

## **Response to comments raised during the consultation period – East Fettes Avenue – new pedestrian crossing facilities**

### **Q1. Why are crossing facilities being constructed, there is no need for them?**

A request was made to the Road Safety team for pedestrian crossing facilities at the location and when surveyed, the results met the criteria approved by the Council's Transport Infrastructure and Environment Committee on 28 July 2009 for a pedestrian refuge island.

### **Q2. Can the location of the crossing be further to the north, in line with the pedestrian entrance/exit to the school?**

The design brief discussed for this project was to meet the 'desire line' of the southern pedestrian access/egress to Inverleith Park and the school. This was to be a main feature of the island's location and has an influence on the best location for the crossing point. The proposed design is a simpler, compliant and safer location to construct a crossing point.

### **Q3. Access to the school should be prioritised over entrance to the park?**

A request to consider crossing facilities at this location was received after the survey was undertaken. Consideration was given to this location but not was not supported over the proposed design (see Q4).

### **Q4. Can there be two islands; one opposite the school entrance and one opposite the park entrance?**

Consideration was given to providing an additional crossing point where the footway from the school meets East Fettes Avenue. However, should there be a pedestrian crossing located here its arrangement would cause conflict with the required movement of the 'right turn' lane with insufficient space available to do so without removing the right turn as well as a requirement to remove significant number of parking spaces on both sides of the carriageway to accommodate a pedestrian refuge island.

### **Q5. Can the crossing be located midway between the school exit and Carrington Road?**

This is too far away from the desire line or trip generators which met the criteria for a crossing.

### **Q6. Can the type of crossing be a zebra, puffin or toucan? Bleeper/rotating cone? Waiting pedestrians may block pavement?**

The base data which is used to assess if a location is suitable for a crossing is known as the PV<sup>2</sup> value. This is a nationally recognised value that indicates the number of passing vehicles and pedestrians. Pedestrian and vehicle counts are taken over the peak hours of a week day between both 7am to 10am and 3pm to 6pm, and avoid any school holidays or other factors which may skew results.

This base PV<sup>2</sup> value is then adjusted to take account of local factors such as the age of those crossing, the composition of passing traffic, the number of pedestrian incidents and the number of trip attractors such as schools, doctors' surgeries, shops etc.

A location with an adjusted PV<sup>2</sup> value of 1 or higher (2 or higher on a dual carriageway) would be considered for a puffin crossing, locations with a value of 0.3 or higher would be considered for a suite of measures that includes a zebra crossing, a refuge island or pavement build-outs. If a very low PV<sup>2</sup> value is achieved no additional crossing facilities may be recommended.

This location resulted in an adjusted PV<sup>2</sup> value of 0.504, meeting the criteria for a pedestrian refuge island.

**Q7. Can the design encompass build-outs, a raised table or a single stage crossing and cycling facilities?**

The design follows a Council standard for pedestrian refuge islands; the suggested amendments to the proposed design will be investigated in the detailed design phase.

**Q8. Can you remove rather than extend the guardrail?**

The provision of additional guardrail and dropped crossing point with tactile paving across the vehicular access to the school, will provide for a safer route for pedestrians to follow to the crossing point.

**Q9. Can a crossing be located in Carrington Road/Fettes Avenue?**

This is out with the scope of scheme. However, proposed designs for Cycling and walking improvements on Carrington Road were consulted upon in October/November 2016 which encompasses alteration to this junction. Details of the proposal and consultation can be found at

<https://consultationhub.edinburgh.gov.uk/sfc/design-cycle-walk-carrington-road/>

**Q10. Can single yellow lines be used instead of double yellow lines?**

Double yellow lines provide protection for the crossing area 24/7, to maintain sightlines for pedestrians and approaching drivers.

**Q11. Extend double yellow lines/ensure no gaps in restrictions about island?**

This will be investigated in the detailed design phase.

**Q12. Will additional parking spaces be made available elsewhere in respect of those lost at the crossing point?**

It is Council policy to prioritise pedestrian movement; the provision of a pedestrian island is to facilitate crossing and enhance accessibility to the park. As there are no specific parking or loading spaces being removed, the loss of general parking spaces can be accommodated without providing alternatives.