



CYCLE PATH PRE-CONSULTATION RESPONSE 03/2018

INTRODUCTION

In February 2018 CEC published a pre-consultation questionnaire through Granton District Community Council. This is our initial response to the proposals.

The Wardie Bay Residents Association aims to represent the views of the 200+ households on Lower Granton Road. We were set up in opposition to plans of the 1980s and 90s to infill Wardie Bay and Granton East Harbour. We have since campaigned for better amenities for residents and investment in the public realm on this most central and attractive section of Edinburgh's Waterfront.

1. Generally, we support any proposal to improve space for pedestrians and cyclists on Lower Granton Road. However, having waited for decades for any meaningful investment in the public realm here, we have significant concerns about the scope and quality of this proposal which seems to be a quick fix rather than a long-term, holistic plan to provide suitable public realm for the Waterfront. For the reasons below we do not support this proposal in its current form.
2. We have strong concerns about the wisdom of spending on this project when it is likely that it will have to be ripped up in the event of either tram phase 3 going ahead (which we hope will happen) or if the section J-J1 of the Edinburgh Promenade goes ahead. This Promenade section was promised to happen between 2018 and 2027 (according to the Waterfront Design Code of 2008 which is published on the CEC website). If this cycleway project is considered to be section J-J1 of the Promenade we would question why it is not being designed in accordance with the code.
3. Residents have experienced 25 years of on/off funding and proposals for the much-needed realignment of Lower Granton Road. LGR was built in the 1850s and is now experiencing 12,000–14,000 vehicles a day which creates significant problems of amenity for both residents and visitors. It is disappointing therefore that when funds have become available they do not appear to be being used on improving facilities for residents. This scheme just skirts around the serious issues of LGR rather than tackling them in any meaningful way.



CYCLE PATH PRE-CONSULTATION RESPONSE 03/2018

4. We are disappointed that of the community aspirations set out in the "Sustrans Report: Captured Ideas from Community Engagement in Lower Granton Road" have been taken on board with these proposals. There is no attempt to address the other community aspirations and in fact this proposals will preclude many of them happening, particularly the realignment of the road.
5. Our greatest concern is that by its location the cycleway would prevent the long-standing aspiration to re-align Lower Granton Road in order to provide proper pavements widths, a car parking strip (for residents, visitors and deliveries) as well as sufficient carriageway width for two vehicles to pass safely. This aspiration was initiated by CEC in the 1990s and received funding in 2003 but only didn't go ahead due to the incompetent way that CEC managed Section 75 funds. It is the priority ambition of our community group and should be an aspiration of anyone who wants to see the most being made of Edinburgh's Waterfront.
6. We have strong concerns about the design quality of these proposals. This is one of the best sections of the Waterfront, it is close to high areas of population density and is the section closest to the City Centre. It has the potential to be so much more than is shown in this uninspiring proposal to just run a strip of tarmac down the middle of this space. There is no development of a sense of place as is recommended in Scottish Government guidance such as 'Designing Streets' or the CEC Prom Design Guide. Why is this project not being led by a landscape architect as is the case in other parts of the city? If the City is serious about investing in its Waterfront, then we would expect to see much greater levels of design aspiration.
7. The proposed tree planting to McKelvie Parade is unconvincing and the reference to the design being carried out by an officer 'who kindly put together some recommendations' only serves to illustrate the problem of not having a proper landscape architect. In any case the tree planting in front of houses or flats would be unwelcome due to loss of views. We suggest that trees could be planted in front of the St Columba's Hospice car park.
8. We are opposed to the use of excavated material and are not convinced this will work well, it would seem to create a difficulty for mowing and maintenance and seems to be a way of avoiding removal costs, rather than a part of an overall design strategy – and this comes back



CYCLE PATH PRE-CONSULTATION RESPONSE 03/2018

to point 6 about the lack of a landscape architect leading the design process. We wonder where the remainder of the excavated material will go.

9. If this goes ahead the low stone wall between the north LGR pavement and new cycle way should be removed to provide a unified area of public realm – although bollards must be put on the pavement edge as vehicles will drive/park on it otherwise.
10. We don't like the bollards on the cycle way at the junction with Wardie Beach entrance. Generally this area does not look well resolved and your designers do not appear to have resolved the problems created by level changes. The meeting of the cycle way with the impressive stone pier walls is awkward and unresolved. We suggest that cars should be prevented from parking in this area by relocating the bollards along the road edge.
11. We hope that the proposal to put a pedestrian crossing on LGR where it meets Granton Square is still going ahead. We would also like to see a raised table to Lonchinvar Drive as was shown on the earlier proposal.
12. We strongly oppose the proposal for benches with associated ramps at the entrance to the Wardie Beach. Benches would be of more use to the community on the beach itself, as would improvements to the beach entry including better and more bins, signage and a community notice board. There is still a strong community aspiration for CEC to provide the same level of management of Wardie as it does for other beaches in Edinburgh.
13. We oppose the benches also as it would mean some loss of the hedges and planting which are enjoyed by the community.
14. If we are to have bike racks, these would be better located at the beach entry where visitors to the beach can make use of them. How about providing some bike storage solutions for residents as part of this exercise?
15. We are concerned about waste management as this is an ongoing problem and we would suggest that as part of this scheme improved facilities are provided.



CYCLE PATH PRE-CONSULTATION RESPONSE 03/2018

16. Generally, we feel that this proposal lacks any sense of holistic, joined-up thinking. It carries with it no attempts to address the significant and long-recognised problems of LGR and does not provide the kind of public realm space worthy of this unique setting. It fails to comply with the principles of 'Designing Streets' with its primary focus on movement (of cycles) rather than developing a sense of Place. The awkwardly designed junction at the pier walls to Wardie Beach is a particular example of this.