

Issues raised during CCTT Site Walks with TTN team: TTN responses and CCTT comments						
ItemNo	Issue	Description	Raised	Defect	TTN Response (210223)	CCTT Comments (conflicting views/interpretations in bold) (070423)
1	Pedestrian Crossings	Where there are split or staggered crossing points it is important that there is sufficient space at the midway point (island) for pedestrians to gather while waiting to complete their crossing. The double Toucan crossing from the north side of Picardy Place has the additional complication that this space is shared with cyclists. Given the potential for large numbers of pedestrians wishing to use these crossings at certain times it may result in people stepping into the adjacent roadway with inherent dangers for their safety. Also at the staggered pedestrian crossing outside the Holiday Inn there is no protection for pedestrians waiting at the island from traffic heading north/east along Picardy Place. Consideration should be given to providing some additional protection given the limited size of the waiting space and moving traffic being on both sides of the island. We are also concerned that the new crossings will not follow desire lines and as a result pedestrians may cross at points without controlled crossings creating additional hazards for them and others. We understand that the design for Picardy Place assumes that the existing pedestrian crossing points are retained but it is not clear to us that these are optimal given the volume of pedestrian movements and the limited space at the crossing points. Given these concerns we believe that a further review of the overall design for the Picardy Place area is undertaken to ensure that there is clarity between the elements being undertaken as part of the Trams project and that covered by the Picardy Place development.	NTBCC	No	<p>Staggered crossings are all design as per traffic signs manual chapter 6 along with ESDG.</p> <p>The island to the north of Picardy is not shared space and we are in talks with active travel about the usage of this in the future.</p> <p>Any concerns around the design of Picardy Island site will need to be directed to the Active Travel team.</p>	<p>The staggered crossings in particular at Picardy Place continue to be a cause of concern as the likely number of pedestrians using these crossings will be very high at times due to the tram stop and the number of hospitality venues in the area. Chapter 6 of the Traffic Signs manual appears to be more concerned with the control of traffic at junctions using traffic lights rather than the issue highlighted here. The ESDG (G4 - Crossings- Designing Crossings) specifically states that staggered junctions should be avoided. It does not appear that there is justification for this layout from either document.</p> <p>There may be some confusion about which island was being highlighted as being shared with cyclists. This is not the one besides the Holiday Inn but the one at the top of Broughton Street. Our understanding is that this will have a Toucan crossing. If so the concerns about lack of space between the tram tracks is still of concern. We will take up any concerns with the interior layout of Picardy Place with the Active travel team but clearly there is a link between the infrastructure around the tram stop and at the boundaries of the public realm with anything that the Council may design.</p>
2	Continuous Footways	While we support the use of these measures to provide pedestrians with priority at such points there is clearly a need to educate drivers and cyclists that pedestrians do indeed have right of way. Clear signage will be crucial at these points. Do we need to have some form of visual warning to alert vehicle drivers of the presence of pedestrians similar to that for zebra crossings with Belisha beacons? Also we are aware that concerns have been raised about partially sighted pedestrians and the need to alert them to these crossing points. Consideration should be given to some form of tactile paving on either side of each junction. We also note that motorists and cyclists wishing to turn into side streets across one of these continuous pavements will be negotiating a turn over a raised section of pavement. The current use of a tarmac ramp may not be suitable for long term use and consideration should be given to some other form of ramp.	NTBCC	No	<p>These have been designed in accordance with ESDG and Cycling by Design along with input from the Active Travel Forum throughout the design process.</p> <p>Additional signage will be installed during the initial opening of these to show new changes to layout and CEC are undertaking a communications campaign to highlight these changes and how they are to be navigated.</p> <p>We are well aware of the concerns raised and the potential need for tactile paving. from this we have undertaken RSA however a full RSA will be undertaken upon final completion at which point we will review.</p> <p>A tarmac ramp is put in place as anything else would not be suitable.</p>	<p>Cycling by Design does not appear to offer any guidance relevant to the issues highlighted. ESDG does offer guidance (including G& Priority Junction: Continuous Footways) which does not appear to have been followed in the design of at least some of the junctions. There appears to be a requirement for tactile paving for all junctions unless the expected traffic flows are very low. As noted previously, a RSA has already been conducted and this highlighted these issues but it would appear no changes to the design were made to address these concerns. Waiting for a further RSA will only result in a further delay in implementing any required mitigations. There are many examples of locations with paved ramps around the City which contradicts the statement that tarmac is the only option. The use of asphalt to merge the side street with the continuous footway especially where the side street is setted and/or in the World Heritage site is contrary to our reading of the guidance. Is the tarmac currently used on Gayfield Square a temporary surface or is this intended to be permanent.</p>

Issues raised during CCTT Site Walks with TTN team: TTN responses and CCTT comments

ItemNo	Issue	Description	Raised	Defect	TTN Response (210223)	CCTT Comments (conflicting views/interpretations in bold) (070423)
3	Floating Bus Stops	Clearly there are additional hazards for pedestrians using bus stops which require them to cross cycle paths especially where these are on downhill sections of road such as on Gayfield Place. We note that there are two planned crossing points at the bus stops and that these will be marked as being zebra crossings giving priority to pedestrians crossing the cycle path. As with the continuous pavements on side streets above it will be crucial to educate cyclists that pedestrians do have the right of way. We understand that cyclists using cycle paths are required to observe the speed limits for the adjacent road which along Leith Walk would mean 20mph. We consider that this speed would still be too high at these crossing points and that there should be a reduced speed limit and clear signage to alert cyclists to the fact that pedestrians including those who are partially sighted may be crossing the cycle path. We note that the use of the zig zags on the cycle paths has raised some concerns but without some form of traffic calming it is unlikely that the signs alone will be sufficient to control cyclist speeds at these critical crossing points. The latest Cycling by Design document (Section 3.10) provides guidance on this issue and suggests that actual or visual narrowing and rumble strips may be required to control cycle speeds in areas adjacent to bus stops.	NTBCC	No	<p>Tapers have been installed either side of floating bus stops as a visual and physical calming measure for cyclists approaching these as well as the raised white lines for zebra crossing.</p> <p>We are currently undertaking communications package to educate people on the use of these.</p>	The response does not address the concerns raised. We continue to have concerns about interactions between cyclists and pedestrians wishing to access or leave a bus stop. In particular is it possible to have a reduced speed limit for cyclists using cycle paths adjacent to bus stops or other pedestrian crossings? Also what is the project's view on the guidance contained within the Cycling by Design document?
4	Cycle Path @ Gayfield Square	Given that there is provision for a two way cycle path on the other side of Elm Row and that the cycle path on Gayfield Place is not connected to any other part of the cycle path network, consideration should be given to whether this small section of cycle path should be retained long term. It reduces the width of the footpath and creates additional risks for pedestrians using the busy bus stops along this section of roadway. When the planned review of the public realm on Elm Row is undertaken, the continued need for this cycle path should be reviewed.	NTBCC	NO	Noted - however this has been installed for potential future connections following discussions with Active Travel.	Noted
5	Public Realm Improvements at junction of London Road and Baxter's Place	We note that there will be a large increase in the amount of space available to pedestrians but that it is not clear whether any work will be undertaken to remove the step which runs through this space at present. We have previously highlighted concerns about this largely unmarked step including after one incident where a pedestrian was injured following a fall. Given the concerns already expressed about visually impaired pedestrians crossing continuous pavements on side streets, it is unacceptable for this hazard to remain. It should be removed by providing a continuous flat but sloping surface or failing that by some form of barrier (e.g. planters) to prevent future accidents. Given the size of this space, consideration should be given to some form of planting to soften the hard landscaping. Any work undertaken at this section of pavement should take account of the extensive cellars and in particular the existing electricity sub-station present here. Annick who is copied on this email can provide further clarification on this latter point if required.	NTBCC	No	<p>Unfortunately the step cannot be removed due to a number of reasons which have been highlighted. That being said following a review tactile paving will be installed top and bottom of this along with planters to form a barrier.</p> <p>The footpath heading north is over 4m in width from the edge of the step to the new segregated cycleway and follows the desire line for pedestrians looking to cross London Road.</p>	We note the stated restrictions in the design of this section of public realm and welcome the actions subsequently agreed to minimise the risks to pedestrians and in particular those with impaired vision or mobility. We will monitor the area once construction is completed to ensure that the key desire lines do not cross the retained step.

Issues raised during CCTT Site Walks with TTN team: TTN responses and CCTT comments

ItemNo	Issue	Description	Raised	Defect	TTN Response (210223)	CCTT Comments (conflicting views/interpretations in bold) (070423)
6	Floating Bus Stops	Floating bus stops are dangerous and unacceptable. EBUG is actively campaigning against these. They further reduce the footpath space.	LLCC	No	See item 3.	See above comments (3). The bus stop that concerns us especially is the one at the foot of the Walk (for buses travelling south). This is an incredibly busy stop and the number of people using it at any time is much greater than appears to have been catered for. Buses arrive at this stop almost continuously which means that passengers alighting and boarding are almost continuously crossing the cycle lane. Even when there no buses present, there is simply not enough room on the pavement (what's left of it) for all the passengers awaiting buses to stand, so they inevitably stand on the cycle path, blocking it for cyclists and leading to negative interactions all round.
7	Street Lighting	The lighting in multiple locations has been reported as being too bright along the entire route	LLCC	No	A review is being undertaken on this with CEC street lighting and any necessary changes will be made in due course.	Residents on Constitution Street are complaining.
8	Drainage	Ponding at pedestrian crossings along the route	LLCC	Yes	Any ponding has been raised as a defect and will be rectified in due course as part of our defect management process.	On road ponding near pavements must also be avoided to avoid
9	OLE Locations	Positioning of OLE has reduced the footpath width on Constitution Street	LLCC	No	We are aware of the concerns raised, however where possible we have tried to achieve footpath widths of 2m - 2.5m and never below the minimum of 1.5m.	We think there are stretches narrower than 1.5m
10	Pavement Space	Reduction in pavement space along the route, how does this comply with ESDG or transport hierarchy	LLCC	N/A	We have endeavoured to achieve footpath widths 2.5m or above and never below the minimum of 1.5m as per ESDG.	The 1.5m quoted from the ESDG is not intended to apply to new developments of the type like the Trams project especially on busy retail streets like Leith Walk and should be in response to specific constraints rather than due to the pressure of space for other transport groups which are intended to have lower priority according to ESDG and the Travel Hierarchy.
11	Tactile Paving	Perceived misalignments of tactile paving along the route and at pedestrian crossings		No	We have reviewed along the route and would like clarification of what the actual issue is as nothing has been picked up on site.	People with visual impairment who walked the route recently reported several deviations from approved practice, we still have to get details of where and what exactly.
12	Bernard Street Public Realm	A number of issues raised; - OLE Locations - BT box - tactile (dog leg) - Ped crossing ramps to steep	LLCC	No	Noted - all installed correctly and any issues with BT apparatus to be raised direct with them.	
13	Assembly Rooms Public Realm	Two step kerb around this entire area, possible trip hazard and 'poor' design	LLCC	No	This was installed as a solution for a number of factors, road level changes being the main one. The footpath could not be lowered to match due to utilities and residential entrances. We have made sure to keep above minimum footpath space and will review the area as part of our final RSA.	Dangerous for people with poor mobility and /or visual impairment.

Issues raised during CCTT Site Walks with TTN team: TTN responses and CCTT comments						
ItemNo	Issue	Description	Raised	Defect	TTN Response (210223)	CCTT Comments (conflicting views/interpretations in bold) (070423)
14	Street Lighting	Lack of lighting provided around Ocean Terminal	LHNCC	No	Current lighting levels have been raised and final design lighting has all been agreed with CEC street lighting and we are in the middle of finalising installation.	
15	Discovery Garden	Who will be maintaining the discovery garden going forward	LHNCC	N/A	Ocean Terminal.	
16	Bus Stops	Lothian continue to move bus stops and are not updating passengers, why can't CEC notify people and work with Lothian on this	LHNCC	N/A	Any queries relating to Lothian Busses need to be raised directly with them.	This is not Lothian's fault, it is CEC's fault. They need to inform Lothian of road closures and changes to bus stops earlier, so that Lothian can notify passengers adequately. They can't be expected to create notices for every stop instantaneously.
17	Landscaping and Trees	Issue with tree pits and types of trees, why can't these be properly planted and maintained as planters take up too much space. Also who will maintain going forward	LCCC	N/A	Due to shallow services along Leith Walk tree pits could not be installed and a review of planter locations is currently being undertaken. Any maintenance will be carried out by CEC.	Planters are very unpopular. They block the pavement and / or the cycle path and are perceived as ugly and likely to quickly become 'litter bins'. (Not surprising, since there are apparently NO actual litter bins). What budget has been set aside for the maintenance, periodic replanting, cleaning and graffiti removal? As noted elsewhere: there is not enough space on most stretches of Leith Walk pavement to allow comfortable pedestrian circulation. Some side streets <i>may</i> be suitable (perhaps to help hide bin hubs from view)
18	Eastward Travel	Lack of left turns from Leith Walk, why can't Brunswick be opened or London Road. London Road is a major route for vehicles accessing east of the city	LCCC	N/A	As part of the final design a number of left turns are available; Manderston Street Lorne Street Dalmeny Street Albert Street Brunswick Street is currently under review. London Road banned left turn was installed to allow a continuous crossing for pedestrians and cyclists along with the flow of public transport as per the transport hierarchy.	The rationale for closing the left hand turn from Leith Walk on to London Road was previously stated to be a response to the high forecast saturation levels being modelled at this junction. We suggest that the closure of the left hand turn will increase the volume of traffic using other left hand turns from Leith Walk resulting in more vehicles passing through the largely residential area north of London Road between Leith Walk and Easter Road. We have yet to see the modelling that was used to justify this change and assess the impact on other junctions especially around Picardy Place.

Issues raised during CCTT Site Walks with TTN team: TTN responses and CCTT comments						
ItemNo	Issue	Description	Raised	Defect	TTN Response (210223)	CCTT Comments (conflicting views/interpretations in bold) (070423)
19	Cycling Infrastructure	Multiple Issues raised; - Continuous footways need to have tactile paving - Ramps either side need to be steeper to slow vehicles down - Too many different styles of tactile paving around signalised crossings and cycle path - 25mm Segregation not enough	LCCC	No	<p>These have been designed in accordance with ESDG and Cycling by Design along with input from the Active Travel Forum throughout the design process.</p> <p>Additional signage will be installed during the initial opening of these to show new changes to layout and CEC are undertaking a communications campaign to highlight these changes and how they are to be navigated.</p> <p>We are well aware of the concerns raised and a full RSA will be undertaken upon final completion at which point we will review.</p>	<p>Continuous footways: see above comments (regarding ESDG and CbD); we also note that there is no <i>consistent design</i> (approach angles, routing of cycle path; "on-ramps" too shallow coming from Leith Walk or non-existing when exiting side streets) and total absence of permanent advisory signage (eg "left turns: cross continuous footway with care"); communication and "additional signage" upon opening where installed was late, ineffectual and never backed up by "soft enforcement" (targetted police patrols).</p> <p>In addition, poorly installed paving across some junctions has already failed (due to modelling not forecasting correct traffic volume and tonnage?), as well as elsewhere "thanks" to widespread pavement parking (including tactile paving); these are defects.</p> <p>Earlier RSAs have picked up some of the above but seem to</p>
20	Signage	Signage to make sure cyclists are slowing down for pedestrians around floating bus stops and along the route in general. Will a campaign be taking place on this	LCCC	N/A	Please see items 2 and 3 for information.	<p>This is not a signage issue, but one of floating bus stops and cycle paths that are wider than necessary. Where these have been introduced at very constrained and busy locations (eg just north of Pilrig Street), they cause conflict - even before yet to be installed bus <i>shelters</i> will alter sight-lines and behaviour - are very obviously out of place irrespective of any ESDG and CbD interpretative sophistry.</p>