

Tell us your views

We would welcome your views on all the questions below and on any other matters relating to the future of transport in Edinburgh that you think are important. Please attach additional sheets if you need more space.

Please send your responses (no stamp needed) by **24 February 2006** to:
Freepost SCO 4822
Local Transport Strategy
City of Edinburgh Council
1 Cockburn Street
EDINBURGH
EH1 0BR

Alternatively, you can email:
kim.hunton@edinburgh.gov.uk

We will treat all responses in confidence and any personal information will not be disclosed to any third parties without your consent.

Q1 Do you agree that the Council's overall aims for transport (on page 2 of this paper) are the right ones for the city? Is there anything you would add or subtract from these?

We broadly agree with these aims.

Q2 Are you supportive of the major infrastructure improvements being developed for the city? Are there other specific projects you think should be supported?

We support the delivery of Tram Line 1 and Tram Line 2. The Leith-Princes Street-Airport route will provide an important high-volume, high-quality, public transport spine across the city, augmenting the City's bus services.

We consider the development of a Tram Line 3 route from central Edinburgh-Cameron Toll-NRIE-Midlothian to be a high-priority scheme that CEC should be strongly advocating. We do not support the proposed eastwards alignment of TL3 after the NRIE (as previously proposed), and consider that Dalkeith or Penicuik would be more appropriate terminal stops for this tram route (Dalkeith is one of the largest Scottish population centres with no rail access).

We continue to be baffled by the low priority that CEC persists in giving to reopening of the Edinburgh South Suburban Railway (ESSR) to passenger services. The project would allow the reopening of a significant number of new rail stations within the city for a project cost low compared to e.g. the various tram proposals. This proposal has had endless consultants' reports conducted upon it, which have established, *inter alia*, a significant positive Benefit-Cost Ratio for the project. As there continues to be no progress on delivering the project despite significant political (Councillor and Executive-level) support for the project, we can only conclude that there is a specific prejudice against the project from within CEC's City Development Department. This consultation paper persists in propagating the lie that the ESSR project cannot be delivered because of rail capacity constraints between Waverley and Haymarket (page 4: "major capacity constraints on the rail network"). As a cursory consultation with First ScotRail would establish, there is available track capacity through this section of track as North Berwick-Haymarket trains already operate at peak hours through to Slateford (see Capital Rail Action Group's 'Crossrail 2' paper for a description of how to return passenger rail services to the ESSR).

We specifically oppose the current proposal for the Edinburgh Airport Rail Link (EARL), although we support the provision of heavy rail services to Edinburgh Airport. The process by which the current proposal has come about has been severely mishandled by the Scottish Executive. We shall be submitting evidence against the EARL project in the forthcoming Parliamentary Bill process.

We are very sceptical of any proposal for "bullet trains" between Edinburgh and Glasgow. We consider that reliability and line speed improvements could be made to the Edinburgh & Glasgow rail line at more appropriate cost, and that these should be taken forward as priority. We would however look more favourably at high-speed rail proposals between Edinburgh and Glasgow should they form part of a North-South high-speed line.

We specifically oppose proposals for a Second Forth Road Bridge. In the absence of a credible programme of road traffic demand management, which CEC no longer possesses following the collapse of the congestion charging proposals, the delivery of a second Queensferry road crossing would encourage car commuting into the City, damaging the environment and quality of life for Edinburgh residents.

Q3 What priority would you give to each of the following? (please tick one box only for each topic)

	Essential	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	No priority	Don't know
<i>Better bus services into the city centre</i>			*			
<i>Better bus services to other areas of the city</i>		*				
<i>In the city centre, make streets easier to cross and more pleasant for pedestrians</i>	*					
<i>Elsewhere in the city, make streets easier to cross and more pleasant for pedestrians</i>	*					
<i>Divert through traffic from city centre shopping streets</i>			*			
<i>Pedestrianise city centre streets</i>			*			
<i>More Park + Ride sites around the city</i>			*			
<i>Increased city centre parking</i>					*	
<i>Reduce air pollution</i>	*					
<i>More road space for cars</i>					*	
<i>Improve facilities for cyclists</i>		*				
<i>More 20 mph zones in residential areas</i>		*				
<i>Additional maintenance of roads</i>			*			
<i>Additional maintenance of pavements</i>		*				

Q4 Are there any other proposals that you think should have priority?

CEC should design and deliver travel awareness campaigns addressing the cultural issues around unsustainable levels of car use and car reliance, utilising the insights provided by analyses of transport psychology. Perhaps the most important lesson from the defeat in the congestion charging referendum is that significant change in the direction of sustainable transport is unlikely to be politically deliverable unless and until the public has a better appreciation of the need for change in transport use. We have serious doubts about CEC's ability to deliver any meaningful interventions to tackle the environmental and social impacts of transport in the absence of such measures; what we can be sure about is that a transport programme focussed principally on public transport infrastructure investment will not in itself be sufficient to address current unsustainable trends.

Q5 What do you think the city centre should look like in 5 years time?

The city should meet its statutory responsibilities to meet European air quality standards in order to protect the health of its residents. (Should it fail to do so, it will be open to legal challenge – which will certainly damage Edinburgh’s reputation as an attractive place to live.) Delivering air quality improvements will require reductions of traffic volumes on the most polluted streets.

The whole city should be safer and more attractive for users of the most sustainable, and most healthiest, modes of transport: walking and cycling. Many trips by this mode are deterred because of air pollution, noise pollution, and (real or perceived) road danger. The City should aim for these to become the normal mode of transport for journeys up to two miles in length (which form the majority of transport trips). In order to achieve this, action will have to be taken to make car users obey basic legislation on traffic speeds and driver behaviour.

Furthermore, action must also be taken to improve the quality of the City Centre streetscape / urban realm. Current implementation/maintenance/enforcement is poor compared with the likes of Glasgow or Dundee, and embarrassingly poor when compared to developments in, for example, Manchester.

Lastly, the city should have an operational high-quality tram line, with bus routes remodelled to take advantage of the higher capacity provided by the tram on key spine public transport routes.

Q6 What do you think the priorities should be for transport improvement in Edinburgh in the longer term?

In order to meet the UK Government's long-term target of reducing carbon emissions by 60% by 2050, action will have to begin now – as part of a longer-term programme – of meeting this target. It is not acceptable to further defer action.

Q7 Are there any other matters you would like to raise in relation to the Local Transport Strategy?

The further threats posed to Edinburgh's environment by the increasing uptake in the purchase and use of SUVs.

Increasing awareness of issues around oil depletion (/ 'Peak Oil'). See e.g. Depletion Scotland for more information.

It would be most helpful if you could let us know whether you are replying to this paper as an individual, or representing a business, organisation or group.

Individual

Retail

Office

Other business

Community Council

Community Group

Interest group *

Other

If **Other** please indicate: _____

THANK YOU for taking the time to respond to this consultation.

Please return it by email or by post to the address at the beginning of the questionnaire, **by 24th February 2006**.