times. The pavements are very narrow, with cars often parked on the pavement. When meeting another family on the pavement, we often have to push our buggy onto the road to get around another family/buggy etc. This often feels dangerous as the road is very busy, with heavy goods vehicles using it regularly as their sat nav takes them down the road.</p> <p>Our car has also been damaged whilst parked on Brunstane road (dent on front left wing). It is our view that the road is simply too narrow for two way traffic. There are often traffic jams for 10 minutes or more as cars get stuck half way along the road and can't get back.</p> <p>We would benefit significantly should the road be closed. We would use active travel (walk/scoot/bike) rather than drive, as we would feel much safer.</p> <p>I work at the University of Edinburgh and use the No 1 cycle path 3 days a week. The most dangerous part of my journey, where I often experience hostile or 'close passing' vehicles, is on Brunstane Rd. This has forced me into cycling up the pavement which I know is illegal, but in my opinion a much safer option given the current conditions on the road.</p>
Support	<p>We support measures to reduce traffic and car use in the area and support the traffic calming measures as proposed in the ETRO TRO/21/13- Brunstane Low Traffic Neighbourhood.</p> <p>We would like you to consider further measures to introduce traffic calming in other areas and streets leading to Portobello High Street, including Brighton Place, Southfield Place, and Park Avenue.</p> <p>We believe Brighton Place should be restricted to through traffic, for instance by installing a bus gate, allowing only buses, cyclists and pedestrians. Currently there is too much speeding and dangerous overtaking by drivers on this road, for instance around the traffic island near the bridge. It feels dangerous even walking on the pavement with kids, let alone cycling. The "cycle lane" with flat cobbles is being parked on constantly negating its purpose. This area is also part of a school route from Portobello to Duddingston and St John's primaries, and the High Schools, and we believe safety of children needs to be prioritised. We urge you to take more action against the pervasive 'car is king' mentality that is preventing our streets from being safe for people who use active travel.</p>

Response	Comments
Support	<p>I write in support of the proposals within TRO/21/13 – Brunstane low traffic neighbourhood. Thank you for working on these proposals.</p> <p>I live on Coillesdene Crescent. My household has two adults, two children and pets. We own a car (drive about four or five times a week), walk locally every day, and variously ride bikes from once a week to every day, depending on who. Although I take a broad perspective on mobility and mode choice, I believe the safe operation of any residential street, for all its users, should take priority above the convenience of driving a car along it. Being in a car is the least vulnerable mode of travel, after all.</p> <p>The Coillesdene area suffers from a range of transport and mobility issues, outlined below. These will be exponentially increased by the Brunstane development unless significant changes to traffic movements and hierarchy are made well in advance of new residents moving in.</p> <p>Street design The Coillesdene streets were laid out in the thirties, when fields were developed into housing and there were little constraints on space. It was a time of far fewer vehicles. Street design professionals now would recognise the layout as conducive of vehicle priority and higher speeds, due to wide carriageway, wide-angled corners, low kerbs and long ‘blocks’ creating a desirable rat run for drivers – commercial and private.</p> <p>Vehicle speeds Vehicle speeds on Coillesdene Crescent are an ongoing concern. In April 2019, at a point when speeds were concerning me beyond tolerance, I approached Police Scotland who said they were already aware of the issue. They set up some high-viz / advance warning sign checks to discourage speeding, handing out a couple of tickets, too – hard to imagine a driver not slowing in time for a high viz check. Police Scotland’s resources do not extend to never-ending surveys in a single location, though.</p> <p>Vehicle volumes The volume of vehicles on Coillesdene Crescent is under-recorded. A baseline study was carried out previously over an abnormal holiday week and cannot be considered representative. A further survey is now underway, this won’t be representative either as this time it coincides with the entire closure of Morton Street at Joppa Road, and the simultaneous partial closure of Coillesdene Drive at Joppa Road for fibre optics. It is frustrating that the surveys can’t be timed to fully capture normal (non TTRO) conditions. The recent temporary closure of Brunstane Road under TTRO forced a massive increase in traffic volume into the Coillesdenes. This demonstrated the interdependence between a Brunstane road closure and the safety of streets in the Coillesdenes. Interestingly, the often-observed phenomenon of traffic evaporation did not transpire in that time. It might suggest a majority of drivers using the streets as a rat run are from the wider local area, seeking to avoid the longer Seafront / Milton Road route with a traffic light.</p> <p>The future, and the way forward It is right to trial the changes proposed in the ETRO, and tweak and monitor them in case they bring great benefit to users of the streets. The ETRO changes need to be trialled, learnt from and necessary changes ultimately implemented well before the future impacts of the Brunstane development are felt. The scale of the development with its only vehicle exit / entry onto Milton Road which is adjacent to the cemetery would lead to regular pedestrian / vehicle conflicts in the Coillesdenes, and an increase in vehicle collisions. The forward thinking ETRO approach is consistent with the principles of infrastructure first, when thinking about new developments and the changes to support sustainable movement and mobility.</p> <p>TRO/21/13 as presented fits with the Council’s policies across local planning, transport and mobility, community safety, road safety and sustainability. These policies all have committee approval behind them, which means they are the product of extensive consultation exercises across diverse user groups. Taken together, they clearly set out that the way to establish healthy communities is to provide safe places, provide adequate and safe sustainable options and streets and support safe active travel. TRO/21/13 is also consistent with the principles behind the Scottish Government’s ‘Designing Streets’ publication.</p> <p>Although my car journeys may become less convenient during the trial, I support this trial in the interests of seeing how the streets can be made to operate in a way that is much safer for people of all ages and abilities.</p>
Support	<p>I lived [on] Brunstane Road for 9 years.</p> <p>During our time there the traffic has increased as your traffic surveys will show. The speed of through vehicles travelling south to make up for lost time once over the bridge has created a serious accident risk at the intersection of Brunstane Road with Dalkeith Street and Argyle Crescent.</p> <p>When the road was closed for almost a year when Brighton Place was closed, the traffic chaos that critics feared did not happen. In fact many found the trip round Eastfield much smoother and quicker than previously being jammed in Brunstane Road.</p> <p>Therefore I add my support to the experimental closure of the road on safety grounds.</p>
Withdrawn	<p>I wish to formally object to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Closure would only reroute traffic to the Coillesdene Area where more families have recently moved too because of the low traffic and safe roads. <p>Currently there is an increase in delivery vans and with the learners - the Coillesdene cannot safely handle anymore traffic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. At a time of budget controls I’m sure there’s better areas to appropriate funds than something which isn’t “broke”. 3. Having examined road accident statistics there has been NO accidents since a minor one over 10 years ago in 2009 in the Brunstane North Area. 4. The Statement of reason is not correct - “To encourage sustainable travel”. South Morton Street fulfills this requirement. <p>I hope these points are taken into consideration.</p> <p>Withdrawal: After further investigation I’d like to withdraw my objection.</p> <p>I feel by closing off / reducing the traffic in the Coillesdene Crescent will make our road safer.</p>

Appendix 5: Summary of objections and supporting comments

Objections summary

Traffic behaviour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closing Brunstane Road further directs local traffic down already congested Roads of Brighton Place, Eastfield/Milton Road and Harry Lauder/Portobello High Street. Increased traffic flows, displaced traffic and congestion elsewhere. • A solution must be found that pushes traffic out of residential areas. Diverting traffic away from a road which has been in use as a through route for 100 years into previously quiet streets. Ignoring of speed limits because of inconvenience. • We need more roads open not fewer. • The proposed diversion through Milton Drive will put that traffic on a road which is even narrower than Brunstane Road itself. • The resultant increase in traffic will be even worse when the proposed development of the 1300 houses at Brunstane Farm comes to fruition. • Requires traffic to take a longer journey resulting in higher levels of vehicle emissions. • This proposal will focus more car traffic onto the main highways, and will not re-route cyclists, rather it will intensify the use of shared space. More cars on roads, simply increases the likelihood of incidents. Multiple studies have shown that traffic calming measures increase the instances of erratic and dangerous driving. Cars swerving around obstacles, while speeding up, hitting the brake, speeding up, hitting the break. • Increases the likelihood of East Brighton Crescent/Lee Crescent being used as a rat run. • Restriction of access to the Brunstane allotments and bowling club. • These plans will delay ambulances, cause problems for deliveries and refuse collection, concerns reflected in previous consultations. • It is surely unfair that residents living in Milton Drive, Milton Terrace, Coillesdene Avenue and Eastfield Gardens will have to accept all the cars/lorries flowing through the area, albeit some one-way. • A significant number of learner drivers use the Coillesdene area for three-point turns, emergency stops and practicing parallel parking round stationary vehicles this proposal makes no sense. • There is no need or justification to offset the traffic issues of one street onto others where there is currently no problem. • Should this plan be implemented we'd ask that traffic-calming measures are introduced on Seaview Crescent to try and alleviate increased traffic. • The result will be a greater volume of traffic diverted to Brighton Place. I experience vibrations in my home on Sandford gardens from heavy vehicles on Brighton Place, and the demand for parking space in the area exceeds supply. I believe some traffic vibrations maybe causing structural damage to properties, including fracturing of stonework. • Turns Brunstane Road into a private car park. • The proposed closure creates an unnecessary barrier/division in the local neighbourhood. • Residents in Brighton Place frequently cannot access their driveways because of queued or parked vehicles. This will be exacerbated if Brunstane Road is closed. • Our streets are in bad enough disrepair without extra traffic - Coillesdene Crescent was resurfaced not that long ago and holes are already appearing again • This does not seem to be an appropriate time to perform an experimental traffic study. With traffic and working patterns remaining very different due to the continued impact of covid, I would suggest that any research would be better postponed until public transport goes back to pre pandemic numbers.

Appendix 2

- The poor design of the junction with Milton Road East also contributes to the congestion at the south end, leading to tail-backs and frustration.
- What exactly are the traffic issues on Brunstane Road that have initiated all of this? I have experience mild congestion from time to time, but nothing worse.

Road Safety

- Over the last two years there have been a number of serious accidents at the junction of Coillesdene Drive and Coillesdene Avenue. Vehicles are not stopping at the junction and HGVs are using the route as a short cut. There are a number of young children living on Coillesdene Drive and this proposal puts them at serious risk of injury as this will increase traffic flow, noise, pollution and opportunity for incidents.
- Increased pollution and safety risk to children in Brighton Place which is designated a safe route to school.
- Come winter and bad weather, all of the restricted turns will be treacherous.
- Brunstane Road residents are not so concerned about children's safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway.
- There are not enough existing restrictions in place - speed bumps, signs to control the speed of traffic at 20mph. That speed reduction measures are planned for mid Coillesdene Avenue is an admission that through traffic still using our area will tend to speed to make up for the longer journey time/distance caused by the proposed closure.
- Brunstane Road is on a hill and the last time it was closed there was a serious danger from cyclists zooming down it, often without a thought for pedestrians.
- There is an increase in delivery vans and with the learners - the Coillesdene cannot safely handle anymore traffic.
- Who is going to police this when people inevitably don't adhere to the signs?
- Will traffic calming be introduced on Morton Street to slow vehicles? The fact there are plans for Coillesdene Avenue seems an admission that the council expect this route to become a rat run.
- Build up of waiting traffic on the surrounding roads – one with a High School and access to Brunstane Primary School.
- The inevitable impact resulting from the decision to ban HGVs turning left from Portobello High Street onto Sir Harry Lauder Road is that more HGVs will use the Brighton Place/Southfield Place/Duddingston Park route to access Milton Road. This will be in addition to the extra traffic displaced from Brunstane Road. This will make Brighton Place and Southfield Place a less safe environment for school children, cyclists and pedestrians.
- There appears to be no evidence of there being any current road safety/accident issue and accordingly the proposed scheme can deliver no benefits in that direction.
- The traffic movements (<20mph!) only become busier at the two peak times in the day. The rest of the time I've observed over recent months is the road is relatively quiet!
- Having walked on that road on a weekly basis, it is clear that the residents of Brunstane Road are not that concerned about childrens safety and the passage of wheelchairs and pushchairs, as on both sides of the road, residents are parking their cars on the footway. This has made it extremely difficult for me to walk on the pavement with a buggy and my 3 month old.
- Traffic Calming Measures should be extended down the length of Coillesdene Avenue to the East, to prevent creating a new rat run/cut through slow traffic.
- There would be a very significant increase in the volume of traffic using Milton Drive (as the only exit from the Coillesdene area for anyone travelling North). The exit from Milton Drive to Milton Road East is particularly difficult, with a large hedge, meaning cars often edge out into the path of the buses using the bus stop immediately beyond. This will cause a number of accidents.
- The junction at Eastfield is unsuitable for the traffic from Portobello turning right on Milton Road due to parked cars and also doesn't take into account the proposals for cycle lanes at this junction too.

Appendix 2

- Eastfield junction will experience more accidents as a result of the restrictions. And more idling at lights/junctions and only benefit the residents of these streets.
- Something needs to be done about the speed of 40 miles an hour and parking near junctions on Milton Road East. There is no need for such a residential road to be 40 and the blind spots created by parking (currently within legal distances) on the road make it a potentially lethal combination for those turning onto Milton Road East heading east or west.
- Consideration should be given to the safety of pedestrians crossing Seaview Terrace. Any changes at Brunstane Road will increase the volume of traffic along this road, as seen when Brighton Place/Brunstane Road was closed previously.
- The council should be prioritising the limited funding elsewhere, no safety issues on Brunstane Road

Active travel

- Displaced traffic reduces safety for active travel users elsewhere in the Coillesdene area
- South Morton Street, which lies immediately to the east of Brunstane Road encourages sustainable travel.
- Not everyone has the ability to use active travel, mobility impaired users will use lengthy detours adding to pollution
- There are multiple off road paths and options that can better and safer channel cyclists in, around and through the Joppa/Portobello area.
- Cyclists do not contribute to road tax, that cars and motorised vehicles do as part of the cost to the upkeep of the roads we all access. Nor are cyclists critical to the wider community access where the demographics are of an aging population where mobility scooter and vehicular access is far more vital.
- This order will do nothing to further the council objectives which were quoted on the ETRO such as cycling, walking etc.
- Does this suggest that the residents of Brunstane Road are allowed to have their very many motor vehicles parked outside their own houses, but that everyone else is to walk or cycle around?

Options assessment

- Consider other options e.g. placing double yellow lines down one side.
- The most realistic solution would be to make Brunstane Road a one way street be closed (north or southbound options were specified).
- Makes more sense to close the road at Milton Road due to the congestion at the main junction there.
- There needs to be some joined up thinking about the proposals for CPZ in Portobello, the plans to extending cycle ways from Portobello to Musselburgh, and the traffic flow in general along with this project.
- Making certain streets one way Marlborough St and Regent St, perhaps would be considered.
- I have been surprised that the council has not taken the opportunity to implement a proper LTN given that a residents association poll favoured this.
- Deciding to close a road during a pandemic when a lot of residents are still working from home is not giving a realistic picture of pending traffic issues.
- Perhaps if there had not been a delay to implementing the law to ban pavement parking there would be no need for any of these measures as there would only be space for limited parking on the road
- The main problem in Brunstane Road is caused by residents parking on both sides of the street and on the pavements. This is a matter that should be addressed rather than closing the street to enable residents to park their cars! Perhaps everyone who lives in a narrow street will apply for similar measures if this precedent is set? A more logical solution would be to limit the parking or to make the street one way rather than creating a private car park.

Appendix 2

- Imperative to implement a "Mini-Holland" type ETRO now rather than wait to confirm the obvious weaknesses of the presently proposed ETRO
- The council are actually encouraging these residents to own cars as they will have their very own parking place, of course the council could use this as an opportunity to install parking for permit holders only and at least get some money as we are constantly hearing about how little budget is available to them!!
- Turning Brunstane Road into a cul-de-sac may suit the residents of that particular street, however if implemented, this proposal would be to the detriment of the residents living in the streets which form the Coillesdene triangle, which is currently a quiet, safe area that does not require traffic restrictions or calming measures.
- The council has not included evidence here from previous surveys to demonstrate widespread support (or lack thereof?).
- Why close a road (i.e. Brunstane Road) that doesn't have bus routes? Surely it is prudent and wise to have two north/south routes into and out of Portobello.
- Traffic lights or widening the road should be explored before closure, which is the simplest and the most damaging solution.
- It is suggested that the 'triangle' from Brunstane Road to Eastfield becomes a 'resident only' access
- A number plate recognition system (NPR) is installed at all entry and exit points to fine those who transit through the area within a certain time window, with an exception available to residents.
- The only way to solve the problem is to prevent traffic altogether from accessing a through route, however devious, in the whole of the Joppa triangle. One possibility is to prevent access to or from the triangle on to the Milton Road. This would force traffic all through to go along the major roads.
- Closure should be the very last resort. If the council is serious about experimenting, why is it that they are not experimenting with some of these alternative less draconian suggestions?
- It's just the same issue in other streets in Portobello where the council intends to implement a CPZ which will remove parking spaces down one side of the street.
- The provision of traffic calming measures within the Coillesdenes are not proportionate to the objectives sought by the TRO and are grossly over engineered solution to a non-existing nor forthcoming problem.

Consultation

- Previous consultations showed 80% opposition from residents in the Coillesdene area. What level of opposition is required before councillors pay attention, 100%?
- By pressing ahead with this closure, the council will lose even more credibility in the eyes of the wider community, as it sets a precedent whereby, anyone who does not want traffic passing their door can merely demand that the road.
- The vice convenor of the council's transportation committee resides on the side street just to the north of the bridge and as such, I, like many, consider that this is a blatant conflict of interest and abuse of public office.
- Temporary barriers for months will give the area a tacky and tawdry appearance looking closed.
- The sixty thousand pound cost for an eighteen-month trial closure is a waste of our money and a blatant continuation of a council that does not listen to its residents.
- If this plan goes ahead and fails, I will seek fundraising within our community for a legal review of how transport plans are adopted in the wake of a resounding local community rejection of your plan.
- Impacts the house price profile across the area, some increased and some reduced.
- Brunstane Road residents bought their houses knowing that the road was busy.
- The proposal is a result of lobbying by a small group of residents campaigning to close their own road to benefit themselves.

Appendix 2

- We feel that the views given by the local and wider community in previous consultations have been disregarded, and that there should be an independent audit of this proposal.
- The traffic situation on Brunstane Road is not unique. There are many other streets within and outwith the area that are narrower, with vehicles parked on both sides, and you don't hear of residents wanting to have their area closed off. Closing Brunstane Road will set a precedent as anyone who doesn't want traffic using their road can ask for the road to be closed.
- The Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) (Scotland) Regulations 2012 has not been applied equally to all residents living in the Brunstane Road postcode & Joppa Triangle postcode area.

Supporting Comments

Traffic behaviour

- Drivers perceive it as a short cut, but the saving of time will often be slight given the severe congestion on Brunstane Road and the generally free-flowing traffic on the much wider Joppa Road and Milton Road. The impacts to the people who live on Brunstane Road are out of proportion to the time benefits to the drivers.
- Our car has also been damaged whilst parked on Brunstane road (dent on front left wing). It is our view that the road is simply too narrow for two way traffic. There are often traffic jams for 10 minutes or more as cars get stuck half way along the road and can't get back.
- The narrow street was built at a time when horses and carts were the mode of transport. It was not designed to accommodate resident parking along with the passage of cars or the width or weight of heavy goods vehicles that we see regularly see travelling down the street.
- Sat Nav and increased home delivery services now bring more and more heavy goods vehicles down Brunstane Road as the perceived shortest route between the Promenade, or High Street, and anywhere south of the city.
- Frighteningly, as it stands at the moment, any emergency could not be attended promptly if the road is in utter chaos which it frequently is.
- Reduces unsuitable heavy goods vehicles from using residential streets
- Reduces rat run traffic through Coillesdene Crescent
- Reduces volume of traffic
- The primary reason for supporting the proposal is in anticipation of the increased traffic that will with certainty flow through the Joppa triangle when the New Brunstane development is built - 'if we think it's bad now, just wait till a few extra 1000 households drive through the area'!
- The street is not designed to have this level or nature of traffic travelling through it without any regulation.
- The main routes are better suited and provide more reliable journey times.
- The safe operation of any residential street, for all its users, should take priority above the convenience of driving a car along it.
- It fits with the Council's policies across local planning, transport and mobility, community safety, road safety and sustainability. These policies all have committee approval behind them, which means they are the product of extensive consultation exercises across diverse user groups.

Quality of Life

- It will improve the quality of life for myself and my family reducing danger, stress, pollution and increasing our general well being.
- The appalling language of drivers every weekend when there are numerous incidents can be heard by my kids in our garden is dreadful.
- Reduces traffic noise
- Reduces air pollution
- Hardly a day passes when there isn't 'an incident/incidents' involving motorists challenging each other as to who is in the right/wrong whilst they snake their way up and down Brunstane Road. Listening and watching the exchanges is highly stressful and their language and behaviours

Appendix 2

wholly inappropriate. As a resident, I have been verbally abused by motorists whilst attempting to placate some situations. This is totally unacceptable and detrimental on the mental health of residents.

- During previous road closures more children appeared walking to school either with minders or without, and the accompanying adults were less stressed as there was less danger from traffic. More bicycles appeared, being cycled by adults and unaccompanied children. People with mobility scooters also started to use the road.

Road Safety

- There has been a recent pattern of rat running cars and vans mounting and driving down the pavement at some speed. It has gone from being a nuisance to a danger.
- I use the No 1 cycle path 3 days a week. The most dangerous part of my journey, where I often experience hostile or 'close passing' vehicles, is on Brunstane Rd. This has forced me into cycling up the pavement which I know is illegal, but in my opinion a much safer option given the current conditions on the road.
- The 20mph speed limit is rarely adhered to, the traffic calming measures and unsuitability for articulated vehicles are consistently ignored, and the increasing volume of traffic and size of vehicle has made damage to resident's vehicles and likelihood of a more serious incident inevitable.
- Increases safety for children and for older residents.
- Increases safety for cyclists.
- The pavements are very narrow, with cars often parked on the pavement. When meeting another family on the pavement, we often have to push our buggy onto the road to get around another family/buggy etc. This often feels dangerous as the road is very busy, with heavy goods vehicles using it regularly as their sat nav takes them down the road.
- A previous exercise to appoint speed bumps has had no impact whatsoever on the volume or speed of traffic.


Active Travel

- During the more recent closure we saw substantially greater use by residents and visitors cycling or walking to the beach with a substantial reduction of noise, traffic congestions and petrol/diesel fumes, which I believe is in line with Council Policy
- We would benefit significantly should the road be closed. We would use active travel (walk/scoot/bike) rather than drive, as we would feel much safer.
- There is insufficient space for pedestrians to walk over the bridge as it's limited to pavement space on one side, and the railing means there is no option for more than one person to pass at a time.

Appendix 2



Client: City Of Edinburgh Council
Project: 4057-SCO Coilliesdene, Edinburgh
Site: 02 - Brunstane Road
Start Date: Saturday 9 October 2021
Speed Limit: 20
Lat/Long: [55.94688, -3.10201](#)





Direction	7-Day Average Speed	7-Day 85th %ile Speed
Northbound	16.7	19.4
Southbound	16.9	20.0
Combined	16.8	19.7




mph mph

On a 7-day average		
10.5%	0.7%	0.0%
14.9%	2.1%	0.0%
12.6%	1.4%	0.0%

of vehicles are travelling over posted speed limit (PSL) of vehicles are traveling 10% +2 over PSL (24mph) of vehicles are 15mph over PSL (35mph)



Direction	Weekday Average Total Traffic	7-Day Average Traffic	Weekly Traffic Total
Northbound	1186	1162	8137
Southbound	1057	1045	7314
Combined	2243	2207	15451



Incidents/Observations
 Data loss occurred during the survey period. See "Data Summary" file for further details.


Data annotated with '*' denotes when a given time period has been affected by data loss. For a full breakdown of data loss please refer to Data Summary.

Tracsis will retain all personal data relating to this project, including all video images, for a period of 3 months after receipt of this report and all other data files for one year. If you would like a copy of the personal data or wish for us to retain for a longer period, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Appendix 2





Client: City Of Edinburgh Council
 Project: 4057-SCO Coilliesdene, Edinburgh
 Site: 01 - Southfield Place
 Start Date: Saturday 9 October 2021
 Speed Limit: 20
 Lat/Long: 55.9498, -3.11926




Direction	7-Day Average Speed	7-Day 85th %ile Speed
Northbound	19.8	24.2
Southbound	18.4	23.0
Combined	19.1	23.7



On a 7-day average		
49.7%	15.9%	0.2%
35.4%	10.8%	0.2%
43.2%	13.6%	0.2%
of vehicles are travelling over posted speed limit (PSL)	of vehicles are travelling 10% +2 over PSL (24mph)	of vehicles are 15mph over PSL (35mph)



Direction	Weekday Average Total Traffic	7-Day Average Traffic	Weekly Traffic Total
Northbound	2676	2540	17783
Southbound	2221	2148	15033
Combined	4897	4688	32816



Incidents/Observations
 No incidents or observations during the survey period


Data annotated with '*' denotes when a given time period has been affected by data loss. For a full breakdown of data loss please refer to Data Summary.

Tracsis will retain all personal data relating to this project, including all video images, for a period of 3 months after receipt of this report and all other data files for one year. If you would like a copy of the personal data or wish for us to retain for a longer period, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Appendix 2





Client: City Of Edinburgh Council
Project: 4057-SCO Coillesdene, Edinburgh
Site: 03 - Coillesdene Crescent
Start Date: Saturday 9 October 2021
Speed Limit: 20
Lat/Long: [55.94605, -3.09351](#)




Direction	7-Day Average Speed	7-Day 85th %ile Speed
Eastbound	19.3	23.2
Westbound	20.8	25.3
Combined	20.0	24.4



On a 7-day average		
44.6%	10.3%	0.1%
61.0%	24.6%	0.1%
52.8%	17.5%	0.1%
of vehicles are travelling over posted speed limit (PSL)	of vehicles are traveling 10% +2 over PSL (24mph)	of vehicles are 15mph over PSL (35mph)



Direction	Weekday Average Total Traffic	7-Day Average Traffic	Weekly Traffic Total
Eastbound	442	427	2990
Westbound	445	430	3007
Combined	887	857	5997



Incidents/Observations
 No incidents or observations during the survey period


Data annotated with '**' denotes when a given time period has been affected by data loss. For a full breakdown of data loss please refer to Data Summary.

Tracsis will retain all personal data relating to this project, including all video images, for a period of 3 months after receipt of this report and all other data files for one year. If you would like a copy of the personal data or wish for us to retain for a longer period, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Appendix 2





Client: City Of Edinburgh Council
 Project: 4057-SCO Coillesdene, Edinburgh
 Site: 04 - Coillesdene Gardens
 Start Date: Saturday 9 October 2021
 Speed Limit: 20
 Lat/Long: [55.94596, -3.0923](#)




Direction	7-Day Average Speed	7-Day 85th %ile Speed
Northbound	19.2	24.6
Southbound	20.3	25.6
Combined	19.7	25.1



On a 7-day average		
45.2%	18.4%	0.1%
54.8%	24.6%	0.3%
49.5%	21.1%	0.2%
of vehicles are travelling over posted speed limit (PSL)	of vehicles are traveling 10% +2 over PSL (24mph)	of vehicles are 15mph over PSL (35mph)



Direction	Weekday Average Total Traffic	7-Day Average Traffic	Weekly Traffic Total
Northbound	205	193	1354
Southbound	162	153	1074
Combined	367	347	2428




Incidents/Observations
 No incidents or observations during the survey period

Data annotated with '*' denotes when a given time period has been affected by data loss. For a full breakdown of data loss please refer to Data Summary.

Tracsis will retain all personal data relating to this project, including all video images, for a period of 3 months after receipt of this report and all other data files for one year. If you would like a copy of the personal data or wish for us to retain for a longer period, please do not hesitate to contact us.





Client: City Of Edinburgh Council
 Project: 4057-SCO Coilliesdene, Edinburgh
 Site: 06 - Milton Drive
 Start Date: Saturday 9 October 2021
 Speed Limit: 20
 Lat/Long: 55.94605, -3.09084




Direction	7-Day Average Speed	7-Day 85th %ile Speed
Northbound	18.6	23.0
Southbound	18.5	22.6
Combined	18.5	22.8



On a 7-day average		
39.6%	9.1%	0.0%
36.5%	8.1%	0.0%
37.8%	8.5%	0.0%
of vehicles are travelling over posted speed limit (PSL)	of vehicles are traveling 10% +2 over PSL (24mph)	of vehicles are 15mph over PSL (35mph)



Direction	Weekday Average Total Traffic	7-Day Average Traffic	Weekly Traffic Total
Northbound	169	163	1140
Southbound	234	227	1588
Combined	403	390	2728



Incidents/Observations
 No incidents or observations during the survey period

Data annotated with '*' denotes when a given time period has been affected by data loss. For a full breakdown of data loss please refer to Data Summary.


Tracsis will retain all personal data relating to this project, including all video images, for a period of 3 months after receipt of this report and all other data files for one year. If you would like a copy of the personal data or wish for us to retain for a longer period, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Appendix 2



Client:
Project:
Site:
Start Date:
Speed Limit:
Lat/Long:

City Of Edinburgh Council
Coilسدene, Edinburgh (Sept 21)
5 - Coilسدene Avenue
Tuesday 19 October 2021
20
[55.94/1, -3.091/2](#)





Direction	7-Day Average Speed	7-Day 85th %ile Speed
Eastbound	20.1	25.5
Westbound	18.4	23.8
Combined	19.3	24.8




mph mph

On a 7-day average		
52.9%	23.1%	0.2%
37.8%	13.9%	0.2%
45.8%	18.8%	0.2%
of vehicles are travelling over posted speed limit (PSL)	of vehicles are traveling 10% +2 over PSL (24mph)	of vehicles are 15mph over PSL (35mph)



Direction	Weekday Average Total Traffic	7-Day Average Traffic	Weekly Traffic Total
Eastbound	218	203	1418
Westbound	198	178	1245
Combined	416	380	2663



Incidents/Observations
No incidents or observations during the survey period