

**CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL**  
**TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**Item No 3**

**16 November 2023**

**DEPUTATION REQUESTS**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Deputation</b>
<b>3.1 In relation to item 6.1 – Business Bulletin Appendix 1</b>	Car Free Holyrood (written submission)
<b>3.2 In relation to item 6.1 – Business Bulletin Trams to Newhaven</b>	Community Councils Together on Trams (verbal submission)
<b>3.3 In relation to item 7.1 – Response to Edinburgh Tram Inquiry</b>	Community Councils Together on Trams (verbal submission)
<b>3.4 In relation to item 7.2 – Travelling Safely Schemes</b>	The Whitehouse Loan Group (verbal and written submission)
<b>3.5 In relation to item 7.2 – Travelling Safely Schemes</b>	Spokes (written submission)
<b>3.6 In relation to item 7.3 – Public Toilets</b>	West End Community Council (verbal submission)
<b>3.7 In relation to item 8.3 – Communal Bin Review Update</b>	The Learmonth Terrace Garden Association (verbal submission and written submission)
<b>3.8 In relation to item 8.3 – Communal Bin Review Update</b>	The New Town and Broughton Community Council (verbal submission and written submission)
<b>3.9 In relation to item 8.3 – Communal Bin Review Update</b>	West End Community Council (verbal submission)
<b>3.10 In relation to item 8.4 – Cleansing Performance Update</b>	Unite Union (verbal submission)

**CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL**  
**TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**Item No 3**

**16 November 2023**

**DEPUTATION REQUESTS**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Deputation</b>
<b>3.11 In relation to item 8.5 – Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions</b>	Edinburgh Living Street Group (verbal and written submission)
<b>3.12 In relation to item 8.5 – Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions</b>	Sight Scotland and Sight Scotland Veterans (written submission)
<b>3.13 In relation to item 8.5 – Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions</b>	Spokes (written submission)
<b>3.14 In relation to item 8.6 – Supported Bus Services</b>	Balerno Community Council (written submission)
<b>3.15 In relation to item 8.6 – Supported Bus Services</b>	Craigleith / Blackhall Community Council (verbal and written submission)
<b>3.16 In relation to item 8.6 – Supported Bus Services</b>	Ratho and District Community Council and Ratho Bus Working Group (written submission)
<b>3.17 In relation to item 9.1 – Motion by Councillor Davidson – Corstorphine Connections</b>	Accessible Corstorphine for Everyone (verbal and written submission)
<b>3.18 In relation to item 9.1 – Motion by Councillor Davidson – Corstorphine Connections</b>	Corstorphine Primary Parent Council (written submission)
<b>3.19 In relation to item 9.1 – Motion by Councillor Davidson – Corstorphine Connections</b>	Low Traffic Corstorphine (verbal and written submission)

**CITY OF EDINBURGH COUNCIL**  
**TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE**

**Item No 3**

**16 November 2023**

**DEPUTATION REQUESTS**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Deputation</b>
<b>3.20 In relation to item 9.2 – Motion by Councillor Heap – Westfield Street Parking</b>	Westfield Street Residents (verbal and written submission)

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

## **Car Free Holyrood**

### **Written Deputation**

**Transport and Environment Committee 16 November 2023**

#### **Item 6.1 Business Bulletin, Appendix 1 Draft consultation response to Historic Environment Scotland's Outline Strategic Plan for Holyrood Park**

Car Free Holyrood is a group of local residents campaigning for a safer, greener Holyrood Park. Our campaign is calling for the end of motorised through-traffic on the private park road network. We have written extensively on our website about the benefits of closing the park roads to motorised through-traffic for safety, how such an approach supports local and national transport and environmental goals, and the opportunities to increase accessibility in a car free park where the most accessible, paved space is opened up for use by an inclusive access hub.

In regard to the draft consultation response to Historic Environment Scotland's (HES) Outline Strategic Plan for Holyrood Park, we are pleased to see the Council 'welcome the vision that across the Park by 2034: *"vehicular traffic will largely cease, and active travel will become the primary mode of transport [...]; reflecting wider societal trends away from a car dominated urban environment"*, putting people first. Reducing or removing intrusive through vehicular traffic from the Park are routes to reducing impacts identified (vulnerable user safety, severance, air/noise pollution etc.) and are supported by the Council.'

After reviewing Appendix 1, and recognising that this consultation response is still in draft, we would like to raise the following points:

**2.12:** The draft discusses "strategic routes within and around the city centre, including those within the park". We strongly disagree that the park roads should ever be treated by the council as a strategic route for motor vehicles (we previously submitted a deputation as such – see [8 Dec 2022, Item 7.1 Circulation Plan Delivering the City Mobility Plan](#)); this is a historic site, SSSI, and one of the city's amazing greenspaces. The Council's understanding of the park roads as a strategic route has frankly led us to the current inequitable and deteriorating status quo in the park.

**2.14:** In the context of a climate emergency, the use of the word 'incremental' to describe implementation is very concerning and should be removed ["should consider incremental implementation and testing of options evaluated"].

**2.14:** We also caution that longer implementation through a testing and learning approach will mean longer disruption for all users, particularly those walking, wheeling and cycling in the park but also drivers who already are subject to an arbitrary and constantly shifting schedule of closures. Also the testing and learning would only serve the Council in its own mitigation of temporary traffic displacement, it does not benefit HES or contribute to its new vision for Holyrood Park.

**2.14:** We advocate for removal of the following: "This would enable potential unintended consequences (i.e., traffic displacement) and impacts on accessibility (including that for emergency services), to be monitored and mitigated in partnership with the Council, ensuring they are fairly compared with the benefits of proposals put forward." There is no stakeholder agreement with HES and the traffic outside the park is the Council's to manage and, in the spirit of Scott Arthur's addendum from October 2023, to support HES should they decide to remove through vehicle traffic. Additionally, there are closures every weekend and for a number of events and maintenance activities throughout the year, and the sentiment that unknown potential circumstances in which unintended consequences would outweigh the benefits could be used to slow down action further.

Additionally we advocate for the following additions:

**2.9:** Add that the removal of through vehicle traffic in Holyrood Park contributes to the City's climate targets through encouraging active travel, sustainable accessibility measures, and the corresponding outcomes around behaviour change and modal shift. The way the draft is written severs this section from discussion of the climate and nature emergency when they are interlinked.

**2.9:** Add the incoming LEZ to the following as an immediate factor in a worsening status quo when enforcement begins in June 2024: "Identified impacts risk worsening with increasing user numbers visiting the Park, assuming no changes to the network are made."

**2.10:** A commitment to removing Holyrood Park's road network as a vehicular route in the Circulation Plan to be presented in February 2024 (we contributed a deputation and consultation response on this).

**2.15:** Recognition that any 'hopper bus' or localised sustainable transport service for the Park should adhere to the transport hierarchy and not push other users off the road space - particularly those walking, wheeling and cycling on the High Road where there is one lane. This could be achieved by using a narrow vehicle.

Recognition that despite Holyrood Park management not being accountable to the Council, residents have voted for representation in the city which supports climate and transport targets which removal of vehicular traffic in the Park would be aligned with and that residents made their concerns about the park roads clear in the Spaces for People consultation. Objective 5 follows on from the Traffic Management Survey in summer 2021 and is now in consultation. However, a second round of consultation is planned with the consultation period lasting 18 months taking us to 2025, and this continues to add delay and inaction on an issue that is important to residents.

Waiting until 2025 to take any action and even longer to fulfill the vision of Objective 5, [as we have discussed in our most recent blog](#), in the face of a climate emergency, multiple consultations, and upcoming enforcement of the LEZ in June 2024 is a commitment to a deteriorating status quo and worsening experience for park users. The Council should encourage HES to take swift action and emphasise that the Council's longterm transport plans

for the city, including the City Mobility Plan and Circulation Plan, are not a barrier to action, and instead will support HES in the removal of through vehicle traffic in the park and work to mitigate any negative impacts.

Finally, we must not lose sight of what we have to gain through opening up the continuous, paved accessible road space to walking, wheeling and cycling:



- People have space for social experiences side by side, even if using mobility scooters or pushing prams, without traffic noise interfering.
- People on bikes of any age, from age 3 to 103, can feel comfortable using the paved space without having to worry about negotiating with traffic or contend with the current incomplete, narrow cycle paths that flood and ice over in winter as well as create conflict between people on bikes and pedestrians.
- Children have space to play on scooters and bikes.
- Enhanced park user experience in lower-lying areas of the park like St Margaret's Loch.
- More attractive walking, wheeling and cycling experiences in the Galloping Glen and on Duddingston Low Road.
- More opportunities to engage with nature without traffic noise and more people staying on the paved spaces because they can engage with nature there rather than further

degrading the unpaved park network, a problem which is outlined in the draft Outline Strategic Plan.

- The community using the road space for other uses. Park Run was only possible when the Saturday road closures began and we want to start a Cycling Without Age Scotland chapter in the Park, what else will the community do with the chance?
- Joy!

Sarah Gowanlock, on behalf of Car Free Holyrood

*Spokes Lothian Planning Group has the below comments relating to section 7.2 Travelling Safely Schemes of the November 2023 TEC Report;*

- *Comiston Rd – changes at Comiston Springs Av jn; Pentland Ter floating parking & central island*  
*Spokes Planning Group support the proposed adjustments to the bellmouth junction at Comiston Spring Avenue and making this buildout permanent being considered as possible ETRO changes.*

*Spokes Planning Group also support the review of the pinch point at the traffic island and Braid Hills Drive exit point given much cycle user feedback of this junction being the weakest part of the cycle provision from Greenbank to Fairmilehead.*

*We note that the Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route information is pending review and should be provided in early 2024. However we emphasise that the above Comiston Road proposals need considered together with the Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route.*

- *Silverknowes Rd North*

*Spokes objects to reopening the road to all traffic by narrowing the bike lane.*

*As noted in the TEC Report (9.2/9.3) it is recognised that this will likely increase car traffic and induce demand for short car journeys which is completely contrary to CEC's 30% car-km reduction target. This is also incompatible with the Sustainable Transport Hierarchy which is part of CEC and Scottish Government policy. Marine Drive is fully accessible to private motor vehicles currently and as such we see no need for reopening this link to it.*

*Spokes would encourage the money and Officer time being spent on these negative proposals to be used instead to improve active travel here or elsewhere in the city.*

- *Silverknowes Rd South – We oppose replacing the Quiet Route by a segregated cycle lane which ends at a “busy roundabout” with admitted (9.2.2) potential increased cyclist risks and reduction in bike use.*

*As per the original Spokes comments of 2020 Spokes does encourage the provision of cycle facilities on main roads that are a natural link between the NEPN and Promenade at Silverknowes. This reflects the transport hierarchy, is direct, involves fewer turns, gives the opportunity to patronise the shops and business on the Silverknowes Road Parade and seamlessly connect to the NEPN. However, ending at a busy roundabout is quite unacceptable.*

*Detailed information would need to be provided for full judgement to be passed on any proposed ETRO changes.*

*In summary it seems there is a contradictory approach to the two parts of the Silverknowes Travelling Safely ETRO proposals and as such Spokes PG requests detailed information and discussion on both before any final decisions are taken.*

*Apologies for any inconvenience.*

*Kind regards,*

*John Robson*

*On behalf of Spokes Lothian Planning Group*



**Deputation to Transport and Environment Committee meeting to be held on 16 November 2023  
regarding item 8.3 Communal Bin Review Update**

The New Town and Broughton Community Council (NTBCC) notes the excellent work that has been undertaken to modify the location of bin hubs to be installed in Phase 3&4 to take account of the views of residents and welcomes the recommendation to further consider the waste collection arrangements throughout the World Heritage Site. In principle, we support the proposals but recognise that there remains much work to be done to finalise the arrangements, not least effective engagement with all residents affected by the recommended changes.

We also welcome the work that has been undertaken to allow a trial of the green gull proof sacks on a limited number of streets in the New Town in the last year. Although the report refers to the limited impact of this initial trial on the overall tonnage of recycling collected, our own monitoring of individual streets has shown a 250% increase in the volume of dry mixed recycling that is being collected. This number was accepted by the waste collection staff as being a reasonable estimate of the impact of the green gull proof sacks. As the trial only covered nine streets, the tonnage being measured across all streets in the city centre area would not be expected to be greatly affected by that from the trial streets. We therefore believe that the volume of recycling collected and participation rates are better metrics for any trial.

Although the initial trial did not include any measurement of non-recyclable waste volumes, anecdotal evidence suggests that there is less such waste being put out for collection. The newly extended trial will allow this to be properly tested, encourage an increase in the presentation of food waste for recycling and provide further useful information to guide future decisions about the most appropriate arrangements to enhance recycling in the whole of the City Centre.

We agree that the recommendations from the APSE report to install pneumatic or other underground refuse systems are currently neither practical nor financially viable. We are pleased to note that the APSE report highlights the unacceptable impact of communal bin hubs on the heritage of World Heritage Site as shown by the Heritage Impact Assessment conducted by Simpson and Brown last year. We believe that heritage impact should be included in any decisions about waste collection in areas 5 A, B and C as well as other areas that border the World Heritage Site.

One of the important lessons from the initial green gull proof sacks trial has been the importance of direct engagement with Council officers and local residents, which has ensured that the key messages about the need to increase recycling are delivered and that feedback from residents can be properly considered. Such positive engagement will be critical to the decision-making and deployment of any new arrangements for collection of waste and recycling across the World Heritage Site.

The NTBCC would welcome the opportunity to directly participate in the engagement process in our area and with other Community Councils that will be affected by these decisions. Jointly, we believe that we can make a positive impact on achieving the City's recycling goals.

## Summary: Relocation of Communal Bins – Learmonth Terrace - Residents Opinion

1. The council public information packs as issued for the TEC 18<sup>th</sup> May and Nov 16<sup>th</sup> meetings included Communal Bin Review Updates and discusses both potential bin relocation and the change to an alternative type of bin.
2. Our residents are, at this moment, particularly concerned regards Bin Relocation and it is this we wish to raise at the TEC mtg on 16<sup>th</sup> Nov. The Communal Bin Review Update (16<sup>th</sup> Nov Public Pack) places Learmonth Terrace within Area C (Page 271 of the pack) and on the next page you state: - “While the type/size of bins would change the bin locations will not”. However, we were informed that this was still under review and hence the request to present our case to the TEC.
3. Learmonth Terrace has apartments on one side only. The bins are located at 3 points along the non-apartment side of the street which has no pavement but instead a wide, grassed area which extends for the length of the terrace. To deposit our waste, we cross the road and, standing on the grassed area, can, quite safely, access and deposit our waste into the general waste and recycling bins.
4. We recognise the council aims in trying to “Provide Ease of Access and to Avoid Having to Cross or Stand in the Road when Using the Bins.” However, none of the residents when questioned have raised these as a need or concern. (We might only go to the bins once or twice a week – whereas we might cross the road on a daily basis to get to parked vehicles or the bus stop, walk into town or walk the dog).
5. We are fortunate – we have the option of having the bins separate from the apartments and at a distance acceptable to all the residents. If the bins are located on the same side as the apartments our concerns include (amongst others) that this: -
  - (a) Will create new, and result in an increase, in the current health, safety and environmental problems that occur – and literally - place them on our doorstep. Problems over which we, and the council, have little or no control. Problems which affect not only residents but those pedestrians who use the streets sole pavement. (Fly tipping is a never-ending problem – small, light items mainly being dealt with by the residents and only the larger, heavy immovable items being reported to the council for removal).
  - (b) Will result in a few, having to bear the majority of the various detrimental impacts created by the bins – whereas currently it is spread equably between all the residents. The residents agree this would be unfair.
6. Having consulted with the residents it is clear there is a resounding and emphatic “YES” vote with regards to **retaining the bins in their current location**.

Thus, we appreciate the opportunity to provide further details on the above.

Your Sincerely

Allan Davidson

Good morning,

Charles Platt and I are here on behalf of the residents of Learmonth Terrace regards the proposal by the council to relocate the communal bins to the same side of the street as our apartments.

Learmonth Terrace has apartments on one side only. The bins are located at 3 points along the non-apartment side of the street where instead of a pavement – there is a wide, grassed area – extending the length of the terrace. To deposit our waste, we cross the road and, standing on the grassed area, can, quite safely, access and deposit our waste into the general waste and recycling bins.

We recognise the council aims in trying to “Provide Ease of Access and to Avoid Having to Cross or Stand in the Road when Using the Bins.” However, none of the residents when questioned have raised these as a need or concern and indeed having the bins separate from the apartments and at an acceptable distance, is seen as beneficial. If the bins are located on the same side as the apartments our concerns include (amongst others) that this will create new, and result in an increase, in the health, safety and environmental problems inherent with waste management - and literally place them on our doorstep. Problems which affect not only residents but those pedestrians who use the streets sole pavement. Problems over which we, and the council, have little or no control - Fly tipping being one example.

Fly Tipping and use of bins by non-residents.

As only the larger, heavy items are reported to the council it may not be aware of the full extent of the problem. (Residents usually clear up any small items themselves). Relocation of the bins would result in those large objects not only reducing the usable width of the pavement but result in a safety hazard as pedestrians bump into, scratch/cut themselves as they navigate around the items such as 2metre bread boards, furniture, buggies, electrical goods etc.

Smaller items left at the side of bins includes bags of rubbish filled with waste food, used nappies and wipes, glass, paper etc which are then targeted by seagulls - and subsequently the local foxes (and rats on occasions). This hazardous, contaminated material, would now be trampled into/stick to the pavement, be entrapped by the railings, blown onto the steps of main doors and accumulate in basement areas. Further encouraging foxes and rats to cross the road (We don't have chickens locally). Currently the range of dispersal of the rubbish is restricted as it gets entangled in the grass or the hedge. Finally, the bins would be even more visible to non-residents - encouraging more fly tipping.

Auditory Impact: The noise from glass being deposited is annoying and disturbing as is the emptying of the bins which often occurs early and at weekends (0700 Sunday). Also being a World Heritage Area/Listed Buildings - we are legally restricted to the use of ultra-thin double glazing – fitment of is almost, if not impossible, as the ground floor flats have curved windows.

Visual, some might say Mental Health Impact. There are no raised ground floor flats – so wherever the bins are placed they would be within the eyeline/an eyesore to residents – plus a very undesirable sight for all the hotel's guests. Currently the bins seem almost camouflaged as they blend in with the cars and trees.

Fairness: Currently no resident has a bin directly outside their front door/window. If the bins were relocated this would result in a few, having to bear the majority of the subsequent negative impacts (including that on the property's value). Whereas currently it is spread equably between all the residents. All the residents agree the proposed change – would, if implemented - be inherently unfair.

In summary, having consulted with the residents it is clear they see no benefit in any change – and indeed a worse situation if implemented - and this is confirmed by their resounding and emphatic **“YES”** vote when asked whether to **“retaining the bins in their current location”**.

## **Pavement parking: deputation from Living Streets Edinburgh Group**

Walking, disability and cycling organisations have campaigned for a ban on pavement parking for well over a decade. It is also now four years since the ban was legislated for in the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019. On the eve of the ban finally coming into effect, it is essential that it is administered as effectively as possible, so that we see an end to vehicles parked on pavements and blocking dropped kerbs.

We would like to give full credit to councillors who adopted a policy last August that the ban should apply to all streets, with no exemptions. We are encouraged to hear the determination to stick to this position. We want to see the additional revenue generated by penalties re-invested in effective enforcement - especially in those areas in the city where parking attendants don't currently patrol.

However the report before councillors is extremely disappointing. It not only fails to acknowledge this 'no exemptions' policy, but also asks councillors "to note" an approach which permits the possibility of exemptions - contrary to council policy.

The report seems to assume that current parking capacity must be accommodated; that the Council must ensure that people who currently park on the footway are able to either park somewhere else, or must be allowed to continue to park on pavements. How can a council with a target to reduce car use by 30% countenance such an approach?

When footway parking is no longer permitted, then the responsibility lies with the owner to find somewhere else to park safely and legally. No doubt many people who currently park on the pavement won't be able to park outside their home and will have to walk further to a suitable parking space. But if someone has nowhere to park safely and legally, then it calls into question whether they should own that car at all.

The Council's Project Centre consultants advise that they have recommended "cost-effective mitigation measures to alleviate footway parking" for all the problem streets which they have identified (Para 2.3.9 of the Appendix). One of these mitigations is 'exemption': in other words, to alleviate pavement parking, it should be permitted!! This is an incredible feat of logic. We have asked to see the full list of these recommendations and suggest that they must be made available to all councillors, and to the public.

The report makes no mention of the need to assess the impacts on disabled people of continuing to permit footway parking which we believe fails to conform to the Public Sector Equality Duty. The Scottish Government's statutory disability transport advisors (the Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland, MACS) has called for all councils to adopt a 'no exemptions' policy.

It would be unforgivable if the long-awaited ban on irresponsible parking was undermined at the eleventh hour by allowing streets to be exempted because of displaced parking. Cars belong in a driveway or garage, or on the carriageway. Pavements are not places where vehicles belong. It really is that simple.

Living Streets Edinburgh Group  
November 2023

Sight Scotland and Sight Scotland Veterans welcome the preparations to begin enforcement against pavement parking in Edinburgh, following the introduction of new powers by the Scottish Government.

As per the “Implementing of new parking prohibitions” paper from the Transport and Environment Committee, we support the national awareness campaign for the prohibition of pavement parking and stress the need for a specific targeted campaign in Edinburgh, especially in designated red zones. We believe the third sector can be useful partners to disseminate this messaging. We further agree that any proposed Exemption Orders must be considered fully by Committee before being progressed. We’d look forward to more information on how surplus monies from PCNs will be used and the categorisation of PCNs.

Many thanks

Nicoletta

Nicoletta Primo

Policy and Campaigns Lead

Sight Scotland and Sight Scotland Veterans

2a Robertson Avenue

Edinburgh

EH11 1PZ

Switchboard: 0131 229 1456

Web: [sightscotland.org.uk](http://sightscotland.org.uk)

Web: [sightscotlandveterans.org.uk](http://sightscotlandveterans.org.uk)

Spokes comments on [item 8.5 - Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions](#) (16/12/23)

Spokes welcomes the imminent implementation of these new parking prohibitions, stemming from legislation passed in 2019 and now at long last being brought into operation throughout Scotland by the Scottish Government.

We welcome the indications in the Committee report that they will be strongly enforced in Edinburgh - this is vital.

If enforced properly, the new powers will massively improve the accessibility of the footway network in Edinburgh, making it easier and safer for people to walk and wheel around the city. However, we are greatly concerned that there is no mention of increased enforcement action in the committee report.

Whilst the focus is, rightly, on the new powers around pavement parking, the new powers around dropped kerbs and double parking are also very important. These will allow the council to make cycling in Edinburgh easier and safer for everyone.

Finally, we do not see any mention in the committee report on whether the council's incorrectly parked vehicle reporting form will be amended to allow members of the public to report pavement parking, double parking and parking at dropped kerbs. We believe this should be done.

We therefore urge councillors to ensure that the new powers are used and enforced in full, in order to maximise the benefits to those walking, wheeling and cycling in Edinburgh.



As you know Balerno Community Council have received notice from CEC of an item appearing on the draft agenda for the Transport and Environment Ctte meeting on Thursday 16 November.

The paper concerns Supported Bus Services and in particular makes recommendations in relation to the current Service 63 between Balerno and Queensferry. The paper in effect proposes removal of the service 63 and substitution of a new service to run between Balerno and Cramond.

The Community Council has had complaints in the past about reliability of the 63 service and would have welcomed improvements to that service. It recognises that some current users may well be disadvantaged by the withdrawal of the section between Gyle and Queensferry and would request, at the least, that provision be made to cater for that need by ensuring integration between the Balerno Cramond and the Queensferry Gyle timetables.

Overall however, the Council welcomes the proposed enhancement in the Balerno Gyle service afforded by the significant extension of the daily operating period.

However the Council also regrets that the proposed service is not proposed to run on Sundays and would ask that a Sunday service at least equivalent to the Sunday timetable operated on the 63 route be made available on the proposed Balerno Cramond route. Increasingly NHS appointments are being offered for Sundays, and people will often wish to visit patients in hospital on Sundays. BCC pressed for a long time following withdrawal of the service 24 in 2016, for a service to St Johns Livingston, that being the referral hospital for Balerno. The 63 linking at Hermiston to Livingston services was the response. Losing that linkage on a Sunday would not be a welcome development and we would ask that a Sunday service therefore be included on the proposed Balerno Cramond route.

We would be grateful if this point be pursued at the Committee meeting on 16 November.

Many thanks

Richard

Richard M Henderson  
Chair  
Balerno Community Council

## **Craigleith / Blackhall Community Council Deputation**

### **Agenda Item 8.6**

The deputation is in relation to Supported Bus Services at item 8.6. The interest of the Community Council is specifically focused on service 13 which currently operates between Blackhall and Lochend. We welcome the retention of the financially supported bus service for a further period, but we are disappointed and concerned that the proposal in paper 8.6 to reroute the service via Lothian Road, similar to Lothian Buses service 47, and effectively nudging the city centre will remove from Craigleith and Blackhall another bus service providing direct and easy access to the retail core of the city centre.

We request that this proposed route - Blackhall to Dumbiedykes - in item 8.6 should be reconsidered so that there is access to the retail core of the City Centre at the east end of Princes Street and St James Quarter.

The Craigleith/Blackhall area has experienced major changes to bus routes since 2022. Lothian Buses Service 42 linking Craigleith with the City Centre via Stockbridge was withdrawn, Service 41 linking Blackhall and other parts of north west Edinburgh with the City Centre also withdrawn. Service 47 which replaces service 41 only nudges the City Centre at the West End and does not provide direct access to the retail core. Rerouting service 13 as proposed would therefore add to a further deterioration in bus services linking Craigleith and Blackhall with the retail centre of Edinburgh.

Alan Denham  
Secretary  
Craigleith/Blackhall Community Council

Written Deputation to The City of Edinburgh Council Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) from Ratho Bus Working Group

Agenda Item 8.6      Supported Bus Services

The Ratho Bus Working Group (RBWG) notes with significant disappointment that it was not briefed on the Committee Report in advance to allow comment to be made, as was understood would happen during dialogue with Jacobs Consultancy (Jacobs).

There are a number of references in the document (3.3, 4.1, 4.6) to RBWG. Had the document been provided to us in advance, RBWG would have requested that these be amended to 'stakeholder groups'.

In particular, 4.6 implies endorsement by RBWG of the proposed direct route from Ratho via Ratho Station and the A8. Jacobs were specifically advised that this route had been operated in the past by Lothian Buses and was not deemed to be commercial. We have always championed a direct route but from an existing service, either a route passing nearby X27/X28 (A71) or a route stopping short of Ratho 12/22 (Gyle Centre) in addition to an hourly shuttle to the Gyle for local services.

The route proposed in this paper has not been reviewed by RBWG. Has this been proposed simply to allow Lothian Buses to (perhaps reasonably) decline to tender for the direct service as shown?

The A71 route benefits from better bus lane priority and can access the West Approach Road – why has this not been shown as an alternative?

Amendment: 4.4.1 Should be noted as Gyle – Ratho Station – Ratho – Hermiston P&R – Ratho – Ratho Station - Gyle

The proposal for the Hermiston – Ratho – Ratho Station – Gyle would provide a bus to a transport node every 30 minutes. However, this still means the connection from either Gyle or Hermiston to Ratho is only hourly, and a key deterrence factor for travel to Ratho, particularly at night. Interchange is all very well – but only if both services are frequent. It is not an acceptable option when offered as an hourly service. This relates directly to 3.4 in the report to support isolated communities, accessibility, mobility & equalities criteria.

Amendment: 3.4.3 we would suggest adding : Transport was highlighted by the Edinburgh Poverty Commission as a key issue in combating poverty in the city. Appropriate transport provision is therefore central to delivering on equalities issues, ensuring Edinburgh's citizens can get around the City of Edinburgh Council local authority area on an equal basis.

We see no evidence of sections 8 (climate and Nature emergency) & 9 (Risk, Policy and Compliance) being met as part of the proposed Ratho routes

The request made to Jacobs for a face-to-face meeting with Lothian Buses was not responded to, either to say whether it was possible or not.

During the previous TEC on 12<sup>th</sup> October Councillor Lang requested an update from the Committee Chair regarding progress with the report. In the absence of Stuart Lowrie, the response was a vague 'everything is on track'. This was patently not the case as McGills Scotland East had announced they were to cease operations on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2023, with services being withdrawn on either 15<sup>th</sup> October or 2<sup>nd</sup> December. This fundamentally changed the situation regarding Supported Bus, inasmuch as one of the two principal operators (all Lothian operations are treated as one) would no longer be in a position to tender. TEC should have been alerted to this fact at that meeting.

This fundamental change also created a crisis in that the 3 main supported bus services could be stopped with little notice, at any time. This also put pressure to start DPS as soon as possible to avoid loss of services completely, which in turn questions the ability to undertake the 'supported bus review' comprehensively.

There is no supporting information regarding how any of the proposed routes have been arrived at. Reliance however has clearly been placed on information provided by RBWG in respect of passenger demands, with the Chesser – Sighthill route becoming a local circular, and the Turnhouse leg of the current 68 being dropped. We would request that the supported bus review information/evidence is shared with us including the weightings and qualifications for each service proposed.

This detail will be important in relation to section 6 on funding. The current budget of 1.5m has remained unchanged which given the substantial increase in operational costs means it will not be sufficient without making cuts and that's before you add in the 2 new services. All services should be evaluated on weightings based on the Supported Bus Framework.

The progress of this matter – which has most impacted Ratho and those on the 63 route from South Queensferry to Balerno, principally as a result of McGills being unable to source drivers - has been glacial. The spectre of McGills withdrawing their services – which are being operated out of contract – hangs over Ratho. The process needs to move faster.

So whilst the RBWG will support the report to commence DPS as stated we would insist as mentioned in 5.1: officers continuing to review and refine routes. It is to be hoped that the A71 option for the Ratho direct service will replace the current proposal.

Ratho Bus Working Group (RBWG)

On behalf of Ratho & District Community Council

12<sup>th</sup> November 2023



Dear Rachel,

I attach a deputation on behalf of Accessible Corstorphine for Everyone (ACE) in respect of the following agenda item for the Transport and Environment Committee (TEC) scheduled for Thursday, 16th November, 2023 at 10.00am:

Agenda Item 9.1 motion by Cllr Euan Davidson: Corstorphine Connections

The deputation will be read by David Lowe. He will be supported by Jackie Connor, Peter Roberts and Trond Haugen. We do not intend to use any Powerpoint presentations this time.

I attach the deputation script and a supporting document data analysis. I would be most grateful if you would circulate our deputation to the committee members in advance of the meeting.

Thanks and best regards

Peter Roberts

## Deputation for TEC Meeting of 16th November 2023

### Summary

- There is an urgent need to repeat the direct survey of local residents;
- Flawed baseline data prevents accurate assessment of the experimental changes;
- Omissions in first month data hide traffic displacement to main roads;
- The boundary of the LTN has seen a far greater increase in the volume of traffic than would be expected from the general trend;
- The Manse Road changes have caused traffic displacement but **not** evaporation and have not helped safer routes to school;
- Latest UK parliament reports find no evidence the such schemes increase active transport;
- The Manse Road changes have made the network of distributor roads less efficient;
- The Manse Road changes have exacerbated the barriers to travel between north and south Corstorphine;
- The LTN has been counter-productive to its aims and should be removed.

### Deputation

Good morning.

I'm David and I am accompanied by Jackie, Peter and Trond.

We are here to once again ask this committee to reverse the ETRO imposed upon Corstorphine and to highlight the mounting evidence that the LTN has failed to meet its own objectives.

Our previous deputation explained that the LTN is causing severe disruption to our village. We also demonstrated clear bias in the consultation process and pre-determination in the interpretation of its results. Many of the approved restrictions were never even mentioned during the consultation.

We note that the council has revived the Community Reference Group and welcome the inclusion of a representative from ACE. However, there is still an apparent bias. We urge the council to repeat the direct survey of residents' views and so give local people the chance to give their verdict.

The council has since published data on traffic volumes in and around the LTN zone for the first month of operation. We have given you our analysis in a supporting document. We recognise that these results are preliminary and that subsequent data is expected. However, we would like to draw the committee's attention to the following:

First, the baseline data is flawed. It was taken during Covid restrictions, when traffic would likely be lower than normal. It would have been far better for the council to repeat the baseline study immediately prior to implementation. Indeed, the failure to do so is a serious error in process which means that there is now no reference point against which to compare either the first month, or any subsequent data. This makes it impossible to prove the success of the experiment. The onus is on those sponsoring the LTN to prove that it is necessary, proportionate and achieves its aims. We cannot understand why a recent baseline was not taken so that this could be achieved.

Secondly the first month data failed to include Meadow Place Road which is the Road most likely to bear additional loading from Manse Road displacement.



Also, the measurement on St Johns Road was taken at single location between Manse Road and Clermiston Road. This is precisely where we would expect to see traffic removed by the closure of right turning lane from Manse Road. However, this displaced traffic will now travel along other sections of St Johns Road and these were not measured.

In spite of this, there are some conclusions which can be drawn with a high degree of confidence:

Most strikingly, if you live on the edge of the LTN, you will have seen a far greater increase in the volume of traffic outside your home than if you lived anywhere else. Furthermore, any improvement in child safety from the reduction of traffic on Manse Road has been bought at the expense of increasing the volume of traffic (and hence the risk to these same children) as they approach school along adjacent roads!

Any benefits for the 30 or so households of Manse Road have come at the expense of making life worse for a far greater number of people.

The results provide no evidence whatsoever of traffic evaporation. Nor is there any evidence that further restrictions will cause traffic to evaporate. This is entirely consistent with the latest studies on such schemes in general. For example, the latest Public Accounts Committee report on active travel schemes finds that there has been no sustained increase in cycling rates and, in some cases levels of activity are lower now than when the targets were set. Discussions with a local resident with significant experience as a chartered civil engineer specialising in transportation indicate that the Manse Road changes are ill-conceived, disproportionate and counter-productive to its objectives.

Manse Road is an important part of the local distributor network and its traffic light controlled junction with St Johns Road is tailored made to serve this

purpose, unlike Station Road. The closure of this vital local asset makes the distributor network less efficient.

St John's Road already forms a barrier to travel between north and south Corstorphine. The north side of Corstorphine is built on a steep hill and walking, wheeling and cycling to and from north Corstorphine are only feasible for the physically fit. Many of the houses in this area have little access to bus routes. Any measures intended to improve local travel would ideally reduce the extent to which these accidents of local geography divide our community. These changes do the opposite.

Traffic which previously crossed via Manse Road to Clermiston Road is now forced to use a much longer stretch of St John's Road. Any additional restrictions will almost completely isolate the two parts of Corstorphine from each other. The only remaining route from south to north Corstorphine would then be the already congested Drum Brae Roundabout.

The implementation of the Bus Gate has been haphazard and inadequate.

The LTN has failed. It should be removed immediately and the council should go back to the drawing board. This time it should listen to local people.

Thank you

## Corstorphine Connections - Automatic Traffic Counts

### 1 month post implementation results (29 September 2023)

There are 3 major flaws in the comparison of the baseline data with the 1 month post implementation data.

1. The baseline data was recorded in November 2021 during covid restrictions and as a result will almost certainly have under-estimated the traffic volumes. See [Working from home during the COVID-19 pandemic](#) which states “**September 2021:** [Scottish Government](#) urges businesses to allow staff to work from home until mid-January 2022”
2. The omission of Meadow Place Road is likely to have caused a significant bias in the data as this is one of the main routes that traffic from Manse Road is likely to have been displaced onto.
3. When the weather is bad then more people will travel by car rather than walking or cycling. The baseline data was taken in November when the weather is likely to have been significantly worse than when the 1 month post data was taken in June.

There are also many other factors which could also affect the results - e.g. local events in one set of data missing on the other.

The most significant of these flaws is the fact that the baseline data was taken over a year ago and at a time when COVID restrictions were in place. This makes it virtually impossible to isolate the effect of the LTN when comparing the baseline with any post LTN implementation data. As a result I do not believe any conclusions relating to the effectiveness (or otherwise) of the LTN should be drawn from such a comparison.

Despite the above (and the preliminary nature of the data), I have had a look at the data and my results are shown in the remainder of this document.

## Overall Figures

The figures are all based on the updated (V2) 1 month post implementation traffic counts which are the most accurate figures now (to the best of our knowledge).

**Table 1 - Total weekday traffic flows (Mon-Fri) across a full 24-hour period**

	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>1-Month Post</b>	<b>Increase</b>	<b>%increase</b>
<b>Total</b>	70,057	74,513	+4,456	+6.4%
<b>Total LTN</b>	35,721	36,480	+759	+2.1%
<b>Total Boundary Streets</b>	34,336	38,034	+3,698	+10.8%

**Table 2 -Total weekday traffic flows (Mon-Fri) across the hours of operation of the bus gate**

	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>1-Month Post</b>	<b>Increase</b>	<b>%increase</b>
<b>Total</b>	28,690	30,223	+1,533	+5.3%
<b>Total LTN</b>	14,986	15,529	+543	+3.6%
<b>Total Boundary Streets</b>	13,705	14,694	+989	+7.2%

**Table 3 -Total weekday traffic flows (Mon-Fri) outwith the hours of operation of the bus gate**

	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>1-Month Post</b>	<b>Increase</b>	<b>%increase</b>
<b>Total</b>	41,367	44,290	+2,923	+7.1%
<b>Total LTN</b>	20,735	20,951	+216	+1.0%
<b>Total Boundary Streets</b>	20,631	23,340	+2,709	+13.1%

Based on the data it appears that there has been an increase of traffic in the overall area (LTN + Boundary Streets) of around 6%. This is probably related to the gradual relaxation of Covid working from home advice.

Table 2 shows that traffic has moved from the LTN streets to the boundary streets during the bus gate hours. Table 3 show a similar effect outwith the bus gate hours and the greater increase outwith the bus gate hours also seems to suggest that traffic has moved in time from within the bus gate hours to outwith the bus gate hours. So traffic seems to have been displaced rather than “evaporated”.

The lack of data for Meadow Place Road is likely to have affected these results and it is likely/plausible that the inclusion of this data would have increased the Traffic on the Boundary streets even further.

## Corstorphine High Street

If we look at the data for Corstorphine High Street (which is the Road which passes in front of Corstorphine Primary School) we see the following.

### Corstorphine High Street - total weekday traffic flows across a full 24-hour period.

	Baseline	1-Month Post	Increase	%increase
<b>Total</b>	6,406	6,383	-23	-0.36%

### Corstorphine High Street -Total weekday traffic flows across the hours of operation of the bus gate.

	Baseline	1-Month Post	Increase	%increase
<b>Total</b>	2583	2667	+84	+3.2%

### Corstorphine High Street -Total weekday traffic flows outwith the hours of operation of the bus gate.

	Baseline	1-Month Post	Increase	%increase
<b>Total</b>	3,823	3,716	-107	-2.8%

The changes on Corstorphine High Street are very small and the statistical errors in the data are likely to overwhelm such changes. It is interesting to note however that traffic passing the primary school actually increased very slightly during the bus gate hours (~ an extra 15 vehicles per hour.)

## Corstorphine Primary School Area

Unsurprisingly (given the implementation of the Manse Road Bus Gate) there has been a large reduction of traffic on Manse Road during the bus gate hours ~ 746 vehicles (56% reduction or 130 less vehicles per hour), however there has been an impact on nearby roads:

**Total weekday traffic flows (Mon-Fri) across the hours of operation of the bus gate.**

Road	Baseline	1-Month Post	Increase	%increase
Station Road	882	1159	+277	+31.4%
Pinkhill	790	758	-32	-4.0%
Ladywell Avenue	883	701	-182	-20.6%
Dovecot Road	222	296	+74	+33.3%
Saughton Road North	3638	3865	+227	+6.23%
Ladywell Road	2853	3398	+545	+19.1%
Featherhall Avenue	529	961	+432	+81.7%
Manse Street	76	65	-11	-14.5%
Corstorphine High Street	2583	2667	+84	+3.2%
Kirk Loan	1141	1025	-116	-10.1%
<b>Total</b>	<b>13597</b>	<b>14895</b>	<b>+1298</b>	<b>+9.5%</b>

This more than offsets the decrease on Manse Road (of 746 vehicles). If we include the Manse Road statistics we get the following:

	Baseline	1-Month Post	Increase	%increase
<b>Total</b>	<b>14909</b>	<b>15461</b>	<b>+552</b>	<b>+3.7%</b>

So there has been an overall increase of traffic in the area around Corstorphine Primary School during the bus gate hours.

## All Monitored Streets

If we look at the data over all the streets that were monitored we see the following:

### Average number of vehicles (weekday)

Road	Baseline	1-Month Post	Increase	%increase
St John's Road	21032	20942	-90	-0.43%
Station Road	2227	2791	+564	+25.33%
Pinkhill	1757	1582	-175	-9.96%
Balgreen Road	6364	7875	+1511	+23.74%
Ladywell Avenue	1807	1520	-287	-15.88%
Dovecot Road	469	582	+112	+23.9%
Broomhall Crescent	194	165	-28	-14.51%
Saughton Road North	8889	9163	+274	+3.08%
Broomhouse Drive	6940	9217	+2277	+32.81%
Ladywell Road	7096	8021	925	13.04%
Featherhall Avenue	1043	1839	+796	+76.32%
Manse Street	164	166	+2	+1.2%
Manse Road	3029	1789	-1240	-40.9%
Corstorphine High Street	6406	6383	-23	-0.36%
Kirk Loan	2641	2479	-162	-6.13%

### Average number of vehicles (weekday) during bus gate hours

Road	Baseline	1-Month Post	Increase	%increase
St John's Road	8016	7424	-592	-7.4%
Station Road	882	1159	+277	+31.4%
Pinkhill	790	758	-32	-4.0%
Balgreen Road	2559	3031	+472	+18.4%
Ladywell Avenue	883	701	-182	-20.6%
Dovecot Road	222	296	+74	+33.3%
Broomhall Crescent	78	70	-8	-10.2%
Saughton Road North	3638	3865	+227	+6.23%
Broomhouse Drive	3130	4239	+1109	+35.4%
Ladywell Road	2853	3398	+545	+19.1%
Featherhall Avenue	529	961	+432	+81.7%
Manse Street	76	65	-11	-14.5%
Manse Road	1312	566	-746	-56.8%
Corstorphine High Street	2583	2667	+84	+3.2%
Kirk Loan	1141	1025	-116	-10.1%

The main takeaways from this are:

1. Featherhall Avenue has seen a large increase in traffic ~+80% mainly southbound. This is hardly surprising given the closure of the other exit roads from Featherhall.
2. There is a significant decrease in traffic on Manse Road both overall and within the bus gate hours ~40-57%. The decrease within the bus gate hours is almost certainly due to the bus gate, the decrease outwith the bus gate hours is probably caused by people avoiding the area due to the confusing signage around the bus gate.
3. Station Road has seen a significant increase in traffic overall ~25% and an even bigger increase of ~ 31% during the bus gate hours.
4. Dovecot Road has seen a significant increase in traffic both overall and within the bus gate hours (~24%. and 33% respectively). Unfortunately no measurements were taken on Castle Avenue (which may also have been affected in a similar way to Dovecot Road).
5. Broomhouse Drive and Balgreen Road have both seen significant increases in traffic ~34% and ~20% respectively.
6. Other Roads have seen a mixed picture with smaller % changes (both decreases and increases).

The traffic evidence to date seems to suggest that there has been little impact on reducing traffic in the overall area and suggests that traffic is instead being displaced both within the LTN area itself and also to the boundary streets.



## **Deputation from Corstorphine Primary School Parent Council in response to Motion 9.1 By Councillor Davidson - Corstorphine Connections**

Corstorphine Primary Parent Council have been working over a number of years to improve pupils' journeys to school. The school is situated in the centre of Corstorphine and has many busy roads for children to navigate (including Corstorphine High Street, St John's Road, Glasgow Road and Meadow Place Road). The school also has a fairly distinct and large catchment area. This all makes independent travel to school particularly challenging but the benefits of active travel are numerous and as elsewhere, families who are able to walk, wheel or cycle to and from school where possible are encouraged to do so.

**“...physical activity can increase mental alertness, energy, positive mood and self-esteem, as well as reducing stress and anxiety, according to the Mental Health Foundation. Teachers find that pupils who cycle, walk or scoot arrive at school more relaxed, alert and ready to start the day than those who travel by car. Cycling, walking or scooting to school also increases awareness of road safety as well as boosting independence for children.”** [Sustrans - Why travelling to school actively is important](#)

All parents want their children to be safe and to be able to breathe clean air. In May 2019, parents, children and the school worked together to undertake the Council's ParkSmart campaign and to create a new School Travel Plan. Many of the responses from the ParkSmart survey highlighted the main issues around the school to be the volume and speed of vehicles, particularly along Corstorphine High Street and Manse Road. In addition, inappropriate parking, people mounting pavements or performing dangerous manoeuvres were all highlighted as unnecessary dangers.

Whilst it is clear there are a wide range of views in relation to some of the changes in the current trial, some parents report improvements relating to some of these issues in the streets around the school, particularly at the back of the school. For example, Manse Rd and Featherhall area in general are much improved at drop off and pick up time.

However, due to the delays in implementation, ordering of works and vandalism, there has been very little 'normal running' of all the changes. As such, it is not yet possible to have an understanding of the full impact that the changes may have on all the roads around the area. We would request that the members of the Transport and Environment committee allow the 'bus gate' to remain in situ with the same hours of operation (as the nursery within the school grounds operates beyond usual school hours) for the full duration of the project or until such time that full and robust data has been gathered and analysed. That would allow all interested parties to be able to understand better whether the scheme delivers the sorts of benefits that we all want to see for our children and all residents and visitors to Corstorphine, or if changes can be made that would help it do so.

We thank you for your consideration and would be happy to talk to any Councillors in further detail if they have any questions or require any further detail.

Best wishes

Corstorphine Primary Parent Council



## **REF - 9.1 Motion by Councillor Davidson (Lib Dem) - Corstorphine Connections**

Low Traffic Corstorphine is a group of local Corstorphine residents and business people passionate about bringing safer streets, better air quality and much improved accessibility to residents of all ages, genders and abilities whether they are walkers, wheelers, cyclers, drivers or passengers. We present this deputation in light of Cllr Davidson's Motion at point 9.1 in today's Agenda, in which he, without providing any real evidence to support his motion, requests the removal of a key part of the Corstorphine LTN project, namely the Bus Gate on Manse Road. We note;

- **There is strong local support for the trial LTN process in Corstorphine**
- **Development in West Edinburgh means existing infrastructure is not sustainable**
- **Community engagement and consultation shows that there is demand for change**

Looking back at historical data we can see Manse Road has conveyed enormous volumes of traffic for many years – the September 2018 Dataset for Manse Road shows a 5 day working week average of 4130 vehicles per day,<sup>1</sup> and whilst traffic flow dropped a little through the Covid pandemic, flow patterns quickly returned to above 3000 vehicles a day by November 2021<sup>2</sup>

To put this into context, Manse Road is an old village road (one of the oldest and most historic in Corstorphine). It has extremely narrow pavements but is a key thoroughfare for pedestrians. Children and families with prams, buggies, wheelchair and mobility scooter users use this route to access Corstorphine amenities including shops, the park and the Primary School. This is the key reason substantial traffic reduction measures are so badly needed here.

We believe that this motion puts the voices of those who wish to prioritise motorised vehicles over all other modes of transport and the health and wellbeing of the wider community by pushing for the removal of this key element of the project. We urge Councillors to give all elements of the Corstorphine Connections LTN time to bed in and evaluate their benefits based on real data and not initial reactions and anecdotes.

Perceptions that the community has not been consulted on this LTN project appears disingenuous and we would remind the committee of the long process which has been observed in its design. The project team have held multiple public and stakeholder engagements throughout the process, together with the 6 month in-parallel public consultation period. We know that many residents within Manse Road and Featherhall have come to enjoy the newly acquired quietness and safe feel of their streets. Given time, our community will adjust to this new road layout and will thrive as a result. It's a genuine pleasure to walk along Manse Road during the hours of bus gate operation and be able to stop and speak to friends and neighbours without fearing fast vehicles or having to raise voices to be heard over the previously constant traffic noise.

Data from early points in the trial are inconclusive and it is the very nature of LTN installations that behaviour needs time (measured in months, not days or weeks) to adjust.

We at Low Traffic Corstorphine believe that time will, on the whole, change the minds of the community and behaviours will adjust, making the space a far safer one to travel by foot, wheel or cycle in future.



## Low Traffic Corstorphine

lowtrafficcorstorphine.org.uk | @TrafficLow

We therefore ask Councillors to give the project the proper time to bed in and bear the fruits it is designed to bear, as set out under the current 18 month Corstorphine Connections ETRO.

Fundamentally, it would be an error to remove one of the main mechanisms of the Corstorphine LTN before the trial has run its full course. If the bus gate were removed, can we enquire please, what solutions Councillors might suggest be put in its place to prevent the several thousand intrusive vehicles a day from returning to travelling through the historic narrow street that was never built to carry such volumes? I ask on behalf of what we believe is the the quiet majority in the Corstorphine community who are currently enjoying the quieter and safer walking, cycling and living environment the Manse Road Bus Gate has given us in Corstorphine Village.

Bus gates are not new and are, and have been, working well in many locations across this city for many years and decades.

Please show leadership and ask for patience to allow the Corstorphine Connections project to be given a chance to succeed.

I would also refer back to our previous deputation to TEC back in August<sup>3</sup> for our other main points in support of the Corstorphine LTN scheme.

Thank you for allowing us to submit this deputation.

Chris Young & Janis Ross-Williamson

**Chris Young**

Co-Chair Low Traffic Corstorphine

**Janis Ross-Williamson**

Co-Chair Low Traffic Corstorphine

### Sources

- 1 <https://edinburgh.axlr8.uk/documents/44485/44485%20Documents%202.zip> Doc2
- 2 <https://edinburgh.axlr8.uk/documents/44485/44485%20Documents%202.zip> Doc3
- 3 <https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/documents/b23637/Deputations%2017th-Aug-2023%2010.00%20Transport%20and%20Environment%20Committee.pdf?T=9>

Chair, Westfield Street Residents (statement)

Re agenda item 9.2 (Westfield Street parking)

“Oh how our daily lives have been changed overnight, for the worse”

Our normal daily lives with adequate parking spaces have changed dramatically and has been totally transformed and completely intruded upon by an invasion of mostly static ‘nuisance parkers’.

Causing on average over two thirds of resident car owners to seek parking elsewhere, mostly westwards if you work shifts.

This issue is causing several severe health and safety issues, both within and outwith the street for residents. Not to mention the peace and tranquility of normal daily life.

This issue is there 24/7.

Normal daily life is also being replaced by increased environmental issues of noise of huge volume of cars seeking, lingering, manouvering around for long periods with engines running causing severe noise disruption and increased emissions at all times of day. Some cars have been scratched by attempting turning in limited space at night once wholesalers gates are closed.

This out of control huge invasion of our normal peaceful privacy is not our own making and needs to stop immediately so that our normal service can also be resumed immediately. More so we can then all look forward to and enjoy the forthcoming festive period in peace, and of soul and mind.

Finally, and separately ‘an old wooden boundary fence’ has been completely removed to our surprise! This also served us the space for signage/notice ‘private land, residents parking only’.

Grant Lidster

Westfield Street Residents ( Chair )