

| Q4. Considering the information provided, please use the space below for any comments or suggestions relating to the proposed street layout. | Q5. Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions relating to development of the island site. | Response ID | Submitted Date |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| | | ANON-8G9D-FCWG-3 | 2017-11-17 18:22:50 |
| <p>Where has the taxi rank at the Playhouse been moved too, taxis are part of public transport as well. But once again they are an afterthought and treated as such by the council.</p> | <p>How about incorporating a taxi rank</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCWQ-D | 2017-11-17 18:35:47 |
| <p>I can not see how any of the ideas floated, other than the Sustrans one, are getting serious consideration.</p> <p>the gyratory proposed is a throwback to the 70s, around Europe these are being removed, yet CEC seem wedded to the car and bow down to it at all times.</p> <p>please whatever you do, let it pass the "yes, I would like my 12 year old child cycle though it" test.</p> | <p>horrific. all about cars. I fail to see how I would cycle up Broughton and onwards to Leith St without numerous stops, while I wait for the cars to allow me to pass. Not fit for purpose.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCW3-F | 2017-11-17 18:44:44 |
| <p>Will there be traffic lights to regulate the flow of traffic onto the triangle? Would be useful to be able to have lights that can be turned off/on to help flow?</p> | <p>Should be a strictly public and non-commercial to all enjoy regardless of ability to pay, not mixed development. It would be great if it were host to temporary public art commissions that utilise the whole island and change its form and function (aka Fourth Plinth in London). Could be programmed by the Collective Gallery up on Calton Hill and change 3-4 times per year. Funding could be through city tourist tax and taxes levied on the new St James shopping centre (both owe the city something like this). If it were to be permanent, provided it was suitably fenced off from the traffic, it could be an ideal place for an urban beach style children's playground. Makes good use of its island status. There aren't any good playgrounds in the area, nearest is West End of Princes' St. or East end of Montgomery Street (which is in a shocking state of disrepair). Either way, a bold statement would be to NOT have a Costa Coffee kiosk in the island.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCWM-9 | 2017-11-17 19:14:25 |
| <p>It's a hideous idea. The whole thing is car dominated. This could be a lovely area if the space was for all people, not just those who drive.</p> <p>The central area will be unpleasant with all those lanes of traffic .</p> <p>Bite the bullet and make it people and bike friendly NOW. don't wait to narrow it some time in the never never.</p> | <p>The island look horrible. Don't create it.</p> <p>If you do, make it a park.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCWR-E | 2017-11-17 19:57:14 |
| <p>I know i might be talking nonsense and over budget and not in plan at all but the best way is to build tunnel crossing for pedestrians and this way it will be a more open and less. Clutter. Can really comment on the plan as need to see a virtual representation with cars and bicycle simulation.</p> | <p>Rent it out for any commercial company to use it like a petrol station or. Mcdonald to finance my under tunnel idea the use the money for other work for the council.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCWD-Z | 2017-11-17 20:13:18 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>almost a motorway - 4 lanes of traffic to reach the central island - which will be extremely noisy and unpleasant because of the traffic.</p> <p>Pedestrians travelling between the Omni centre and Tesco need to cross two busy roads still.</p> <p>Pedestrians need to cross the segregated cycle lanes to get anywhere, which will lead to conflict, and having these lanes will cause drivers to be abusive or drive dangerously around cyclists using the road, as many drivers incorrectly think that cyclists shouldn't be on the road if there is a cycle lane present.</p> <p>Cyclists are likely to go from the road to the cycle lane to skip the lights, which will annoy motorists, and may cause conflict with pedestrians - particularly at the south tip of the island; cyclists heading from Leith to Princes Street.</p> <p>Drivers - and this includes local busses - are forced to wait at either 1 or 2 sets of traffic lights now.</p> <p>Suggested improvements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No road in front of the cathedral - this would remove the central island and make it a usable space. A segregated or shared use cycle lane could link Leith Street and York Place where the road currently is 2. One lane of traffic in each direction on the remaining two sides of the island to allow the pavement to be widened and bus stops to be carved out from the pavement 3. Following on from 2, bus stops could be cut into the pavement, to allow traffic to flow while busses are stopped. <p>In summary, the city centre should not be somewhere that should attract private car drivers - this is what the bypass was built for. I understand that the road layout needs to be able to allow traffic to flow, but building what is essentially a motorway around an island in the middle will only cause more traffic. I would be interested to find out how the volume of traffic travelling through the East end of the city centre has changed with the recent Leith</p> <p>More trees are great, the Sustrans idea is the best. tired of pandering to motorist who think they have the right to drive any where, I drive a car and van by the way, but ride a bike around town . thanks</p> <p>The dedicated cycleways appear to be inadequate, particularly from the York Place approach.</p> | <p>The island is just that - an island. In the current proposal, it's an island in a sea of vehicles, and will be noisy and polluted.</p> <p>In the current proposal I cannot see any significant use for the space - ideally I would like to see it used in a similar way to Jubilee Gardens in Stockbridge, where the Stockbridge market is - however as I said, the island will be noisy and polluted, and being an island, it will be difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to reach comfortably.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCWH-4</p> | <p>2017-11-17 20:32:01</p> |
| | <p>Trees, and grass, they soak up pollution and look better than anything else.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCWC-Y</p> | <p>2017-11-17 20:41:00</p> |
| | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCYP-E</p> | <p>2017-11-17 22:54:23</p> |
| <p>It needs a better connected cycleway at the front of the cathedral - it's too fragmented. In addition, the pollution claims seem dubious about other suggestions. I would recommend the suggestion from Zone Architects - it seems like a good balance. I would have liked this to be consulted on too, not just the sustrans alternative. Walkingcycling shouldn't be a second thought, it should be our first thought for what we plan for.</p> | <p>I would suggest green space given the three lanes of traffic which surround it. You have two massive shopping centres nearby, let's at least do something sensible with it. It's an entrance to the city centre, so plonking more retail there is madness.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCY6-M</p> | <p>2017-11-18 08:35:41</p> |
| <p>The design should not be based on an island, but a T or Y junction</p> | <p>The island concept was, I understand, required for the St James hotel which is no longer needed. The logic of having an island at all has therefore gone. If there will be extensive public consultation "of course" on the use of an island site, why is there not extensive public consultation about whether to have an island site at all?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCYV-M</p> | <p>2017-11-18 08:57:31</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| Three three lane streets would only encourage driving in the area, increasing noise and air pollution. Would seem like walking and cycling space is an after thought. Would like to see more space for public transport. | Will probably be useless as it's quite small and have to cross three lanes of traffic to get there. Noise from traffic that's just feet away would ruin any potential atmosphere. Will probably just get filled with trees. | ANON-8G9D-FCYJ-8 | 2017-11-18 09:14:46 |
| It still looks like a multilane roundabout where motor traffic is prioritised especially on Leith St. I like the addition of the cycle lane. How does that cycle lane continue, in particular at the southern end of Leith St. | | | |
| How do people get into the central island? | | | |
| Is there an option to have a tram go south along Leith St in the future? | I would like to see an open square and public transport hub. | ANON-8G9D-FCYQ-F | 2017-11-18 09:18:12 |
| Not good, this could be a great public space served by public transport and buses. Instead a giant roundabout has been created which will encourage more traffic in the area. | | | |
| Make this Junction as difficult for cars and best for pedestrians, trams and cars. | | | |
| I certainly would not enjoy walking in this area, far too many roads to cross. | A public plaza, however this should be connected to the pavement outside omni otherwise it will just be deserted. Who would want to sit in a square in the middle of a toxic roundabout? | ANON-8G9D-FCYK-9 | 2017-11-18 09:19:04 |
| Too much traffic | Use for greenery/sculpture | ANON-8G9D-FCY3-H | 2017-11-18 09:27:51 |
| I cannot understand if I can turn right directly from Broughton St onto York place, this is key for me as it is a nightmare going in a big circle the wrong way with loads of traffic lights to get to it. I do not like that to walk from Picardy place to the Omni looks like it has 4 separate crossing areas, presumably all with traffic lights so will take ages , there should be 2 only crossing both the road and tram lines at once. Or even better , a bridge or underground crossing so there is no road crossing. I don't think this design is very pedestrian friendly to be honest. Lots of stoping and waiting to get anywhere. I don't think this design makes it clear enough where there are traffic lights. | I'd get rid of it and make the roads wider. The design looks like it risks people hitting each other trying to change lanes in a busy area as it is, better use all the space for transit rather than buildings surrounded on all sides by roads. | ANON-8G9D-FCYT-J | 2017-11-18 10:10:34 |
| It's not clear to me as a cyclist how one would get to Leith Street from Broughton Street. It would be useful to have route illustrations. | | | |
| In general the approach looks good but it's disappointing that so much car traffic needs to be accommodated (I'm not disagreeing that it does, though). | | ANON-8G9D-FCYH-6 | 2017-11-18 10:14:17 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>This is a terrible for Edinburgh. Creating an island surrounded by road traffic already is in place in Scotland. George Square in Glasgow and is bigger yet is widely regarded as a poor place for pedestrians. It is very underused which is opposed to Buchanan Street, pedestrianised and very busy with shoppers.</p> <p>The statement "as more people move to active travel" is quite simply wrong. To use an analogy, more people will swim even though we won't take the sharks away! What evidence do you have that no one else has to suggest that people will take up active travel without the facility. This design will make people feel very unsafe in a hostile environment and quite simply active travel will not increase unless you start to prioritise it over private car travel.</p> <p>Although the Sustrans design is not perfect it is much better than this design. It is not an excuse to say traffic will be displaced onto side streets. That is your responsibility to ensure that does not happen. Quite simply by designing this out, making streets one way, speed cameras, no through routes for example.</p> | <p>An island should not be created. This space in front of St Mary's Cathedral should be pedestrianised. It would suggest that the design on layout is already made by asking this question.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCYS-H</p> | <p>2017-11-18 10:29:57</p> |
| <p>Your theory is backwards. More people will not switch to active travel on a road where you have prioritised motor vehicles. The council has to be the instigators of this change. These plans do not go nearly far enough in supporting active travel. The proposed gyratory is like something from 1960's. There is still a huge amount of wasted space which will be just as useless as the present layout. The proposed cycle lanes are far from ideal and will not encourage new cyclists, they hardly support existing cyclists. Why are there so many places where pedestrians and cyclists have to mix, right next to busy junctions, made busier by your proposals. I urge you to remove the gyratory proposal entirely, and look at a T-junction or proposal more like the Sustrans one shown here. Your basic argument against that proposal is that it will cause congestion. We have to make a massive cultural change here, causing congestion and discouraging car use is a positive step. I repeat, people will not turn to active travel while taking the car is easier! You have to force this change. By changing the proposal to a heavily pedestrianised area with fully segregated cycle lanes on both sides which link easily to the Leith Walk lanes, people won't want to bring their cars. They will take the bus or tram to the city centre, or if like me they live within a few miles, they will cycle or walk. This will never happen if you go ahead with the current proposal. CEC cannot continue to bleat on about supporting active travel while they make decisions which are so clearly against active travel and in favour of the car, a mode of transport which is polluting, dangerous and horribly outdated. Be brave, bold and visionary. Do not be cowed by motorists who have no idea how much better their lives would be if they left the car at home. You have to force people out of their cars, but once they are out, they'll thank you for it. You must use this space to make the change this city needs and deserves. We are a great city, but we could be incredible, and join the cities around the world which are finally putting people above cars.</p> | <p>It's an absolute waste in its proposed form, and whatever you put there will only cause problems as drivers will disregard any rules to park there, while cyclists and pedestrians find it entirely inaccessible. Change the design to create a space contiguous with the rest of the pedestrian area. A space which will genuinely be of value to the people of Edinburgh. Make sure there are places to sit and to lick bikes. Since there will be less road, there will be less traffic, and so it will be a pleasant environment for people to walk, cycle or sit and socialise. A three lane gyratory would make whatever you intend to put here dirty, noisy and wholly unappealing.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCYB-Z</p> | <p>2017-11-18 10:40:25</p> |
| <p>Looks incredibly dangerous for pedestrians. Especially disabled people. Shared paths here will definitely cause accidents as cyclists are already a liability here when it is extremely busy.</p> | <p>Makes it smaller and use the space to make segregated cycle lanes to keep pedestrians safe.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCYN-C</p> | <p>2017-11-18 10:41:17</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The overall layout seems adequate, but I would like wider payments around the site and in front of the cathedral, and front of picardy place, as the foot traffic in this area is high.</p> | <p>The mixed-development idea would be a terrible use of the space. There will already be plenty of commercial and retail space as part of the St James development. What is desperately needed in the area is some open space, similar to the St Andrews square area. An area that can be used flexibly to hold weekly markets, craft fairs, Christmas markets etc -especially given that the area currently used for such events in front of St Marys cathedral will be lost.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCYR-G</p> | <p>2017-11-18 10:44:17</p> |
| <p>best and will ignore anything which demonstrates that there are better ways to redo the streets in this area. Instead of moving forwards it intends to move backwards.</p> <p>It is clear from the drawing dated 2009 in the documentation that the Council has always intended to put a 1970s style roundabout here and it clearly has not deviated from that intention for a minute. It may have proposed minor variations, but it has not budged on the actual issue which is the roundabout. By the way, while road building bods may talk of gyratory systems in plain English they are roundabouts.</p> <p>Several far better proposals have been put forward, but the Council have ignored them.</p> <p>These proposals revolved around the transport hierarchy which the Council claims to follow but, as these 1970s proposals demonstrate, are ignoring. Edinburgh should be promoting 21st Century solutions, based around walking cycling and public transport, with most motorists at the bottom of the list. Instead it is promoting increased car use, as the large number of extra parking spaces in the new "development" illustrates neatly.</p> <p>These plans are a throwback to the plans to destroy Edinburgh with ring roads and the like. Fortunately that nonsense was stopped before too much damage was caused, though steaming piles of poo like the Calder Road and the Bristo Place roundabout/Potterrow show the mess the Council intended to create in Edinburgh. The Council clearly hasn't learnt from these mistakes and intends to do the same thing in Picardy Place.</p> <p>No doubt Council bods have their fingers in their ears, are singing la la la loudly and claim they can't hear any objections to their 1970s proposals.</p> <p>Interestingly enough it was the Council itself which demonstrated that these 1970s roundabouts are not sacrosanct. West Maitland street was part of one It is too focused on car infrastructure, focus should be put on making it an attractive space for pedestrians.</p> | <p>A space marooned in the middle of a large roundabout is never going to be of any great value to people. In true 1970s style I assume you intend people to reach this place by windswept footbridges or crime infested subways. People certainly won't want to cross three lanes of traffic to get to it, that is unpleasant as demonstrated by several such places in Edinburgh. If you really want to make use of the space then you need to drop your roundabout. Until you do that your claims of wanting to use the space are patently bogus. With the roundabout removed there are are options around providing pleasant access to the space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCY2-G</p> | <p>2017-11-18 11:32:04</p> |
| | <p>Public square/ garden</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2E-V</p> | <p>2017-11-18 11:41:34</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Pedestrian access from Broughton Street to Leith Street and St James Quarter seems very poor. Should a bridge or underpass not be considered to remove pedestrians from having to dodge traffic and bikes between islands or wait for hours for traffic light changes which are bound to be long on a junction of this design.</p> <p>Also looks like there is little space for vehicles turning North from Broughton Street into Leith Walk. This may well make vehicles more likely to "rat run" through East London St, Annandale Street and Bellevue area.</p> <p>Loss of space in front of Cathedral is also to be regretted. Space in an island in the middle of a busy junction is hardly an improvement.</p> | <p>An open green site with extensive planting would at least be a small contribution to reducing pollution. Certainly don't want even more buildings on it.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2G-X</p> | <p>2017-11-18 12:04:54</p> |
| <p>have you forgot about taxis and crossings or have you decided to remove them both?</p> | <p>make it a roundabout with lights</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2V-D</p> | <p>2017-11-18 12:14:28</p> |
| <p>going to city centre also be added in front of Omni, and not further up leith street, where it's so narrow that pedestrians need to fight for space? Also then I don't see how a dedicated cycle lane would fit.</p> <p>We need cycle lanes that are segregated ad safe to use, going both ways. Current proposals show a cycle lane only on east side of the street, and on the west side it leads to Queen street only. How many cyclists travel from Leith street to Queen street? Nobody. If I want to get to new town from Princess street, I use Princes street and George street not Leith street. If the cycling lane to Leith walk only exists on the east side of leith st, how will cyclists join and exit such a lane, coming from East end of Princes st? Also, there's no provision of segregated cycle lane from Picardy Place. Cyclists always use the fastest, straightest route. They will then choose to stay with general traffic on road, making the whole idea of east side of pavement used for cycling both ways redundant. Bear in mind this is downhill, so cyclist will have considerable speed - when I go back home through the current roundabout, I have the same speed as cars and buses, however cycling which includes stops at roundabout to let traffic though result in mismatch between my speed on bike when I accelerate and that of the cars accelerating around me.</p> <p>The general feel for traffic is that the roundabout function is preserved, not changed. The Sustrans option is better - as most traffic going downhill from Leith st simply travels straight down to Leith walk - how is this going to lead to increased delays and queues? It is simply a straight road, looks and feels much better. Similarly buses and cars coming from London rd and Leith walk and into Queen street have a simpler, faster, straight line of traffic - again much better. Current proposal does not have less lines of traffic than Sustrans option of less complicated travel lines.</p> <p>Please remember that this junction is being used by pedestrians a lot, and it has to offer enough space for pedestrians to feel like they can walk to Omni</p> | <p>if this goes ahead and such an island is created, it should be fully green - trees, plants, flowers, benches for people to sit, not another building. Current proposal takes away geenery from in front of cathedral and by Conan Doyle statue - o this should be replaced in the middle. We do not need more retail space. there's plenty of unused, unrented space in the Omni centre. There'l be loads of new retail in the new st. james'. People need nature, give us more trees - but not in pots as on Leith Walk - these are very sad looking. Real earth, grass, trees, flowers, maybe add some bike parking - current bike racks in front of Omni are always full and there's not enough in front of the entrance to John Lewis, and zero in front of Tesco.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2P-7</p> | <p>2017-11-18 12:29:30</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>in Europe and indeed deserves to be one, rivalling any European capital city. Yet the proposed design is still a motorway-style 3-lane gyratory, prioritising cars over people. Such a design is completely inappropriate for a city-centre location.</p> <p>In Europe and around the world they are busy converting city-centre space previously given over to private motor cars to fine pedestrian plazas and piazzas. In New York, Times Square has been transformed, as has the bay area in San Francisco and many other US cities. Seville, Paris, Copenhagen, Oslo, Amsterdam, Helsinki, even Bogota (the list is endless) are all removing cars from their city centres. The reason: when you create people-orientated spaces, more people will come, people stay for longer and they spend more money - it is good for business. These cities vie to attract talented young entrepreneurs, students and workers and they do so by making them pleasant and attractive places to live.</p> <p>The designers claim that traffic modelling means that the proposed junction will be free-flowing and therefore won't need bus lanes. However, the traffic models are flawed, as they do not take into account induced-demand, nor its opposite counterpart, traffic-evaporation. In practice, such a junction will draw new motor traffic into the area until the system reaches saturation. There will be 3 lanes of stationary traffic, the junctions will get blocked and buses won't be able to move. Vans, coaches and pizza delivery vehicles will be parked all over the bike lanes and pavements, as they do today.</p> <p>To suggest that the traffic lanes could be reduced in future "as people switch to active transport" is a complete nonsense. People switch to active or public transport when convenient, pleasant and safe infrastructure is provide for them "in the first place", not the other way around.</p> <p>The bus/tram interchange involves crossing multiple lanes of traffic and a substantial walk from the southern Leith St bus stops. This will be slow,</p> | <p>Picardy Place should become one of the finest pedestrian plazas in Europe and indeed deserves to be one, rivalling any European capital city. The central triangle should connect seamlessly to either the Omni Centre pavement or the pavement beside the existing Paolozzi statues. i.e not a gyratory.</p> <p>In Europe and around the world they are busy converting city-centre space previously given over to private motor cars to fine pedestrian plazas and piazzas. In New York, Times Square has been transformed, as has the bay area in San Francisco and many other US cities. Seville, Paris, Copenhagen, Oslo, Amsterdam, Helsinki, even Bogota (the list is endless) are all removing cars from their city centres. The reason: when you create people-orientated spaces, more people will come, people stay for longer and they spend more money - it is good for business. These cities vie to attract talented young entrepreneurs, students and workers and they do so by making them pleasant and attractive places to live.</p> <p>As long as the island is left as island, any developments within it will fail: One only needs to stand in the middle of the existing roundabout to see just how unpleasant the proposed scheme will be for pedestrians. There will be noise and fumes belching from 3 lanes of motors. No one will want to linger, sit in cafes, nor spend money on the edges of a "desert island" hotel/shops, surrounded by a moat of deadly motor traffic.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2Q-8</p> | <p>2017-11-18 12:32:10</p> |
| <p>The new island site will be stranded in a gyratory system. That would so obviously be regressive and send a dreadful message about the city's inability to prioritise its public realm. The council should work with the Sustrans led design and reject the island site.</p> | <p>I have no qualms about the development opportunity this new site brings (so long as its design is handled by a good architect and not done in the dead hand of the obvious ubiquitous Edinburgh practice) - but vehicles would be relegated to two side only leaving the west side for pedestrians and cyclists - come on!</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2M-4</p> | <p>2017-11-18 12:50:10</p> |
| <p>The new layout is a significant improvement on that proposed by Sustrans. It is nice to see that the council is - for once - not capitulating to an undemocratic, unelected organisation whose job is to frustrate the citizens of this city who have no choice but to drive or use public transport over active travel. There is still room for improvement on the new layout - the compromise looks set to ultimately please no one. It will still cause delays due to the reduction in traffic lanes.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2B-S</p> | <p>2017-11-18 13:40:36</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I refer to the following benefits claimed above 'The junction ensures the tram stop site is properly aligned for any extension, and has good pedestrian access and links to other public transport. The new layout will allow an effective tram-bus interchange and will allow buses to turn back. The creation of a new bus stop outside the cathedral will provide better access to the St James Quarter as well as the tram.'</p> <p>This is nonsense. There is only one bus stop near the tram, which serves only buses coming from Princes St or North Bridge; useless for a journey in the other direction. It also requires a road to be crossed. What is the benefit of buses turning back? I can think of no circumstances in which this would be required without wrecking Edinburgh's bus network.</p> | <p>I understood that there were no plans now to develop the site. Why is this introduced at this stage?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC24-B</p> | <p>2017-11-18 14:04:04</p> |
| <p>There is one area of the proposed layout which serves neither the needs of pedestrians nor vehicles! At the north-east corner, where Picardy Place meets Union Place. Let's be clear: that is where all traffic destined to the north and east of the city needs to flow, yet it allows for only 1 lane, which is barely sufficient to cope with buses, let alone other vehicles. This is caused by the astonishing introduction of a mini-island in the middle of the road. As a pedestrian it is infuriating to find councils building "unfair" obstacles to crossing a road and the island would force a staggered pedestrian crossing from the main central island to Picardy Place (east end). No sir, it does not improve pedestrian safety because some pedestrians when faced with a pointless obstacle will often walk around it in the street rather than wait for 2 changes of traffic signals to cross a single street. Changes proposed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove mini-island at NE corner 2. Increase lanes for northbound traffic to 2 3. a) Replace the staggered pedestrian crossing with a single direct crossing... <p>OR if unfeasible...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> b) Remove the pedestrian crossing entirely as there is already one to Picardy Place on the west end of the platform, and the central island / tram stop would still be accessible via 4 pedestrian crossings <p>I offer my views as a bus/tram user and as a vehicle owner, while my envisaged use of this area would be primarily as a pedestrian walking to/from my home in the suburbs off Leith Walk.</p> | <p>1) I would love to see a fountain as it's central focal point, with it's stone ledge provide seating. It would need to be cleverly designed to avoid people being drenched in gusty winds in winter. How about a "light fountain", instead of a "water fountain" i.e. a sculptural formation based on a fountain shape, but spraying light rather than water? It would be amazing at night. 2) As a core transport hub, it would be a designated meeting place for people to make contact before socialising or shopping nearby. It needs many park benches. Minimal commercial use - at most a small police-box style kiosk.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC2K-2</p> | <p>2017-11-18 14:34:48</p> |
| <p>Please consider pedestrians and cyclists in this development as it's currently an up and coming area. An increase in the volume of traffic may well prove detrimental to this...</p> | <p>Surely developing the island site will require pedestrian crossings which will hinder the smooth flow of traffic in this area! If you intend to develop the site for pedestrian use, I would recommend pedestrianising the entire area.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC22-9</p> | <p>2017-11-18 14:57:05</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>This proposal is much better than the original, which was a nightmarish return to failed 1960s planning.</p> <p>The routing of cars through the junctions seems much more intuitive than the current configuration.</p> <p>Connections between Leith walk cycleway and the cycleway heading up Leith street is excellent. However this will only be useful if the cycleway up Leith street is actually built.</p> <p>Placing the tram stop inside the triangular public space might lead to people actually using that space, although it still appears as though it will be a noisy traffic island surrounded by motor fumes. It is hard to imagine this as a compelling public space.</p> <p>North South connections for pedestrians and cyclists are still not great. If you are not in a car you need to cross multiple times through multiple light signals.</p> <p>The rationale for rejecting the "Y" layouts is that they will cause traffic queues. However, the purpose of making the city pedestrian and cycle friendly is to reduce the number of cars. The Y layouts are much better for placemaking and active travel.</p> <p>So overall the design has certainly improved but it still resembles a large gyratory and makes moving from Broughton street to the Omni Centre tedious for pedestrians and cyclists. The design seems aimed to satisfy drivers who come from out of town for shopping rather than people who actually live in Edinburgh. It is certainly better than what we have now and what was first proposed but this still feels like a missed opportunity.</p> | <p>It would be useful to preserve some public space adjacent to the planned tram stop.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCF8-3</p> | <p>2017-11-18 17:13:16</p> |
| <p>This is at best a marginal improvement on the last proposal. If the Council is serious about increasing active travel and making the city centre a more friendly environment for pedestrians and cyclists then it should urgently reconsider the latest proposals from Sustrans (rather than the older proposal which this consultation dismisses) See http://www.sustrans.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/files/Ideas%20for%20Picardy%20Place%20DL.pdf</p> | <p>The island site, bounded on all sides by multiple lanes of traffic, will not be a desirable place to walk to or through. The design should be changed to integrate this area with the St James.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCFQ-V</p> | <p>2017-11-18 17:47:23</p> |
| <p>The Sustrans layout is much better plan, promotes active transport and prevents the area turning into a mini motorway</p> | <p>It's very inconvenient to get to and in the middle of a busy junction it would be better not to have the island at all</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCFB-D</p> | <p>2017-11-18 18:37:14</p> |
| <p>1) the new bus stop is a terrible idea because buses will have to stop and unload all passengers, leading to possible tailbacks and gridlock on Leith street, the swing out across three lanes of traffic to get to the single right turning lane, leading to possible tailbacks and gridlock. Even when there is a bus pull-in, the sheer number of buses utilising Picardy place mean that if there are more than two buses arriving at the same time, the third (fourth, or even fifth) bus sticks out into the left lane making it unusable. Buses going through Picardy place should have staggered stops and not be required to immediately pull across three lanes of traffic. A far more sensible idea is a bus lane straight across the proposed triangle with a bus stop in the middle.</p> <p>2) Picardy place is a terrible location for a tram stop. Yes, it makes sense in terms of pedestrians going to the Omni, but if pedestrians are better able to cross the site, the York place stop is sufficient. If necessary, another stop on the Leith Walk side could be added. The tram will cause long delays at the intersections causing gridlock.</p> | <p>Remove the island and put in a bus lane with strong pedestrian links on all sides. This removes buses from the general traffic, making it move faster leading to lower emissions. It might even be able to be combined with the tram stop. the goal should be to segregate not just bicycles, but also buses and trams from general traffic. (And not bus lanes, those never work, a full bus-only mini-Road.) the buses will move faster and block less traffic meaning general traffic moves faster, leading to lower emissions.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCFF-H</p> | <p>2017-11-18 18:42:54</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I prefer the Sustrans suggestion of T-junction because it will create a better environment.</p> <p>The three-lane one-way system roundabout you are promoting here will encourage motor traffic to drive too fast in attempt to get through traffic lights at green.</p> <p>The island in the middle is too isolated and not easily accessible for people to use.</p> <p>A T-junction would be more friendly to people on foot.</p> <p>Anything that slows down motor traffic and causes congestion of motor vehicles is a good thing as it discourages people from driving private cars and encourages use of public transport and walking.</p> <p>This three-lane roundabout will be noisy and smelly with traffic fumes.</p> | <p>Can't imagine people will be bothered to wait at light-controlled pedestrian crossings to access an island that leads to nowhere except another light-controlled pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>People don't want to be corralled like cattle into areas designed around the needs of motor traffic. This will cause frustration and disaffection.</p> <p>The Sustrans idea of a T-junction is much better.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCF2-W | 2017-11-18 20:03:05 |
| <p>Stop this anti car BS and get your act together stop wasting money as well I wonder how a council can still spend more and more whilst you are called out by the media as "cash strapped" a monkey could do a better job than you.</p> | <p>Leave it alone and stop changing things.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCFN-S | 2017-11-18 20:08:26 |
| <p>This is a much much better design, but I am not sure of the use of the central triangle use. I may be interpreting wrongly, but why is there cars in there? Is that like a parking? That center area should be an elevated 'stepped' structure in the middle, for people to walk and sit around on, maybe with an eye catching feature on top, something representative of Scotland, so you are driving up towards it from Leith. Maybe a statue that is changed occasionally? Let's think bolder than just 'a waiting spot for tram'. I imagine also people should be able to cross to this central spot via tunnel or footbridge from the omni side to where Tesco is? It's definitely a good plan but give it some more landmark status!too often Edinburgh goes for practical over bold!</p> | <p>That center area should be an elevated 'stepped' structure in the middle, for people to walk and sit around on, maybe with an eye catching feature on top, something representative of Scotland, so you are driving up towards it from Leith. Maybe a statue that is changed occasionally? Let's think bolder than just 'a waiting spot for tram'. I imagine also people should be able to cross to this central spot via tunnel or footbridge from the omni side to where Tesco is? It's definitely a good plan but give it some more landmark status!too often Edinburgh goes for practical over bold!</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCFW-2 | 2017-11-18 20:37:07 |
| <p>Although the new proposed layout is an improvement on the previous design, and there appears to be improvements in cycling and walking safety, I'm concerned that what we've got is still a large gyratory system or traffic island, and the overall dominance will still be of motor traffic. Can northbound motor-traffic from Leith Walk be lessened? Does Leith street still need to be a major motor-traffic conduit? Is motor-traffic being sufficiently discouraged in this part of town?</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCCX-Z | 2017-11-18 21:16:09 |
| <p>The proposed junction will be much better/less confusing to drivers (especcially those turning onto Broughton Street from Leith Street. Unfortunate about having to remove trees -- why not explore creative landscaping of the island?</p> | <p>Absolutely should be a park or garden space.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCCG-F | 2017-11-18 21:43:35 |
| <p>The pedestrian and cycle facilities are terrible in the current design. The sustrans design should be installed instead with a T junction which creates a public space. Induced demand needs to be considered in the design to make Edinburgh a better city for all.</p> | <p>It should be attached to the pavement when the junction becomes a T junction. Having 3 lanes of traffic between it and the pavement ruins it as a location for people.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCC4-V | 2017-11-19 07:29:01 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I think the layout is really poor and doesn't address the actual problems that currently exist.</p> <p>1 - I regularly cycle and drive from Broughton Street around the roundabout Leith Street and to Calton Road - then to Arthur Seat. This is dangerous for bikes as no dedicated cycle lane and cars as they often nearly hit bikes.</p> <p>A simple clear cycle lane is required to get you across this area and allow people to get to the back of the train station and down towards the new development near Market Street and the Parliament / Arthur Seat.</p> <p>2 - you are mad to take away the pedestrian crossing outside the playhouse - when a show starts or finishes it's a main way to cross the road.</p> <p>3 - removal of so many trees and not enough to replace them</p> <p>4 - centre of design will look horrendous and unsightly</p> <p>5 - fumes for all those crossing in the middle</p> <p>6 - what about the residents and business affected near Sherlock statue ?</p> <p>7 - taxi rank outside Omni / playhouse - again one of the busiest will just be removed and not replaced ??</p> <p>Overall really badly thought out once again.</p> | <p>Greenery</p> <p>Needs to be safe for young ones</p> <p>Not an area for junkies to congregate</p> <p>Water feature ?</p> <p>Statues</p> <p>Art work</p> <p>Cycle storage ?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCCR-T</p> | <p>2017-11-19 08:50:55</p> |
| <p>The plans detailed do not show any provisions for a taxi stance.</p> <p>There is currently a very busy and well used taxi stance directly outside the Omni Centre.</p> <p>This provides essential transport facilities to many people, but most importantly the elderly, infirm and disabled, of whom many rely solely on taxis for transportation.</p> <p>A taxi stance in this area is essential and must not be overlooked in favour of cycle lanes.</p> | <p>The island site should be sold to a developer to help cover the costs of ruining a perfectly good roundabout.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCC7-Y</p> | <p>2017-11-19 09:14:37</p> |
| <p>the cathedral of St. Mary's requires access for disabled persons and space for funeral corteges and wedding celebrations. the former especially should deserve special consideration.</p> | <p>trees should be the main feature.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCCH-G</p> | <p>2017-11-19 09:19:53</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|---------------------|
| <p>It's seems that the Planning department have learned no lessons from the lack of a taxi ranks near transport hubs in the city. One example of this already is Haymarket train station. Taxis play a huge part in getting people around the city particularly the elderly, disabled and infirm. These plans clearly show NO CONSIDERATION at all for these people. At this location you have The Playhouse Theatre and many other leisure facilities at Omni which are VERY popular with various groups.</p> <p>To exclude a taxi rank from this area would encourage taxis forming unofficial ranks. There is a distinct lack of taxi stances in the city already and these plans show there are no consideration to include these as part of of Edinburghs traffic management.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCCC-B | 2017-11-19 09:43:56 |
| | <p>Don't feel mixed use development would be desiresble in the middle of such a busy junction. Additional road crossing for pedestrians to facilitate this would also cause further congestion in such a main artery. A large monument of some sort would be attractive as people approach the city centre and support our cities cultural reputation.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCC2-T | 2017-11-19 09:58:20 |
| <p>Ultimately I do not support any plan which results in a gyratory. The plan as proposed despite the minor tweaks prioritises motor traffic and squeezes pedestrians and active travel users (mostly bicycles but also businesses that may be using cargo bikes, people in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and even just young children on scooter) into left over space and treats them as optional extras.</p> <p>Research into every gyratory ever built* shows that it inevitably is replaced with a simple junction. Having lived and worked on Forrest Road for many years (on and off since 1988) I have seen the impact of that gyratory on quality of life and congestion.</p> <p>Ultimately I am still staggered that the council feels that the appropriate gateway to an world heritage centre is a 3-lane gyratory.</p> <p>*I am aware that is hyperbole but there is a simple rule of thumb for good city design. Do not build a gyratory.</p> | <p>I am aware that in an era where central government has squeezed the city's ability to raise revenue that the city needs to maximise its return from any space it owns and am sympathetic to development that will bring money into the council's coffers.</p> <p>In an ideal world I would like to see a mix of public space, arts and culture space and commercial space. Pedestrianising the third side of the proposed gyratory will connect the "island" to the rest of the city rather than surrounding it with a sea of polluting, noisy and congested traffic. So a development that takes advantage of a peninsula is what I am looking for.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCCN-P | 2017-11-19 10:07:11 |
| <p>" it allows for the number of lanes of traffic to be reduced over time as more people change to active travel." the most common reason given for cycling in Copenhagen is that it's faster than driving, you shape how people travel through the infrastructure you provide not the other way around. The lack of cycling infrastructure is very disappointing . The cycle ways look like they go through where pedestrians wait for lights, which is putting in unnecessary conflict. Strip the space out for private cars now. If you're worried about delaying public transport by congestion, then consider traffic evaporation and potentially also preventing private cars from using Leith street or at least from proceeding onto the A1/Princes street/North Bridge.</p> <p>The original sustrans proposals with a public space in front of the omni centre are vastly superior to the current design.</p> | <p>If the current design stands maybe a forest to absorb some of the fumes that are produced by the surrounding motorways?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC EE-F | 2017-11-19 11:06:28 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Better than the original proposal. Still too much "shared cycle and pedestrian" space. This should be pedestrian only space, with cyclists on the road. Bikes and people don't mix well as they travel at different speeds and pedestrians don't signal or check behind before turning! It is a shame that pedestrian space outside the Playhouse is being lost, as this area gets extremely busy and crowded before a show. Almost certainly the pedestrians will block the cycle lane at that point.</p> <p>I don't understand why it is felt necessary to return to the historical street layout. Good for nostalgia, but the old layout was designed for a completely different mix of transport, and largely grew out of organic development.</p> <p>There must be a Taxi rank included surely.the amount of Taxi ranks is terrible in the city.Is the council overlooking the Taxi trade again?</p> | <p>A bad site for development. Better as open space with grass and trees - trees by the Sherlock Holmes statue are being lost, as are the (not very impressive) trees outside the Playhouse. Shame it isn't feasible to include parking to replace that being lost. Would a taxi rank be feasible, to replace the one being lost by the Playhouse/Omni?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCE9-3 | 2017-11-19 11:07:22 |
| <p>Mr wishart.</p> | <p>Taxi rank required.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCEQ-U | 2017-11-19 11:11:50 |
| <p>This design still gives far too much priority to private cars. Dedicated bus priority lanes should be put in place, and further steps must be taken to ensure that private vehicle use is significantly reduced.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossings must be located at the most convenient place possible for pedestrians.</p> <p>Cycle lanes must be fully segregated in such a way that stops vehicles parking on them and fully protects people cycling. The current segregated path on Leith Walk has somewhat failed as vehicles - typically vans - simply park on the cycle path without any penalty. This puts cyclists and pedestrians lives at risk.</p> | <p>Having an island surrounded by traffic in all directions is a very bad idea. This cuts off pedestrians and exposes them to loud noises, air pollution and a stressful, unenjoyable environment. Again, the number of private cars that Edinburgh Council is allowing to traverse this area would create a horrible environment.</p> <p>Steps must be taken to reduce space given to private vehicles.</p> <p>The "island" should be linked with St Mary's cathedral as a pedestrianised zone. An alternative to this could be only allowing buses through this space, and no private cars.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCE6-Z | 2017-11-19 11:19:29 |
| <p>Having used this junction 100's of times my main concern is the number of traffic lights and their proximity to the current roundabout.</p> <p>These lights currently ensure that traffic is backed up onto the roundabout which, as a result, ceases to function.</p> <p>Any plan that removes this issue would be most welcome.</p> | <p>My only concern about this site being used for a mixed used development would be the height of the proposed development.</p> <p>I would not wish to see anything higher than 2 levels (ground and first) being proposed.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCEV-Z | 2017-11-19 11:35:26 |
| <p>How are cyclists coming down from the top of Leith all, supposed to cross over to the other side of Leith walk to continue their journey north, down Leith walk on the correct side?</p> | <p>Take the opportunity to make it a green space, not just concrete. Benches trees, a meeting place for shoppers and lunches. Perhaps the option to allow pop-up stalls?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCEK-N | 2017-11-19 12:00:36 |
| <p>As a parishoner of St Mary's Cathedral, I am strongly against this proposal. Loss of space directly in front of the Cathedral will have serious implications for disabled and infirm parishioners who are not able to use public transport to travel to and from the Cathedral.</p> <p>It will also mean that there will be nowhere for wedding or funeral corteges to stop outside the Cathedral.</p> | <p>n/a</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCEJ-M | 2017-11-19 12:31:01 |
| <p>The information provided does not comment on the removal of vehicle access to the front of st marys cathedral steps and detail any impact this would have. This needs to be considered and commented upon in the information provided to the public.</p> | <p>With removal of pedtrianised /seating areas and greenery from elsewhere in the proposal- the island should then accommodate this in a new park area similar to St. Andrews square.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCEM-Q | 2017-11-19 12:52:03 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| As a parishioner of St Mary's Catholic Cathedral, I am strongly against this proposal. Loss of space directly in front of the Cathedral will have serious implications for disabled and infirm parishioners who are not able to use public transport to travel to and from the Cathedral. It will also mean that there will be nowhere for wedding or funeral corteges to stop outside the Cathedral. | | ANON-8G9D-FCEU-Y | 2017-11-19 12:58:01 |
| | I'd like to see a build in the style of the 1960s-demolished buildings, purposed for affordable housing. | ANON-8G9D-FCEF-G | 2017-11-19 13:34:27 |
| <p>The design over-emphasises vehicular traffic at the expense of other users at a time when many cities are, correctly, moving towards increased pedestrianisation and improved provisions for cyclists. The overuse of shared cycle/pedestrian space on what are already busy junctions is a fundamentally poor design choice and your failure to recognise any of this. It isn't enough to simply design for the composition of road traffic that currently exists, this opportunity to redesign a key gateway to the city provides a chance to set the course for the way transportation in Edinburgh functions in the future but instead provides a car dominated gyratory, loss of public space and a functionally useless traffic island.</p> <p>The desire should not be a return to the "historical layout", which even then was a largely pedestrian and shopping area with traffic dominated by trams, but a forward looking approach which shows a strong desire to make the centre of Edinburgh dominated less by vehicles rather than ceding further space to additional traffic.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCEB-C | 2017-11-19 14:00:10 |
| <p>Overall, the over focus on road traffic is horrid. Edinburgh is a city where many people walk or cycle and this scheme provides a poor service for both of these people. The three lanes on traffic Picardy place will be nothing less than a mini motorway which will encourage more vehicles into the city not less and will significantly increase traffic noise.</p> <p>The removal of significant cultural objects and the reassignment of these is a crass idea.</p> <p>This will make this areas congested, even more polluted and unfriendly to anything other than cars.</p> <p>Poor scheme and needs to be completed re thought out with the people of Edinburgh in mind and not the business and shopping centre at the heart of the scheme. Disappointing, not future proof and unsensitive.</p> | Who in there right mind would want to spend anytime on an island in the middle of a polluted mini motorway junction. Even the idea that "retail" could go there is indicative that the population of the city are of second thought compared to business in this consultation. | ANON-8G9D-FCEC-D | 2017-11-19 15:25:11 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>the Scottish Government's admirable attempts to reduce carbon emissions or to make our streets living spaces. Given the dreadful management of the St. James redevelopment - I'd advise any councillor to walk down Leith Street during rush hour at the moment - I feel that this must be an opportunity to make one of Edinburgh's busiest areas much more pedestrian friendly.</p> <p>The proposals above are prioritised by concerns over private transport, and no matter the level of spin the Council and developer may employ in their communications, this is readily apparent. For any cyclist or pedestrian Picardy Place roundabout has long been an unpleasant - and for cyclists downright dangerous - space to travel through. Your proposals do absolutely nothing to limit or manage the amount of car traffic in this area. Perhaps this is because of the council's short-sightedness in approving planning permission for thousands of parking spaces for that very ugly redevelopment at St. James Centre.</p> <p>Isn't it the Council's intention to reduce the amount of private traffic moving through our city centre? Isn't that the intention for George Street? In what way does expanding the traffic lanes from two to three achieve this? Yes there are three lanes of sort at the approach to roundabout at present, but your proposal above takes this further and extends this three lane provision. Essentially these plans are just an extension of what is already there. It wastes space in the middle with an island for which there are currently no plans. Because this space is bounded by three lanes of traffic on all sides, it will not be of any use to the general public. This is what makes Sustrans' plans much more amenable. Because this island space is only bounded on two sides, it becomes a properly public realm. Why not build a small park there, giving our city centre some much needed public green space? I note the Council's objections to Sustrans plans, but these are blunt and without supporting evidence. In this public consultation, the Council's analysis on the negative parts of Sustrans plans should be linked to because, as it stands, you are not enabling the public to reach an informed decision by promoting</p> | <p>As mentioned in my previous comment I would be greatly disappointed if this island site was developed for retail, commercial or hospitality uses. We have plenty of this in Edinburgh already. Why can't this be a small public park?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCEN-R | 2017-11-19 16:01:03 |
| <p>I am happy with this proposal.</p> <p>You have persuaded me that it is the solution which gives the best outcome to all users.</p> | <p>Mix used development is fine.</p> <p>I would want a quality building that we can be proud of. What I don't want is something that costs the city money when you are asking us how to save £21M already.</p> <p>Let's get some cash for the site, and then a stream income from Council Tax or Business Rates.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCJX-7 | 2017-11-19 16:15:02 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>compared to active travel.</p> <p>I don't understand why you only show "a y-shaped junction layout [...] as an option in discussion with Sustrans" which doesn't work out of many reasons, instead of showing the suggestion created by Sustrans itself (which can be found here: http://www.sustrans.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/files/Ideas%20for%20Picardy%20Place%20DL.pdf). To me, this looks like a perfect design for this area.</p> <p>My points of criticism with the CEC design are:</p> <p>The island in the middle of the gyratory is surrounded by traffic on all sides, making it noisy and not well accessible. It would be so much nicer having a big open space in front of the Omni Centre.</p> <p>Although it's nice to see that segregated cycle lanes can be found in the proposal, they don't seem to be very practical. Instead of having them on both sides of the road, they are only on the Omni-Centre side, with bikes going in both directions. This means that to get onto the cycle lane/leaving it bikes which travel towards Leith Walk will have to cross a lane of traffic first, and then cross a street again to be on the "right" side of the road for connecting trips. Also, how will an unconfident cyclist travel from Leith Street to Broughton Street? Or from Leith Walk to York Place? It will involve numerous crossings of busy, multilaned roads. Will cyclists be expected to dismount at all of these crossings?</p> <p>Also, will the cycle lanes be physically separated from the pedestrian walkway? The current design on the upper half of Leith Walk causes a lot of conflicts between pedestrians and cyclists as the cycling lane isn't separated by a kerb/drop from the pedestrian walkway.</p> | <p>As mentioned before, I think it should not be an island, but a space connected to the area in front of the Omni Centre. If you build an island, it will be wasted land - who wants to sit/relax in a loud and polluted area where you're surrounded on all sides by cars? In contrast, if it would be like in the Sustrans design, there would be ample opportunity for a playpark, a cafe, trees, a fountain, a nice area for the community to enjoy.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCE1-U</p> | <p>2017-11-19 16:23:33</p> |
| <p>Not enough space for pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>No space for cyclists to go along to York Place.</p> <p>No segregated cycle lane heading from York Place/Queen St to Leith Walk</p> | <p>Farmers market</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJZ-9</p> | <p>2017-11-19 17:44:59</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>acknowledge that there is scope within the space that exists to make conditions better for pedestrians and cyclists, but has instead chosen to prioritise existing road users. The evidence from Europe is very clear that it is improved physical infrastructure that leads to people walking and cycling more.</p> <p>From a cycling point of view it seems that facilities are improved in some areas but that is not continued through the whole design of the area. So to get from Leith Walk to York Place for example looks far too complicated. I can imagine many existing cyclists will ignore the convoluted planned route and instead go on the main carriageway, which undermines the whole point of trying to design for increased safety and enjoyment of cycling. At the simplest level, it looks possible to me that additional space could be taken from the central island and used to accomodate a dedicated cycle lane within the main carriageway, but if that isn't possible for technical reasons then another solution should be found. It is not acceptable that at such busy junctions cyclists and pedestrians will be expected to mix and share space, this is frustrating and potentially dangerous, and has the potential to increase hostility between pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>My basic point is that this is a major new junction and a major through-route and it is not acceptable that cycling and pedestrians are still being given lower priority than motorists. Please, please don't talk about improving things in the years ahead, for once please let's have some vision and actually do this properly, create dedicated cycle lanes throughout the whole area, and create enough space for pedestrians to enjoy the area, with trees and benches integral to the design.</p> <p>I'm also slightly dubious about the amount of space given to the central island. I support the idea in principle, but I wonder how attractive an area stuck between lanes of traffic on all sides is actually going to be for people. Maybe that space can be more usefully used in widening pedestrian</p> | <p>Copied from my response on page 3: I'm also slightly dubious about the amount of space given to the central island. I support the idea in principle, but I wonder how attractive an area stuck between lanes of traffic on all sides is actually going to be for people. Maybe that space can be more usefully used in widening pedestrian carriageways on the surrounding area. I would need to see more detailed plans and description of how this area would work in order to be convinced that this is a good idea in practise.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJG-P</p> | <p>2017-11-19 18:17:49</p> |
| <p>The design looks somewhat practical, but I hope emphasis on public transport over personal vehicles is taken into consideration in the future. If you just simply build it such that buses take priority, then the public will use it, benefiting the council and everyone generally. I know that's very generic, but that's all the expertise I have on the matter, i.e. not very much. Good cities have 100% bikes, buses, trams, and pedestrians, 0% cars.</p> | <p>Keep it simple, just a green space that allows purely pedestrian and cycle access, no hotels or shops such that delivery cars don't have to clog the system. If there really is interest in retail, then make it pop-ups and coffee vans, that sort of thing, so it's minimal impact.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJ6-5</p> | <p>2017-11-19 18:19:43</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Fails to conform to Council's own Street Design Guidance in terms of crossings, footway space, placemaking in general. Not enough public space especially on west side. Major cycle-pedestrian conflict especially on already too-narrow footway on east side. Sustrans option still creates space for development but it would be much better linked to city centre. East-west buses suffer from this scheme. Any tram scheme in continental Europe would allow buses to use the tram stop but then their trams are not designed by railway engineers trying to build a railway through an historic city. We are not told whether modelling of Sustrans alternative has been run using variable demand matrices and if so what elasticities were applied and where these were derived from. Evidence from Edinburgh (Princes St closure to motor vehicles, Royal Mile closure) and many other cities as reported here https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/disappearing_traffic_cairns.pdf shows that modelled predictions of traffic capacity reductions are "often alarmist" and do not materialise as demand falls in response to the capacity reduction.</p> | <p>Sustrans option also provides space for development, but not one in the middle of a 1960s style gyratory. Development of island site seems to have been a major driver of this scheme. Heavily redacted reports obtained via FOI indicate: a) overly close relationship between council and developer b) high costs to council in providing developer's preferred option c) Sustrans option is cheaper. Imposing significant delays on traffic does not appear to be a major problem if it is done by the Council for a developer - look at Leith St closure. Model that.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJK-T</p> | <p>2017-11-19 18:23:31</p> |
| <p>The initial description describes St Mary's Cathedral as "St Margaret's Cathedral". This doesn't bode well for the consideration given to the uses of the cathedral. The current options take no cognisance of the need for access to the cathedral for funeral and wedding corteges. Also many of the congregants are infirm and require drop-off access close to the entrance of the cathedral. From what I can see of the Sustrans drawing (and the way the graphic is shown is not clear) they have allowed for this. As noted above, the Sustrans option is not shown clearly, where is the legend? It is a fundamental of urban design that you put a civic space in front of public buildings. Again the Sustrans proposals do this and expand and create the potential for improvement of what is already there. Sir Eduardo Paolozzi's sculptures are placed at present in a considered assemblage in front of the cathedral. The current plans push them to one side and break the composition by having the "hand" sculpture on the opposite side of Little King Street from the "ankle" and "foot" sculpture. An "island" is a perfect description for what is being created. It will be reached by crossing large vehicular traffic routes. For years there have been discussions in urban design circles about how much better Trafalgar Square in London, or George Square in Glasgow would be if pedestrians didn't have to cross lanes of traffic to get to the squares.</p> | <p>This appears to be the creation of a large piece of land for development. If the intention was to sell this off, including the so-called "public spaces", I would not be in favour. Places like Multrees Walk etc. are NOT public spaces, they are private spaces, which the public are allowed access to.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJQ-Z</p> | <p>2017-11-19 19:08:40</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The volume of pedestrian and cycle traffic will mean that the proposed shared space will lead to significant conflict.</p> <p>The traffic island will remain exactly that - a barren island with minimal use by pedestrians. Just as in Trafalgar Square in London the solution is to avoid isolating a large area of land surrounded by busy roads.</p> <p>The layout is still heavily biased towards motor vehicle traffic.</p> <p>The currently unbuilt on area which the council seem to want to retain to allow development should be incorporated into a vastly improved public realm focussed on active travel - pedestrians and cyclists and biased against pollutant emitting transport which has deleterious effects on public health.</p> | <p>This island site should not be built on and instead should be used to improve the public realm allowing views of the cathedral and the frontage of Picardy place. The area could be actively used by people and allow commercial activity by creating a public plaza with cafe culture and green space. I firmly believe it should not be built on. I also know from the experience of other locations including London that areas that are an island surrounded by a sea of traffic are not attractive for pedestrians and cyclists. Instead the layout should focus on avoiding creating an island and instead expand the area devoted to active travel, relaxation, vegetation and cafe culture.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJB-H</p> | <p>2017-11-19 19:47:56</p> |
| <p>I am very unhappy with the gyratory design . I appreciate the Council's point that buses will need to turn here in future when Princes Street is traffic-reduced, but it doesn't need to be a gyratory or a facility for all traffic. Also, Picardy traffic could be considerably reduced by keeping Leith Street closed to all except buses, given that the present 10-month closure appears to be working well.</p> <p>A direct west-east route link York Place <---> Leith Walk is vital. In previous plans this was shown inside the triangle island, running beside the tram stop, leading to a road crossing just below Omni. In the new plan this cyclerooute is gone, replaced by a grey band, and it appears that cyclists on this, the 'flagship' council West-East route, will have to detour via the front of the cathedral then across 2 very busy tightly-spaced toucan crossings near John Lewis.</p> <p>Leith St <--> Broughton St also needs to be direct and high quality. The previous plans again had a cyclerooute within the island, but the new proposals mean 4 toucan crossings to get from Broughton St to Leith St, and travel from Leith St to Broughton St looks problematic.</p> <p>The various segregated cyclerooutes seem to turn into shared space on the approach to nearly all the junctions – just where cycle/pedestrian conflict is most likely. Segregated routes should continue, with side-by-side 'tiger' road crossings, rather than shared-use 'toucans.'</p> <p>Assuming the gyratory remains, then high quality 2-way segregated routes on all 3 sides of the gyratory (inside and/or outside the gyratory as appropriate) linked by tiger crossings of the roads would cater for all main cycling desire lines. Finally, the segregated routes should be of adequate width – ideally 3m, but they look narrow on the plans, down to 2m at one point.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJR-1</p> | <p>2017-11-19 20:18:25</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>'flow' of (private) motor traffic, that is to say, it aims to support and accommodate traffic volumes at (at least) current levels. Whilst the consultation references the possibility of future accommodation of smaller traffic levels, this is pure wishful thinking, as such a reallocation of road space will be politically extremely difficult, especially if the proposed design is in fact implemented, creating even more demand for roadway space through traffic inducement. A three-lane gyratory layout will only encourage use of (private) motor transport to access both John Lewis/St James Centre and areas further down London Road and Leith Walk. It will sustain a black spot for traffic that will affect not just the immediate area but the entire network of transport links between the city centre and areas accessed via Leith Walk and London Road, a good quarter of the city. The proposed layout 'designs in' conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at numerous locations, not least in front of the cathedral, lowering the quality of the area as public space. It encourages dangerous behaviour by all road users at numerous points: examples are the wide corner for the uphill rightward turn out of Picardy Place, which will create dangerous situations with long vehicles such as HGVs; the poor provision of pedestrian crossings outside the Playhouse; and the convoluted layout of the cycleways, especially for cyclists coming up Leith Walk and wishing to continue westwards towards Queen Street or St Andrew Square (particularly disappointing as this junction is a key link between the planned City Centre to West Edinburgh Link between Roseburn and George St on the one hand and the Leith Walk cycle link on the other hand; the only practicable alternative link I can think of involves the very steep climb along streets such as Dublin Street, which are very cycle-unfriendly even without the incline). The gyratory layout is also poorly suited to the creation of an integrated public transport hub, as it forces interchanging passengers (whether bus-bus or bus-tram) to cross the busy road.</p> <p>A much better solution is a signal-controlled T junction between Picardy Place and Leith Street/Greenside Row. This allows for much better integration between the tram and the bus stops, decreases the need for shared</p> | <p>The gyratory layout effectively guarantees that the island site will not be used as a public space. It will be a very unpleasant area full of people queuing for the crossings; if it is further developed, it will be a site with fairly narrow pavements full of people queuing for the crossings.</p> <p>As discussed previously, the best use of this site is not making it an island but connecting it with the public space to the south-west as part of a much larger civic area.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJ7-6</p> | <p>2017-11-19 20:38:49</p> |
| <p>The dedicated cycleway (Leith Street - Omni - Leith Walk) looks promising although I'm not sure how this will work at the London Road roundabout.</p> <p>I'm concerned that cycling down Leith Street to go down Broughton Street, or vice versa, looks very complicated. At some points cyclists will be moving through crowds of pedestrians waiting to cross roads. Is it clear that there will be combined cycle/pedestrian crossings across Leith Street and York Place?</p> | <p>Please not another hotel anyway. How about a Transport Museum?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJY-8</p> | <p>2017-11-19 20:45:18</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am quite frankly dismayed by the proposed layout. It is not a design for the future but one which is stuck in the past. Countries like Denmark and the Netherlands would laugh at the backward looking nature of these proposals where the car is prioritised over pedestrians and more active means of travel such as cycling. The current proposals seem to mean pavements will be too narrow and cyclists will come into conflict with pedestrians. Accommodating current levels of traffic is not what we should be trying to achieve at all - at least if we are serious about tackling climate change. We should be discouraging car use and making the area attractive for people to walk and cycle or use public transport. Getting from A to B should not involve multi-stage crossings either. There seems to be a lack of proper consultation and scrutiny of the proposals.</p> | <p>There should be no island. The T or Y junction would be better. It is a bit ridiculous to think that such an inaccessible space stuck in the middle of so much traffic could have any useful function apart from an attractive flower bed (not sure Edinburgh City Council could manage to do that well either!). An alternative idea might be a pollution monitoring station.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCJN-W</p> | <p>2017-11-19 22:56:02</p> |
| <p>The final layout of Picardy Place and adjoining streets in order to work and have high cycle and pedestrian usage must be segregated from traffic and each other. The lanes and spaces have to be 3m for cycle route and wider for pedestrians to accommodate future pedestrian and bike traffic levels - not current ones. The plan is to reduce vehicular traffic so future proof the junction.</p> <p>The routes have to be direct and easy - waiting for numerous pelican crossings etc result in people and bikes using a more direct route or taking risks and nipping across / going through red lights etc. It also results in bikes choosing to mix it with the traffic instead which will be the opposite to what is planned.</p> <p>The new cycle route from top of Innocent railway path to the Meadows is an example of round the houses route design and has resulted in it being slower by bike than the direct walking route if a pedestrian!!! There is an opportunity to get it right at Picardy Place so please take it and give priority to others rather than vehicles.</p> | <p>Given the loss of the greenery to make way for the new layout a large part of it has to be given over to a green space similar to St Andrews Square. Pollution may a problem given the volume of traffic going round the island site but definitely should not be used to site yet more retail / commercial. It should be for all to use and enjoy and greenery to help reduce CO2.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC4J-3</p> | <p>2017-11-20 10:15:40</p> |
| <p>Generally good. However, as a parishioner of St Mary's Cathedral I am concerned about access to the Cathedral by car where this is necessary e.g. disabled parishioners, funeral cars, wedding cars etc. Some kind of drop off / short stay parking is absolutely essential for the Cathedral to function. Could this not be provided in the area designated in the proposals for the bus stops. Could they not be moved further south on Leith Street to the other side of Little King Street? The Cathedral has many overseas visitors year round and is part of Edinburgh's tourism experience for many so it's important also that the general amenity of the area abundant the Cathedral is of an international standard.</p> | <p>I agree with mixed use development as suggested. However, it would be good to have something that's different to the surrounding leisure, retail, hospitality offer e.g. a more informal retail / catering, Covent Garden type "market" development.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC4M-6</p> | <p>2017-11-20 11:02:02</p> |
| <p>I work in Union Street and regularly cross Picardy Place. It already takes a long time to cross from the top of Broughton Street to St Mary's Cathedral, as pedestrians appear to be the very lowest priority at this junction. This proposed changes do not look to me as if pedestrians will be any more of a priority. If anything, it looks as if it will be even longer to cross the additional lanes.</p> <p>Buses are already struggling to keep to timetable at peak evening rush hour at at the start of London Road. I don't see anything here that will improve bus times - no dedicated bus lanes.</p> | <p>I see you're planning to take the trees away from outside Tesco and outside the cathedral. It would make sense then to put some greenery on the island site. Whether any trees would survive surrounded by traffic is another matter.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC4N-7</p> | <p>2017-11-20 12:16:33</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The revised proposed street layout is a considerable improvement moving the traffic further from the front of the cathedral but there is still no room for disabled visitors, funeral corteges and wedding cars to park or even to stop. Important events such as HRH The Princess Royal's visit to the Cathedral in 2016 would not be possible without causing major traffic disruption.</p> | <p>The island site is far too small and cut off for mixed use as suggested. It should be kept as public open space or for parking for visitors to the cathedral.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC45-E</p> | <p>2017-11-20 12:28:09</p> |
| <p>I like it generally but critically it seems entirely unrealistic to expect traffic to flow effectively when just one lane on Picardy Place, progressing to Leith Walk, is to receive all the traffic coming from York Place and Leith Street.</p> <p>I'd also like to see the Sherlock Holmes statue facing Picardy Place rather than down Leith Walk.</p> | <p>I'd like to see it used as an outside space for displaying art, primarily that produced by local artists including students at the city's College of Art and by local school children (the work would have to be protected from the weather, behind screens or below gazebo-style metal canopies or awnings perhaps). The art would be continuously refreshed. Amongst or around the display there would be benches and perhaps one or two local small businesses with stalls, e.g. food and drink.</p> <p>There could also be an City of Edinburgh Council information screen where info from the website relating to ongoing consultations and events etc. would be displayed electronically.</p> <p>Altogether this would represent a real community focal point for citizens of the city and be very welcome.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCQK-1</p> | <p>2017-11-20 13:31:21</p> |
| <p>Not a fan of the existing Public art.</p> <p>We would prefer priority for pedestrians and public transport over vehicles, which we would like to see diverted away from having such a large interaction with pedestrians. Fumes. Speed. Noise.</p> | <p>Subterranean vehicle park for cycles and small electric-only motorcycle & scooters. Open air park on top (assumes private traffic diverted away from going around the triangle).</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCQF-V</p> | <p>2017-11-20 13:34:38</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>volume. Surely it should be the intention to reduce motor traffic? The Sustrans proposal has been criticised for potentially leading to congestion, but has thought been given to the effect on congestion in surrounding areas if a design which so heavily encourages motor traffic is used? Fundamentally, this entire design is overwhelmingly motor-centric. It says that our cities are still designed for the private car and does nothing to address problems with pedestrian access getting around this barrier.</p> <p>I do not think it is clear how cycle traffic is expected to safely use some parts of the route, eg. eastbound from York Place to Leith Walk. Are cyclists to be expected to use multiple pedestrian crossings to go the "long way round" the gyratory? This design strikes me as being designed to minimise inconvenience to motorists rather than implement sensible cycle infrastructure. People, including cyclists, are fundamentally impatient and if this is not accommodated accidents will occur. I believe it would be safer to move the island and motor traffic lanes slightly eastward to accommodate segregated cycle lanes on all three sides of the site.</p> <p>NB. I now see some maps have a cycle lane encircling the island. This partially addresses some of the concerns I name above, but creates others. Still cyclists are expected to cross several lanes of traffic to reach the cycle lane rather than use the road. I suspect many will not use this lane.</p> <p>Additionally, "shared pedestrian/cycle space" strikes me as lazy design. While paths like this can work, it is typically in areas with (a) relatively low density foot and cycle traffic and (b) people traveling along the path, rather than stopping and coming in and out of shops or going across it. Good examples of successful shared space would be the North Edinburgh Ferry Road/Roseburn Path and the path from Seafield to Portobello. Both of these are notable for not having many reasons for people to stop, change direction unexpectedly or to cross. This is not the case at the Picardy Place site and without proper segregation conflict will ensue.</p> | <p>The island seems me as a poor location for any serious economic development. It will struggle to attract passing trade and bring surrounded by three lanes of traffic will not make for attractive catering venues, especially for outdoor seating, in the style of St. Andrew's Square garden.</p> <p>An emphasis on cultural and aesthetic development would be a far more efficient use of the space, for example restoring the look the current roundabout previously had with flowerbeds. This would maybe make a good site for the Leith Walk/London Road roundabout clock, which has yet to be returned to the area. I applaud the intention to place the Sherlock Holmes statue there, this could either mark a corner of the island nicely or make a good centrepiece.</p> <p>I find it sad that urban space is rarely considered as having any worth beyond its capacity to be used to sell things. This is especially true in a city like ours, where we sell our city for it's beauty, not it's retail capacity. A relatively dead space like this should be treated for what it is: filler.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCES-W</p> | <p>2017-11-20 13:56:19</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>and private vehicles. Visually, this will be a very uninspiring gateway to the World Heritage Site and is unlikely to result in the creation of an environment that encourages visitors to linger - with the flow of vehicles producing air, noise and visual pollution .</p> <p>Pedestrians and cyclists will experience disjointed and indirect journeys, with through trips requiring multiple crossings of major roads. The proposed public transport interchange is severed from the surrounding pedestrian routes due to its location on an island bounded by major roads. This will be an unpleasant place to wait for a bus or tram. In addition, less able public transport users may be put off by the requirement to cross major roads to access surrounding streets and businesses.</p> <p>The historic street layout of Picardy Place is ill suited to its current, and future, usage. Travel patterns, expectations of residents and visitors and the surrounding environment have all changed substantially since it was last in place. Future changes in travel, including app based taxi services, bike share schemes and autonomous vehicles are all likely to reduce the throughput of cars at this location in the next few years. Designing the junction to maximise traffic flow, based on a design that is itself around 10 years old, rather than aiming to create a high quality environment attractive to investors, visitors and residents seems short sighted.</p> <p>Instead, the design should focus on maximising useable and attractive public space, creating direct pedestrian and cycle routes - which also benefit public transport users. Removing one "side" of the proposed gyratory system would seem to be key to this. Personally, I would favour removing the carriageway from in front of the cathedral and creating a y-shaped junction - as no buses travel between Leith Street and York Place or Broughton Street. This would create a large new public space, linked to surrounding pedestrian and cycling routes. The public transport interchange would be far more accessible and a more pleasant place to wait, due to reduced traffic and related pollution.</p> <p>As a regular visitor to RC Cathedral I would like to stress the importance of disabled parking and space for carriages in front of the Cathedral. I strongly oppose to placing the car traffic and double bus stop right outside the Cathedral.</p> <p>There is interesting alternative presented by Zone Architects (link: http://www.skyscrapercity.com/showthread.php?t=1647714&page=35) that would be reasonable in this place, giving also space for extra public/private building in the middle of the Place.</p> <p>Other progressive European cities, especially London, are in the process of removing gyratory roundabouts because they are hostile to pedestrians and cyclists. I would therefore like to see a 'T junction' (not a roundabout) and an improved public realm with wider pavements and easy road crossings.</p> | <p>The road should be removed from in front of the cathedral, meaning the island site forms part of a larger public space, connected to surrounding streets. The area should become a new civic space - usable for markets and events linked to the festivals and Hogmanay - reducing the need for road closures for such events and damage to soft surfaces.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCQB-R</p> | <p>2017-11-20 14:30:12</p> |
| <p>Concert hall, museum, hotel or even offices would be beneficial.</p> | <p>Concert hall, museum, hotel or even offices would be beneficial.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCQ1-7</p> | <p>2017-11-20 16:09:35</p> |
| <p>Other progressive European cities, especially London, are in the process of removing gyratory roundabouts because they are hostile to pedestrians and cyclists. I would therefore like to see a 'T junction' (not a roundabout) and an improved public realm with wider pavements and easy road crossings.</p> | <p>Other progressive European cities, especially London, are in the process of removing gyratory roundabouts because they are hostile to pedestrians and cyclists. I would therefore like to see a 'T junction' (not a roundabout) and an improved public realm with wider pavements and easy road crossings.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCZE-4</p> | <p>2017-11-20 16:38:54</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>It looks very anti-pedestrian to me. Space on a traffic island is not good public space. Usable public space by the cathedral and where the conan doyle statue is are actually being lost. It looks like it has been optimised for car use a.k.a. a 1970's traffic design. I can't see any bus lanes so it certainly hasn't been designed for public transport. I didn't think a proposal could exist that would be worse than the current roundabout but it seems I have been proved wrong. I thought the council was meant to be trying to slow cars down and give priority to buses, cyclists and pedestrians? Sustrans wasn't the only other option presented to the council either. Looking at the comments beside each proposal it smacks a little of a box ticking exercise consultation with the decisions already made. Disappointing lack of imagination and very poor consultation. If Leith Street was made one way for cars and buses travelling in a westerly/south direction and buses from south bridge routed via Princes street round onto Queen Street before heading down Leith Walk then the whole area at Picardy place and St James could be made into a fantastic place for people and would extend benefits down towards Leith Walk.</p> | <p>It is, by design, doomed to be a dead zone traffic island surrounded by smog bound cars. Having an area cut off like this is so obviously wrong that you have had to add this section to the consultation to see if anyone else can think of something to do with it. Maybe build a statue of a giant albatross wearing a gas mask to protect it from car fumes?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCZ9-R</p> | <p>2017-11-20 16:41:56</p> |
| <p>It is not clear how much space is available in front of the cathedral for people attending weddings and funerals, which require places for cars to stop. No one wants cyclists riding through the middle of their wedding photos. There are currently problems with parking at Picardy Place due to the car hire depot and coaches using the hotel. It seems obvious to me that the pavements will become blocked with traffic in this area. There is a cycle lane right outside the Playhouse. When the theatre empties out the pavement here already gets blocked (bear in mind they have matinee performances which generally end around 5pm). Cyclists will run into the theatre crowds. It is also not clear how the cycle lanes can possibly connect with the cycle lane currently going down Leith Walk on the left. Before Leith St was closed there were always bottlenecks for pedestrians due to the narrow pavements and people queuing at bus stops. If anything this layout actually looks worse. Finally I should point out that the public have no confidence in the City's ability to deliver anything on time. Road improvements on Leith Walk have taken more than a year and are still not complete.</p> | <p>No one is going to want to stay in a hotel in the middle of this Spaghetti Junction. Any type of development is going to require vehicle access at some point and this would involve driving across or parking on the pedestrian areas. The area is already well served by bars and restaurants which generate a lot of waste in the Picardy Place area. The refuse service cannot cope at present so having more outlets will just make matters worse. We used to have a clock on the junction with London Road. This was taken down for the tram works and has not been seen since. Why can't we just have it back?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCZX-Q</p> | <p>2017-11-20 17:13:14</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>The council argue that they are committed to modal shift and prioritising sustainable transport over personal car use. Yet the Sustrans proposals are rejected because they will cause congestion and spillover traffic. This should be a reason for favouring these proposals over the three-lane gyratory. Creating road space creates traffic; ergo removing road space will reduce traffic levels. People will not be able to easily drive into the city centre, they will have sustainable alternatives, so they will not drive. The idea that the triangle of land in the middle of three lanes of traffic will be "usable" is also laughable. How many people use the spaces left by the roundabouts on Calder road for leisure? Even triangles of land, such as that between Torphichen Place and Morrison Street, that are already developed, and have such gyratory systems around them, and deeply unpleasant places to be.</p> <p>The current proposals really are the finest urban design from the 1960s. They prioritise the private motor vehicle over everything else. We live in a Europe where similar-sized cities, such as Utrecht, are ripping out their inner urban roads and replacing them with parks and usable space. They are investing in sustainable transport, not more space for more cars. The current proposals, if implemented, will just be an embarrassment for the city and demonstrate a lack of leadership and bravery on changing transport modes and tackling climate change.</p> | | | |
| <p>Why does the car have right of way on this? How do cyclists have to cross lanes of traffic to turn right?</p> | <p>This will be such an unpleasant place to be, the only option will be to sell it for commercial development. You won't be able to be outside it because of the air and noise pollution from the roads around it. I'll be amazed if people bother walking over the numerous crossings from Picardy Place to get to the island.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCZ6-N | 2017-11-20 17:21:55 |
| | <p>An island, an island. Words fail me</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCZ3-J | 2017-11-20 18:08:16 |
| <p>Please do not remove the trees. It will render the area soulless and unhealthy.</p> <p>Why are 1600 parking spaces included in the new build?</p> <p>Why is there not a park and ride with vehicles designed to accommodate purchases not being used? This would open up northern parts of the city eg at Granton and provide cusotm for the tram extension.</p> | <p>'One option is a mixed used development comprising of retail, commercial, cultural and hospitality.' That's not one clear option, really, is it? It's a list of all the possibilities. What about landscaped green space to replace the hillside which was built on five years ago? Or does that not bring in any money?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCZB-1 | 2017-11-20 18:57:56 |
| <p>First and foremost the proposal clearly indicates that the St James re-development is intent upon driving its commercial interests and accessibility before all other considerations. The bus stops currently sited in York Place and in Leith Street (when it re-opens) provide more than adequate public transport access to the St James Centre. Secondly The proposed bus stops in front of the Cathedral site will not improve the traffic flow as the buses will have to enter and leave the bays whereas currently the buses circulate within the traffic flow. Thirdly, reducing vehicular access to the shared pedestrian/drop off area in front of the Cathedral will have an adverse impact on Parishioners/Visitors who require ease of access for the obvious reasons. Where and how will Funeral and Wedding corteges access the front of the Cathedral?</p> <p>An artists impression of the proposal would be helpful in addition to the diagram as there is a lack of clarity as to how the proposal will be realised and its overall impact/benefit to the environment. The two roundabouts in this area are desolate and defy the World Heritage Site that this city enjoys and are an eyesore which should have been addressed years ago. Does this plan seek to improve one and not the other?</p> | <p>First and foremost the proposal clearly indicates that the St James re-development is intent upon driving its commercial interests and accessibility before all other considerations. The bus stops currently sited in York Place and in Leith Street (when it re-opens) provide more than adequate public transport access to the St James Centre. Secondly The proposed bus stops in front of the Cathedral site will not improve the traffic flow as the buses will have to enter and leave the bays whereas currently the buses circulate within the traffic flow. Thirdly, reducing vehicular access to the shared pedestrian/drop off area in front of the Cathedral will have an adverse impact on Parishioners/Visitors who require ease of access for the obvious reasons. Where and how will Funeral and Wedding corteges access the front of the Cathedral?</p> <p>An artists impression of the proposal would be helpful in addition to the diagram as there is a lack of clarity as to how the proposal will be realised and its overall impact/benefit to the environment. The two roundabouts in this area are desolate and defy the World Heritage Site that this city enjoys and are an eyesore which should have been addressed years ago. Does this plan seek to improve one and not the other?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCZM-C | 2017-11-20 18:59:50 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Where has the taxi rank being moved to,? Taxis are part of Edinburgh,s public transport system as well. You have a large cinema, new shopping centre and a theatre, so public transport is required but taxis don't seem to be part of this grand vision. Where does a disabled person, a family with young children, tourists with luggage or just a resident of Edinburgh get a taxi on this ne proposal, or do you just want people flagging taxis down in the street thus causing more congestion. | | ANON-8G9D-FCZT-K | 2017-11-20 19:45:42 |
| <p>I still feel that the island is a waste of space and does not meet the requirement on the city's development plan for quality public spaces. I think it would make sense to abandon the idea of a gyratory and have a simpler junction which could be offset to allow a large public space immediately outside the cathedral or the Omni Centre.</p> <p>The junction is still dominated by motorised traffic and there is still not enough priority given to pedestrians and cyclists. The junction should have continuous walking and cycling priority paths in all directions whe traffic has to wait. This type of junction layout works well in many other European cities.</p> | <p>My preference would be for no island and for the road alignment to be offset so that there is a large, linked green space and gathering space outside of the cathedral or Omni Centre. This could be used for markets, public performances, seating and coffee, children's lay area etc. The island is uninviting, lying across many lanes of traffic. This should not built on as Leith is already one of the city's, and country's, most developed neighbourhoods. If the island has to remain, it should be a green space not a built environment.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCZC-2 | 2017-11-20 21:28:55 |
| <p>This is rubbish. The shape of the junction brings Edinburgh back to the 1950s.</p> <p>The design will increase car traffic unfortunately. The Council's Local Transport Strategy is very explicit: reduce car modal share from 42% to 29%. Not "accommodate current level of car traffic".</p> <p>Pedestrian crossing provision is poor and involves many 3 stages crossing. People will never respect this, and accidents will happen.</p> <p>Where are the bus lanes? Where is the public transport priority, especially on this key corridor?? Tram/bus interchange is poor and involves again many road crossing.</p> | | | |
| Please review this plan to bring Edinburgh to the 21st century. | Make it a place for people. | ANON-8G9D-FCZ2-H | 2017-11-20 21:41:59 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The presented layout does not seem to take pedestrians, public transport users or cyclist seriously into account.</p> <p>A design which would create an accessible public space, similar to Trafalgar square post 2003 would be way better to access and use than a square which is a island between three massive roads.</p> <p>It does not seem that the current design tries to reduce traffic or congestion in the area. I currently walk across Picardy square to get public transport about 8 times a week and it is a drag, this design seems to make things worse. Reducing the lanes for private motor vehicles would be the way to go if the aim is to reduce traffic in this area.</p> <p>Furthermore, I do not see any bus lines in the current design, how can you seriously claim this design is fit for the 21th century.</p> <p>Leith street could be closed for all private traffic. It seems to work fine at the moment.</p> <p>There should be cycle lanes along all three sides of the square, adding cycling lanes will lead to increased use of bicycles and reduce the use of private vehicles.</p> <p>It's not clear how the Cathedral is taken into account</p> | <p>There is no direct access to the square.</p> <p>- Creating a public space which is not separate by 3 lanes of traffic would increase public movement, make it pleasant and accessible rather than noisy, inhospitable and polluted (Compare to Trafalgar Square prior vs post 2003, Atkins at al.)</p> <p>Having only one road to cross would also lower the time to change between tram/bus for public transport users. This would lower the "cost of travel" for public transport and would make public transport even more desirable. This assumption is based Down's hypothesis (see Mogridge paper)</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCCM-N</p> | <p>2017-11-20 21:59:35</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I'm a veteran of the opposition to the Buchanan plan of the early seventies; this is an example of the same sort of unimaginative thinking. We do not have to surrender our urban centres to private motor vehicles, we should not do so. The world is moving on; private cars in urban centres will become rapidly less significant, partly because of pollution but mainly because of the rise of self-driving vehicles and electrically assisted bicycles.</p> <p>Cycling has been an increasing mode of urban travel in Edinburgh for some decades, but the hills have been deterrent for many users. The increasing availability and falling price of electrically assisted cycles is likely to lead to a step-change in this growth. greatly reducing both congestion and pollution. Planning should both encourage and accommodate such growth.</p> <p>The recommended plan leaves very little public space in front of the cathedral, meaning the Paolozzi works will have little room to breathe and to be appreciated. The plan gives little detail of how the triangle will be developed to allow public space, and that is disappointing.</p> <p>However, my principal criticism is that devoting so much space to motor traffic severely restricts the modes which current planning guidance should encourage. Mixing cycles travelling at 15 +-5 mph with pedestrians travelling at 2 +-2 mph results in frustration and risk for both groups. It would be better to reduce motor vehicle space in favour of cycle space.</p> | <p>I am strongly of the opinion that the space should be developed flexibly as open space, with at least the possibility that it could be adapted as an open air performance space during festival time. Some sort of shallow-stepped semi-circular amphitheatre might be possible.</p> <p>A cafe-booth with outdoor seating would also enhance the public space and make it more usable. Consideration should be given to moving at least some of the Paolozzi sculptures to the island.</p> <p>I appreciate that developing the island as commercial property would bring in revenue to the council, but Edinburgh thrives at least significantly on its cultural festivals and quality urban environment; I feel that preservation of public space is key.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCH9-6</p> | <p>2017-11-20 23:20:27</p> |
| | I think cycling should be prioritized | ANON-8G9D-FCHQ-X | 2017-11-21 07:46:44 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>While acknowledging that there are current traffic volumes that need to be catered for it would be remiss to forget that traffic volumes have recently been affected by the the St James Quarter development. The presence of SOV within the queues of traffic is creating unnecessary excess volume. This would be a great opportunity to enhance the public transport corridor by maintaining the closure of Leith Street to private vechicles and having it prioritised for cycles, buses and taxis. It would also afford an opportunity to expand footways on Leith street to acommodate Pedestrian Volume.</p> <p>The raised issue with a Y layout providing a no turn around facility for buses, how often is it required to happen, currently the layout at London Road provides this service. Thereby the turnaround needs to be part of a wider discussion of the impact of the tramline along the length of Leith Street/London Road/Elm Row/Leith Walk.</p> <p>The council has stated that in 2014 they apporved the RAM for public realm improvements. One of the dismissal points of the suggestion from Sustrans was that the resulting island of a Y layout would not be usable. Totally missing the point that the public realm in front of the Cathedral would be enhance to a great degree. The local market that takes place here would be much more in spot light if it had the opportunity to expand for summer and festival times, and businesses would benefit from footfall right outside the door.</p> | <p>This 'usable' island site has every opportunity to be missed by pedestrians travelling into the city centre by the normal routes, i.e. alongside the Omni centre, from broughton and heading up past John Lewis. The very nature of the island being surrounded by traffic would not make for a calming and people friendly place.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCHV-3 | 2017-11-21 08:30:39 |
| <p>It feels like it will be the same as the space at haymarket/west maitland st/Morrison street gyratory that isn't a nice open public space. Concerned the current traffic levels are being kept and the bias in the writing is appalling. There doesn't seem to be a balanced view. I'd like to remove all people of responsibility for deciding these layouts from the council and replace with new forward thinking people.</p> | <p>An open park with cycle parking facilities and seating area. No need for any more retail with the st James Dev and Omni centre.</p> <p>The CEC transport chiefs can use it to sit and relax and watch the massive traffic island they created breathing in the smog. (Tongue in cheek)</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCHB-F | 2017-11-21 09:45:15 |
| <p>I think this scheme offers walkers and public transport users a poor quality transit area.</p> <p>Much more should be done to keep the green space and not overdevelop this busy part of town. The counter proposal from Zone Architecture and Sustains looks much better and retains a quality of public realm that is really important in an increasingly developed city centre. I am experiencing the awful gyratory at Abbeyhill (both as a driver and as a resident) and it is causing the roads around it to be dangerous for walking to school. Drivers are avoiding it because it takes too long and rat running along Hillside. I am concerned this development will cause further problems and dangerous roads for me and my family.</p> | <p>It should be a green space not developed. Edinburgh is beautiful because it has sightlines please don't cram more development onto this congested space.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCHH-N | 2017-11-21 10:12:01 |
| <p>In what way would the central island be useable? It seems like it'd be of no use to pedestrians or cyclists and would not help create a sense of place. At all.</p> | <p>It'd be surrounded on all sides by three lanes of traffic! Not a pleasant space</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCHS-Z | 2017-11-21 10:13:15 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>original plan, prioritising traffic over people and result in the further diminishing of public space.</p> <p>One of Edinburgh's strengths for both visitors and residents has always been its compact layout and relative coherence of the city centre. At Picardy Place an opportunity is being missed to create viable civic space.</p> <p>The most glaring mistake in both the previous and current plan is the failure to implement a traffic reduction strategy. The surveys carried out by the developer of the St James site indicate an expected increase in car use through Picardy place, with severe detrimental impacts on local health and wellbeing.</p> <p>The closure of Leith Street has shown that diverting traffic around Calton Hill is possible in line with a general traffic reduction strategy. Furthermore, there is scope to introduce a one way system using Leith Walk and Easter Road which would allow residents and business access but reduce on street car movements. In tandem with the construction of the tram line along Leith Walk, there is an opportunity to radically rethink this part of Edinburgh's urban core and to create a liveable environment for residents and tourists alike.</p> <p>Leith Walk in particular is one of the most densely populated streets in Scotland, but it is often not treated as a residential street. Any changes to Picardy Place may well have a negative impact on Leith Walk and those who live there.</p> <p>Lastly, as Edinburgh continues to grow in the coming decade to become both larger and more dense, the current layout will prove unfit for purpose due to increased need for bus journeys and interchange and possible overloading of the tram system. The current designs are fit for neither Edinburgh' status as European capital nor its practical transport needs and the wellbeing of local residents.</p> | <p>It is important that any development does not merely create more retail and leisure space to mimic the adjacent Omni Centre. This is particularly the case as it may have an adverse impact on businesses on Leith Walk.</p> <p>The removal of a large area of open space in the heart of the city is also questionable. Although the council have suggested the site would benefit from development, there appears to be no impediment to safeguarding the area as a public space linked to the cathedral. This space would not only provide a fitting link between Leith Walk and the city of Edinburgh, but could also be used for events, markets, public meetings and other civic uses which would better reflect the needs of residents than private developments. It would also provide a source of income to the council and contribute to the creation of a sustainable and vibrant city centre.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCH2-Y</p> | <p>2017-11-21 10:33:51</p> |
| <p>There is too much emphasis on making the layout work for cars. Edinburgh Council have stayed elsewhere its commitment to reducing cars in the city centre. This seems to go against your own policies.</p> <p>Stating that the island will be a useable space is quite frankly nonsense. When has a space in the middle of a traffic junction been useable. It's irresponsible to suggest people gathering in the middle of all that traffic pollution.</p> <p>It is a cowardly, status-quo proposal that does nothing to meet Edinburgh's world class ambitions. Please be brave. Pedestrianise, with lanes for bikes and public transport. Let there be no place for cars here!</p> <p>I say this as a resident of Corstorphine. Reducing the ability of cars to come into the city centre will reduces the traffic on St John's Road And Corstorphine Road abs increase uptake of public transport.</p> <p>Please, please be brave. The age of the Car should come to an end. Why not be in the vanguard not stuck behind the times?</p> | <p>Genuinely accessible is a priority. Not surrounded by cars. As much of the whole area as possible should be pedestrianised. Then There is an opportunity for a genuinely shared space for concerts, gatherings etc. It is genuinely irresponsible to suggest a shared space in the middle of a busy, noisy, polluted junction such as you are proposing.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC3E-W</p> | <p>2017-11-21 11:18:22</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Whilst I can appreciate that Picardy Place is a challenging site I feel the proposed design will only encourage people to travel to the location by car, especially as the St James redevelopment will create excessive additional parking provision, this is nothing short of an inducement to car travel.</p> <p>The newly created island space rather than acting as a safe conduit for the flow of people (pedestrian and cyclist) from one side to the other will more likely prove to be a barrier. Will people be willing to wait at up to four crossings to traverse the area? I fear people will choose the shortest route from A-B by cutting across the carriage way and tram tracks.</p> | In addition the island will make an inferior public space as it is surrounded by 3 lanes of polluting traffic, this will not make it a place to relax in. | ANON-8G9D-FCHA-E | 2017-11-21 11:20:12 |
| <p>There is no provision for funeral Or wedding cars outside the cathedral. Also removal of disabled parking there</p> | Island should be moved or made smaller to allow for vehicle access to front of cathedral | ANON-8G9D-FC3Z-J | 2017-11-21 11:29:55 |
| | <p>Maximise access and take advantage of the change in level. Form an underground pedestrian link from the Omni Centre directly to the basement of new building on island site. Underground development would increase the amount of accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Consider how the new site is going to be serviced (drop-off, refuse collection, maintenance access, deliveries etc) and see above.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC33-B | 2017-11-21 12:13:21 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FC3M-5 | 2017-11-21 12:24:10 |
| | The Council should retain ownership of the site and use it for the public good. | ANON-8G9D-FC3F-X | 2017-11-21 12:32:03 |
| Needs more pedestrian crossings with longer time to cross. Less shared space with cyclists. | <p>Council houses.</p> <p>Public park- not to be taken over by markets etc for most of the year</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC3T-C | 2017-11-21 12:40:30 |
| <p>The island is a total waste of space as it stands, and this still puts drivers first. I would urge the Council to reconsider the Sustrans proposal, or anything similar (eg the ZONE proposal) which extends the public space in front of the Cathedral to include what would be the island. I cannot believe - after the shambles on Leith Walk, where cycle lanes are still not kerbed off, that we're still having these 1980s-style discussions about traffic flow that assume car dependence cannot and will not be addressed.</p> <p>This is a gyratory system that will see accidents, injuries and likely fatalities. Three lanes of traffic around the island is, frankly, insane.</p> | As before, please join the island to the public space in front of the Cathedral, and it could be a great space for an expanded market, or for a live music venue. If it has roads on all sides it's basically a hostile space for pedestrians and wheelchair users. | ANON-8G9D-FC3R-A | 2017-11-21 12:54:39 |
| <p>There is an opportunity here to help reduce, not encourage private car use, improve public transport links and active travel whilst at the same time create a vastly improved public space.</p> <p>Ignoring this opportunity, one that can be achieved more simply and cheaply than the current proposal is simply irresponsible.</p> | <p>An island surrounded by three lanes of traffic!</p> <p>This is insane.</p> <p>It should be a continuation of public space, probably from the cathedral, possibly from the omni.</p> <p>This design takes public planning back generations.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC3N-6 | 2017-11-21 13:22:09 |
| <p>There is too much space allowed for motor vehicles. There is not enough space given to pedestrians, public transport and cyclists. A far more attractive - and modern - environment would give up car space. These designs would be acceptable in previous decades but not now.</p> | Unfortunately, my favoured option would be an open space, and an open space surrounded by motor vehicles is not one which I would use. | ANON-8G9D-FC3D-V | 2017-11-21 14:35:46 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>terrible addition to the public realm of the area. I cannot understand why this is a positive thing for traffic, let alone public access - I understand that bus and taxi drivers do not support the route or 3 lane system, as not only will it provide lots of twists and turns when going around the gyratory system making access trickier, the journey less comfortable and more convoluted, it will also lead to potential increased frequency of accidents with vehicles cutting in and out of lanes and will with the increased amount of vehicles slowing and accelerating at the junctions / lights lead to increased noise and pollution levels making the public spaces around the Omni, island, John Lewis and Church less amenable places to be full stop. The prospect of crossing 3 lanes of traffic will also ensure that the island development receives less footfall due to it's isolation within the island.</p> <p>Where is the pedestrian crossing opposite the Playhouse? Many many people cross here daily. It seems to be missing entirely from the proposals - surely it is not expected that people will go across the island to get from Picardy Place to Omni?</p> <p>For the cycle provision - I cycle to work daily and avoid the current road layout at Leith St / Leith Walk as a matter of course as it is simply dangerous, so I welcome any improvements here to acknowledge cycle safety.</p> <p>Unfortunately the proposals do not go any where near far enough. I previously lived in East Broughton Place so passed this area daily into and from town - for the new proposals, it appears that if I were coming from York Place or Broughton Street toward Leith Walk, I would either stay on the road where there is no provision only a shared route with buses, or I have to cross the junction to join with the new two way cycle route on the opposite side, then negotiate a 'shared' space with pedestrians - this sounds terrible both for cyclists and pedestrians and would lead to accidents - and then cycle down the new dedicated route by the Omni.</p> <p>I am further concerned and confused how the new proposal joins with the currently being built cycle lanes on each side of the road further down Leith Walk - how does the single two way lane make it's way across Leith Walk once it gets beyond the development by the Omni? Should the lanes not go</p> | <p>Small scale commercial lets and community led shared rentable spaces would be good. Residential spaces up high would be good but I would worry that the noise would be too great to make it sustainable.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC3W-F</p> | <p>2017-11-21 14:50:05</p> |
| <p>Whilst I fully support the city becoming more pedestrian and cycle friendly I feel it important to ensure a good traffic flow. This area is particularly bad especially on Sundays when access through Holyrood park is closed. So I do not think that it gives too much priority to motor vehicles. It is a busy bus route and I think this should be considered a priority.</p> | <p>In an area with a lot of traffic and traffic fumes I think it would be beneficial to have a green space with trees and avoid further buildings or anything too high that changes the feel of having open space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCPP-5</p> | <p>2017-11-21 15:02:03</p> |
| <p>I think the sustrans idea of a Y shaped road lay out. I think this is better for people using the area. I live on Montgomery Street so use the area a lot, particularly John Lewis and Broughton street.</p> | <p>Its a giant roundabout. Waste of space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCPM-2</p> | <p>2017-11-21 16:21:09</p> |
| <p>The proposal is far too car focused, with insufficient consideration given to cyclists an pedestrians. The central island does not look like it could ever become a pleasant place to be.</p> <p>The "y" layout, despite the modelled impact on traffic looks like a better way forward.</p> <p>We can't expect to change peoples behaviour & get them out of there cars if we continue to make that the focus. I say this as a driver who uses Picardy place regularly - but I accept that my convenience isn't the be all & end all when designing a public space.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCPF-U</p> | <p>2017-11-21 16:43:57</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am incredibly disappointed to see the proposed layout to Picardy Place. We have a fantastic opportunity to design a system that reduces traffic flow and encourages active modes of transport, and yet this seems to be squandered with this design.</p> <p>It is well known that if you cater for high volumes of traffic, then you will get high volumes of traffic. Coming up with a design that allows for reduction of traffic in future (should people happen to choose alternative modes of transport) is not going to reduce flow. I am an Edinburgh resident who is incredibly pro cycling, yet, having to travel east to west means that I am often put off by unsafe cycling provision. And I am infuriated when I see council money being spend on billboards encouraging me to get on my bike!</p> <p>This design once again puts motor vehicles centre stage, and requires pedestrians, tram users and cyclists to do their best to navigate around them. I am incredibly disappointed.</p> | <p>I would be incredibly upset if this site were to be developed as a retail and commercial space. Perhaps a green space? Large scale secure bike racks to encourage cyclists to cycle in and then catch the tram?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCPB-Q</p> | <p>2017-11-21 16:48:54</p> |
| <p>I object to the proposed street layout on hte following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There need to be separate cycle lanes to avoid conflict between cyclists and pedestrians in this bus area. 2. To truly aid public transport the design should have bus only lanes. 3. The design creates a car-centric space with far too many lanes. It will be an unpleasant public space. 4. The design therefore goes counter to the council's stated aims with respect to improving and increasing active travel, reducing car use, improving health, increasing public transport use. 5. In terms of design this is a throwback to seventies car-centric design that will make the space around Picardy Place a congested and polluted area. | <p>I object to the idea that this is a usable space. It will be surrounded by very heavy traffic on all sides and hard to get to across three lanes of congested traffic. There are many examples of such spaces in cities and they are all polluted and underused. There are other plans available that leave one side of the space traffic-free. These are much better designs, despite the misrepresentation of the Sustrans plans given here. I would recommend the plans setout in the Broughton Spurtle.</p> <p>Go back to the drawing board and design something that is genuinely good for the space and for pedestrians, public transport and cyclists.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCP4-9</p> | <p>2017-11-21 16:51:08</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>1. Is anyone really going to want to enjoy a coffee, chat, sit down, view of the cathedral in the middle of a 3 lane roundabout backed up with turning buses and lorries? Probably not. The Sustrans plan clearly sets out a safe public space which is easily accessible to everyone.</p> <p>2. Shared spaces for cyclists and pedestrians do not work. There is plenty of evidence to support this. Not everyone is able to dodge cyclists and should not have to.</p> <p>3. It is clear from the plan that the priority of the council is the immediate storage and longevity of traffic. Please show commitment to traffic reduction by actively disincentivising it.</p> <p>4. No clear access for cyclists after Greenside place?</p> <p>5. Please provide drawings of the cycling lanes. The new segregated cycle paths on Leith walk are poorly designed. There is no clear difference between the lane and the pavement. This causes confusion between cyclists and pedestrians and I'm sure will lead to accidents. Most designs in the cycle-friendly Netherlands and even in the UK (London and Manchester) eliminate conflict by separating pedestrians, cyclists and road users with at least a curb. Let's make sure to follow the best practices which have been developed over the 50 years so we can be safe and have a good time.</p> | <p>don't zone for commercial use. Let's have a park. We already have omni and st. james and we don't have a park.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCPJ-Y</p> | <p>2017-11-21 16:53:02</p> |
| <p>This is a junction that is already operating above capacity. Changing it to further penalise road users will only worsen congestion. Pedestrian access should be provided by means of an overpass.</p> <p>Rather than continuing to penalise car users, the council's focus should be on improving public transport options, particularly rail within Edinburgh.</p> | <p>Don't fill it with hideous modern art pieces.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCP5-A</p> | <p>2017-11-21 17:46:22</p> |
| <p>It is disappointing that the opportunities offered by the redesign of this major junction to refocus on sustainable and active transport is not being taken. The continuing provision for cars and light vehicles at the expense of public and active transport and walking gives a lie to the Council's commitment supporting and encouraging active transport. The current proposals for cycling between Leith Street and Broughton Place and Greenside and York Place fail to take account of accepted good practice in public space design and the provision for pedestrians and cyclists suggest that they are considered an after-thought behind motorised traffic. There has to be a willingness to take difficult decisions that will encourage Edinburgh residents to move to a more active lifestyle at a time when they have indicated a willingness to do that. A rethink on this design is necessary.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCPW-C</p> | <p>2017-11-21 18:42:41</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Edinburgh needs a good tram bus interchange. While this is a start it might (we hope) have an endless stream of pedestrians crossing from tram to bus or vice versa holding up traffic.</p> <p>taking buses into the triangle to meet the trams (take a look at the German systems!) would be much safer and more convenient for users.</p> <p>The single traffic lane out of the complex to Leith is inadequate. It has to carry all the traffic and buses from York place.</p> <p>The road traffic has to cross tram lines twice and two sets of lines (?really needed couldn't a single track suffice at this point? The delays (to judge by Princes Street) will be considerable.</p> <p>There seems to be an attempt to have no discussion about the run-off to Leith Walk London Road/tram interface.</p> <p>Are private cars etc to be excluded form upper Leith Street? Facts are hard to obtain.</p> | <p>To make a proper bus/tram interchange (there is none in Princes Street!) and to replace the removed trees</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGX-4</p> | <p>2017-11-21 19:44:51</p> |
| <p>I'm concerned that three lane roads to convey traffic are the opposite of pedestrian and cycle friendly. I am also concerned that there seems to be no firm commitment to return trees to the space or to create new green space, what your explanatory notes say is that this is effectively subject to the design and to being feasible. The whole junction/area could end up looking even more of a concrete and tarmac wasteland than it does already, and not a good or pleasant environment for anyone on foot or on bikes.</p> | <p>We need more green space in this area, not more retail, unless there are cafes or similar. But I find it hard to imagine who would want to use any kind of amenity that is marooned on an island in the middle of a three lane traffic intersection.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGQ-W</p> | <p>2017-11-21 19:59:28</p> |
| <p>The proposed layout has been designed for cars with provision for cyclists and pedestrians added on. As a pedestrian who lives in Leith and who uses feet as transport, I walk over/round/across Picardy Place most days - to shop in John Lewis or in Broughton St and to access Waverley Station (via the 'back' door). The new layout will make my heart sink even more than it does now, given the number of crossings I will have to make. 3 at the top of Broughton Street to get to JL! Ridiculous. How does this fit in with Active Travel or the reduction in emissions? Favouring the private car is not the way to go in the 21st century. I expect the number of drivers using Picardy Place has been counted but who on earth are these drivers? Where do they come from and where are they going? They are not locals or tourists for sure. Are they lost and don't know proper routes or how to use Park and Ride? Their behaviour needs changed, not those undertaking active travel. Traffic experts know full well that if you build a road they will drive on it, if you don't they won't. Perfect opportunity here to do the right thing and not to pander to a developer who wants his car park full. In addition, shared pedestrian/cyclist space on the corners is a bad idea. The chap today at the consultation said 'cyclists would be expected to dismount' Oh, how I laughed, he obviously doesn't know many cyclists! All in all, very disappointing.</p> | <p>It's an island in the middle of three lanes of traffic, it's hardly going to be pleasant! It's going to be inconvenient for pedestrians to access. I expect it will end up trashy like St Andrew's Sqare, the bit at Waverley and George St - cheap looking burger bars and beer huts with fake grass laid and lifted 3 times a year. No? Plant it densely with real trees and a proper garden with art works, water features and no food outlets then! Sigh. Yes, I can walk to the Botanics/Holyrood Park for that.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGZ-6</p> | <p>2017-11-21 20:02:16</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Yes this design gives far too much priority to vehicles rather than pedestrians and cyclists. I walk around this junction regularly and the current layout is a disgrace so something definitely needs done. I would say as many if not more people walk around this area than drive, and if you want to encourage people out of their cars then the maximum possible priority should be given to active travel.</p> <p>Your state that "The proposed street layout is flexible for the future; it allows for the number of lanes of traffic to be reduced over time as more people change to active travel." My response would be that people will not change to active travel unless the proper facilities are there. You assume with this statement that people will automatically shift to active travel - they won't unless the incentive is there. Make car use as inconvenient as possible and people will switch. Therefore reduce the number of lanes now. If you want to reduce traffic, why design it for current volumes?</p> <p>Overall, as a pedestrian using this junction regularly, I think you must make it as easy as possible to cross this area, no multiple stage crossing where you have to wait several minutes for lights to change. If I have to go to 4 different crossings just to get from one side to the other and wait a few minutes at each, it will take far too long and serve to discourage people walking, rather than encourage.</p> | <p>Leave it as an open landscaped public space. It should be accessible which being an island site is difficult, therefore any space which is created should be next to a main throughfare. Therefore I would support the sustrans model over the island layout.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCG6-2</p> | <p>2017-11-21 20:11:49</p> |
| <p>If the volume of traffic is expected to remain broadly the same as it is now, it is disappointing to see that there is not a segregated cycle lane on all of the three new streets surrounding the island. Given the size of the island, it does not seem unreasonable to provide this.</p> <p>If this is not possible, there should be direct cycle lanes / shared space running across the island from Leith Street to Union Place, from York Place to Leith Street, and from Greenside Place to York Place.</p> <p>This is a busy junction and, for cyclists, a dangerous one. Less confident cyclists will continue to avoid it unless there is significantly better cycling provision, and that means segregated lanes or off-road cycling paths.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGK-Q</p> | <p>2017-11-21 20:39:15</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>narrows to one lane to accommodate the tram bahn. Considering that there are 3 lanes at present, this is likely to result in severe congestion at peak times. The tram bahn appears to be wider at the top of Leith Walk than the existing tracks on York Place so there may be scope to reduce its width.</p> <p>It is not clear how the design is more pedestrian friendly than at present. It is assumed that the dotted lines represent crossing points, but this should be more explicit. Has a pedestrian underpass been considered?</p> <p>Vehicle access to St. Mary's Cathedral for wedding and funeral cars etc should be provided.</p> | | | |
| | <p>A focal point should be provided for the island site eg some public art or perhaps a new location for the clock which used to be in the middle of London Road Roundabout . Tree planting, mounding, planting and a water feature should be considered. Cafes, shops and bars could be provided.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCGV-2 | 2017-11-21 21:37:08 |
| <p>The proposed layout does not seem to promote the "active travel" noted but to continue priority being given to car use. Creating a public space while retaining the current volume of car traffic seems to pose a health risk for those using the public space especially given the current evidence relating to the impact of traffic pollution on children's health.</p> <p>Having travelled in many of the major European cities areas such as Picardy Place have for many years been restricted to pedestrian and public transport only.</p> <p>As an older resident of Edinburgh I recall the historical layout and the area outside the Cathedral was not a public space but built up with shops at ground level and traffic levels were in no way comparable with today. I would be strongly against the proposals as they stand.</p> | <p>Given the scale of retail development in the area do we really require more in this area. Even something of low height would restrict the visual aspect of looking down Leith Walk.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCGJ-P | 2017-11-21 21:55:19 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>It's a proposal that would have struggled to be seen 'ambitious' in the car mad 70's. The council has an opportunity to demonstrate it doesn't just say things going in the right direction, but actually does things in the right direction. You want people to switch from cars to public and active transport - you need to stop redeveloping roads and junctions which very clearly favour cars and do not represent an attractive enough proposition to switch to more sustainable modes of transport. Edinburgh needs public space for pedestrians and a clear signal the quickest and most convenient way to travel from Leith Walk / London Rd towards the West End is by bike, bus, tram or foot. Definitely not by car. Extremely disappointing work from a council who pretends to care about its citizen's health and wellbeing - If anyone had bothered doing any research into what other cities are doing, they would have realised how backwards and damaging this proposal was. Beyond poor.</p> | <p>Open space / square. Public transport interchange - quick and comfortable in every weather</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCG4-Z</p> | <p>2017-11-21 23:13:01</p> |
| <p>My key point is that I would like to see Leith Street designated as public transport pedestrians and cyclists only.</p> | <p>Space utilised along the lines of St Andrews Square but on a smaller scale. So green space for relaxation and exhibitions that fit with available space</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGD-G</p> | <p>2017-11-22 08:05:46</p> |
| <p>I'm pleased to see the new layout for the tram stop - the current roundabout is exceptionally ugly and this gives an opportunity for better civic space.</p> <p>However, as a cyclist, these plans really don't work for me. I live in Leith and work on Broughton St. If I were cycling into the old town, I would not be able to get on to the cycle path easily - in fact, I would have to go half way round and cross more than once. Ironically, the current roundabout would be easier, although much less safe. Likewise, the lack of a path on the other side of York place makes it impossible for me to get from the path to Broughton St. Finally, the shared use area outside the Conan Doyle is totally inappropriate. This is an area congested with pedestrians and making this shared space will lead to immense frustration.</p> | | | |
| <p>I'm also not convinced that there is adequate space for buses here.</p> | <p>Please no more retail. Can we just have something for the community please?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCG7-3</p> | <p>2017-11-22 08:10:40</p> |
| <p>It is difficult to comment on the layout as the design objective has not been clearly stated. What are the main traffic flows? How are they likely to change in the future? What will be the impact on the design if the proposed tram extension does not proceed? What are the alternatives?</p> | | | |
| <p>The size of the space in the middle of the triangle is not substantial enough to make it developable, the proximity of the surrounding 3 lanes of traffic will make it an unpleasant place to be.</p> | <p>The size of the space in the middle of the triangle is not appear substantial enough to make it developable, and the proximity of the surrounding 3 lanes of traffic will make it an unpleasant place to be.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGH-M</p> | <p>2017-11-22 08:43:14</p> |
| <p>I still feel that this prioritises cars and therefore goes directly against the aims of the Council detailed earlier. It does little to encourage cycling or make a busy area pedestrian friendly.</p> | | | |
| <p>This is a once in a generation opportunity to make brave decision that will benefit the City for years to come. Instead it appears car users are being favoured, despite the fact that any proposed design will still result in traffic jams and queuing.</p> | <p>a public space that could be used during the festival etc similar to Charlotte and St Andrews Squares. However this would require a drop off in traffic numbers to ever be feasible.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCG2-X</p> | <p>2017-11-22 09:13:03</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am particularly concerned with the fact that traffic will now pass much closer to the front of the Cathedral - noise and pollution . That said, I am also concerned about the safety issue for children with roads so close to the Cathedral - many many children attend the church there . There is a clear issue with relation to parking for those in society who are elderly or infirm especially for those who want to attend the Church there. Most obvious is the lack of space for corteges (Funeral and Wedding) in front of the Cathedral - where would they park - can you imagine your funeral hearse stopping in a double bus stop then being carted through the traffic? Finally, the plans for the triangle - this has to be an open space - no buildings - we should be bold and aim for an open piazza not some concrete monstrosity which infringes the open vista of the Cathedral and hides it away. We should be proud of our 3 City Cathedrals and treat them equally with respect and not put one of them in the middle of polluting high rise traffic chaos .</p> | <p>Green and open space in what will be a triangle of vehicular hell - pollution and noise and disruption - a rat race.</p> <p>We don't need any more retail; commercial or hospitality thanks very much - life is about more than that.</p> <p>A cultural open space like other cities in Europe have would be something to aspire to. All Edinburgh seems to build are shops hotels offices and student accommodation! Let's be creative and live up to our "Enlightened" reputation of old,</p> <p>Thanks</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGC-F</p> | <p>2017-11-22 09:13:16</p> |
| <p>current roundabout. As can be seen from the temporary gyratory around Easter Road, Montrose Terrace etc. traffic regularly backs up on all approaches to the gyratory and I see no evidence that this will not be the case here at this busy junction.</p> <p>Maintaining one lane westbound on York Place will continue to throttle traffic trying to leave the revamped junction as will only having one lane heading east from Picardy Place towards Leith Walk.</p> <p>The open space that would be created in the middle of the gyratory has been marked for undefined potential future use on other versions of the plans. This area should be kept as open space to facilitate pedestrian movement in all directions to / from the proposed tram stop. I would suggest that it might present an opportunity to reinstate the London Road clock which has been removed for several years now and is unlikely to be returned to the London Road / Leith Walk junction as this will become a T junction with traffic lights.</p> <p>As the proposed Picardy Place junction will still handle a large volume of traffic it might be an idea to include traffic lights that permit cyclists a few seconds head start to get ahead of the other traffic to promote safer cycling. Otherwise this will remain a hostile environment for cyclists despite the ASLs.</p> <p>The bus stop on York Place outside St Pauls and St Georges Church has been removed. Where will this be relocated to? This provides a useful interchange for people wanting to move onto buses that head North on Broughton Street. More importantly it provides a useful interchange with the tram stop and now no such interchange exists.</p> <p>The inclusion of bus stops within the gyratory is likely to cause tailbacks blocking the junction and disrupting traffic. It will also be difficult for buses to pull out at times given the volume of traffic in the area. The gyratory should minimise any potential for traffic disruption from buses pulling out of stops,</p> | <p>The site should be kept as open space to allow free movement of pedestrians from the various bus / tram stops and retail outlets in the area. It should be decorated with vegetation and should include the old London Road clock which was removed several years ago and is apparently in storage somewhere (unless it is proposed that it will be restored to the London Road / Leith Walk junction.</p> <p>Any development of the site for retail, commercial, cultural or hospitality use should be denied.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGN-T</p> | <p>2017-11-22 09:41:13</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>This plan seems to me to make the area more car-centric. As a pedestrian trying to get from shopping at Princes/George St for leisure at Omni/Playhouse or lunch on Broughton Street this short walk would be slow, polluted and fragmented.</p> <p>I can't see any pleasant public use for the traffic island at the centre, and am bemused that this is being prioritised in the absence of any concrete plans for it.</p> <p>We need to discourage people driving into the centre of the city, and reclaim it for non-polluting active travel.</p> | <p>Why would anyone choose to shop or eat on a traffic island? Why wouldn't we instead retain a sense of space and eyelines across this part of town?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC78-M</p> | <p>2017-11-22 10:00:03</p> |
| | <p>This could be seen as a new public space, in which case it could be used as a space for the Festival, in much the same way that St Andrew Square is used.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7X-M</p> | <p>2017-11-22 10:43:56</p> |
| <p>The council needs to improve active travel, reduce traffic and improve air quality, and a gyratory with 3 lanes of traffic does not seem the best way to do this. Allowing good traffic flow at this junction will only encourage more people to take cars rather than other forms of transport. This should be taken as a great opportunity to reduce traffic by devoping a better proposal similar to Sustrans idea, and this would support the councils supposed plans to improve the city in terms of active travel and air quality.</p> | <p>N/A</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7G-3</p> | <p>2017-11-22 10:48:12</p> |
| <p>The street layout remains too motor centric and the proposed cycle tracks remain deeply flawed. Pedestrian provision is poor, with too many crossing stages, and the centre of the triangle will not be a usable public space as there will still be enormous amounts of motor traffic passing through the area. The Council has committed to making Edinburgh more cycleable and walkable and achieving significant modal shift from motor cars to bikes. This layout will not achieve this goal.</p> <p>- The segregated cycle track infront of the Omni Centre linking to Leith Walk is welcome but it should not be changed to shared space for the crossing of Leith Street to link with the track infront of St Mary's Cathedral. This will only create conflict, especially at busy times. There are countless examples of how similar links can be maintained without the use of shared space (London's East-West Cycle Superhighway proves that this can be achieved with existing UK road standards).</p> <p>- Similar to the above, the link with the York Place cycle track to the St Mary's Cathedral track should be maintained without resorting to shared space at the Conan Doyle. Again, the proposed layout will create conflict, especially at peak times.</p> <p>- The York Place cycle track should be continued around the North Side of Picardy Place into Union Place and eventually linking with the Leith Walk cycle track. Eastbound cyclists on York Place will not choose to fight their way through the shared space to join the Omni Centre track and will simply join the main carriageway here. This is a clear desire line that is not catered for. If you do not provide cycle tracks for this movement, people will be injured and killed here.</p> | <p>It is unrealistic to expect this site to be used as a commercial/entertainment site. There will still be too much motor traffic in the area. It will be noisy and polluted and is difficult to access on foot. Parliament Square and Trafagar Square in London are good examples of how this sort of arrangement will not work unless the area is substantially pedestrianized i.e by completely closing to traffic at least one side of the square.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7P-C</p> | <p>2017-11-22 10:51:46</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>We are surprised to see such a large gyratory traffic island arrangement considering the city council's commitment to sustainable active travel and to reclaiming the streets.</p> <p>We ask you to consider a T-shaped junction with priority given to movement to and from the tram and bus stops with emphasis given to minimising potential conflict between cycles and pedestrians.</p> | <p>Not supportive of an island at all. Consider other ways of generating public benefit around the T-shaped junction we urge you to consider.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7K-7</p> | <p>2017-11-22 11:00:25</p> |
| <p>The problem with Picardy place in its current guise is traffic flow. You have 2 roads which lead immediately to traffic lights, traffic builds up behind and congestion follows.</p> <p>Everything that you've listed that is wrong with the sustran proposal and what is wrong with the current site will happen with the proposal.</p> <p>Traffic needs to be free flowing from York Place through Picardy/Union place to Antigua st.</p> <p>Traffic approaching from London road heading to Greenside row/Calton road should be given a filter lane at a cross road type junction for leith street/broughton street etc.</p> <p>Leith street at Waterloo place junction needs to be closed off to cars/taxi's to allow public transport/cycling priority - cars and taxi's should be diverted along regent road. You'll ease congestion from Prince Street by allowing buses a free flowing left turn onto leith street.</p> | <p>Following my suggestions the site would be bigger, obviously a tram stop should be there as opposed to york place. You could add some green space with outdoor seating and tables. Similar to what they do in NYC, think Bryant park, offer vendors the chance to serve food etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC76-J</p> | <p>2017-11-22 11:07:28</p> |
| <p>The pavements are not wide enough, and priority ought to be given to pedestrians, cyclists, public transport, and accessible crossing spaces. This is a gyratory system which is being replaced in London. Why on earth are we building it here? We need to give a higher priority to reducing carbon emissions and pollution. In the city</p> | <p>This should be a public space, with landscaping and sculpture....NOT a retail/commercial space. Landscape architect students I m sure would have plenty ideas.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7J-6</p> | <p>2017-11-22 11:17:38</p> |
| <p>The trees should be preserved to the maximum extent possible, rather than planutning new ones.</p> <p>The street layout makes sense, and no favouritism is shown to motor traffic.</p> <p>The street names should reflect the names of the streets that were there before.</p> <p>Given the existing tram stop in York place, what need is there for one in Picardy Place?</p> | <p>It should be a public garden and some of the activities currently using Princes Street Gardens should be transferred there,</p> <p>If any development at all is permitted in the island area, nothing should extend beyond three conventional storeys, and it should respect the existing architectural norms of the neighbouring "traditional" buildings</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7B-X</p> | <p>2017-11-22 11:40:17</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| <p>Whilst the Council's commitment to Active Travel is admirable, people will not switch from private cars to bikes whilst it remains easier for them to drive. The street layout may be "flexible", but if people are not incentivized to switch to active travel by forward-thinking designs which prioritise pedestrians and cyclists (which the proposed design does not), then this flexibility will be pointless.</p> <p>This street layout goes some way towards improving active travel provision, but not far enough! For example, the segregated cycle lane is ok, but cyclists travelling from York Place towards Union Street must take an inconvenient detour towards Leith Street.</p> <p>I also have concerns about the merging of segregated cycle lanes into shared pavement space outside the Conan Doyle pub - I can imagine this descending into chaos at peak times, with cyclists swerving about to avoid pedestrians.</p> <p>This could be avoided by narrowing or closing the road between Cathedral Lane and Little King Street to non-essential traffic. This would provide pedestrians and cyclists with much more space, and allow for a linked cycle path.</p> <p>This would also connect the space outside the cathedral with the central island, making the central island a much more attractive and useful public (maybe even green?) space. Under the current proposals I cannot imagine the island being useful for anything, as it is surrounded by 3 busy roads.</p> | <p>As I said in a previous comment, I cannot see this island being an attractive or useful place for people - it is surrounded by three roads and I imagine it would become "dead" space. A more visionary design would connect this island with one of the pavements, creating a larger public space which is easier for pedestrians to access. This could be a new green space, or a travel information point, where the tramline to be extended.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCPT-9</p> | <p>2017-11-22 12:05:08</p> |
| <p>1) I was under the impression that the Cathedral was in fact St Mary's. Poor attention to detail does not encourage me in the scope of this consultation.</p> <p>2) There is little if any imagination in the proposed plan.</p> <p>3) The placement of bus stops definitely needs improved; one just has to observe how many people currently jaywalk at any of the many numerous crossings. Perhaps a study of "desire lines" could be considered.</p> <p>4) The limited use of the pedestrian space might be explained by the presence of the many open-air drinkers and derelicts in the area.</p> <p>5) This whole area requires a much more imaginative solution than has been proposed.</p> | <p>It is not "comprising of"; it is either comprising or composed of.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7D-Z ANON-8G9D-FC7S-F</p> | <p>2017-11-22 12:55:56 2017-11-22 13:25:36</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The Council developed the y-shaped junction layout has not being given the right consideration. It's not stated if the demand considered the lower traffic due to mode switch from cars and buses to trams from the Leith area. To preserve public transport timing an option of using bus lane has not been explored in this layout.</p> <p>The displacement of traffic to residential streets in the New Town is a moot point being Picardy Place a residential area too.</p> <p>The number of traffic lanes doesn't not need to be increased and shouldn't be increased. For example the connection between Leith Street and Broughton Street is hardly necessary if Elder Street is connected to Leith Street and South Saint Andrew Street is reopened to Princes St.</p> <p>The need for buses to turn around is shortly becoming a non-issue since the Lothian buses depot on Annandale Street is planned to be closed.</p> <p>The need to resemble historical layout is hardly a valid point since the whole St James area was not required to adhere to it. Besides historic maps shows a larger similarity to the Y design, with the street from Broughton Street to Leith Street being slightly larger than a close compared to the East-West branch and the wide Northeast-South branch</p> <p>In summary, scrap the gyratory design and ignore the modelling results and reevaluate the Y design with a stronger place-making approach.</p> | <p>The island site is useless in the current layout as in difficult to reach, surrounded by three lanes of traffic on all sides. Noise, air pollution and low access makes it hardly an enjoyable part of the city.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC7H-4</p> | <p>2017-11-22 13:36:05</p> |
| <p>1. There is too much space for cars/vehicles. The design feels car-dominated and the environment that results would be traffic dominated too: noisy and polluted.</p> <p>2. A simplified layout along the lines of the one proposed by Sustrans would create a better place, more attractive to people, and increase the likelihood of the island site being developed in the future.</p> <p>3. The inclusion of shared space at crossing points seems likely to create unhelpful conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Suggesting that cyclists should dismount in these places is an admission that the design is not fit for purpose.</p> <p>4. The current layout does not serve the interests of public transport users well. There is little priority for buses, and the interchange between buses and trams is not well thought through. If Picardy Place is to function as an interchange between the two, then bus stops need to be moved so that they are closer to the tram stop, and to have direct crossing points (rather than 3 or 4 stage crossings)</p> <p>5. The shared space at the corner of York Place is a poorly designed pinch point. Suggesting that cyclists should dismount here is an admission that the design is flawed. It would be preferable to move the cycle way on this arm of the gyratory, so that it runs next to the carriageway (with a proper kerb separation) and keeps cyclists and pedestrians separate at the corner (York Place/Cathedral Lane).</p> <p>6. The footway at the entrance to Cathedral Lane, the exit from Little King Street, should be continuous in order to give priority to pedestrians.</p> <p>7. There should be bus priority lanes in both directions on Leith Street.</p> | <p>I dont have a strong view about suitable end uses for this site.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCGR-X</p> | <p>2017-11-22 13:45:48</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Seems too much space pedestrian space has been given outside St Marys Cathedral, this area currently is unused wasted space so there seems to logical reason to reduce the carriageway width, which should be increased to prevent inevitable queues and congestion. Similarly Leith Street should be widened on approach to the new junction, far too much pedestrian /cycle space which will not be used and will end up barren space like most of the pedestrianised areas due to the bad weather and temperature of Edinburgh. | As access to and from this site would prove hugely challenging given its island form surrounded by busy main routes through the city this seems a particularly ridiculous idea, it should be left as hard and soft landscape open space, thus reducing the need to provide pedestrian areas elsewhere at the junction, the priority of which must be fast efficient traffic movement at this busy junction and not the congested mess it is now. | ANON-8G9D-FC72-E | 2017-11-22 13:46:06 |
| | No more commercial, hospitality or retail!!!! Could we have it green please?!!sculptures of appropriate size would be welcome. And benches. | ANON-8G9D-FC7C-Y | 2017-11-22 13:57:56 |
| I agree with the critique sent by Living Streets. Assuming that the Council does genuinely recognises that traffic volumes and traffic priority must change fast to cut carbon emissions massively because of climate breakdown and global over-heating and also because of the pollution affecting health especially of children: then the proposed changes are too minimal and more effective changes are necessary. A good start would be the Living Streets proposals. Moreover, the expense of the Council's proposals is wasted money, and open to a charge of irresponsible decision-making, on the part of the Councillors, since the more effective proposals by Living Streets may soon become the obvious and urgent requirement when the necessary funds have been wasted on an outdated concept. | Ill conceived, outdated 1970's concept. | ANON-8G9D-FC75-H | 2017-11-22 14:09:22 |
| It's a shame that most of the public space here becomes, in effect, the centre of a giant roundabout. Saying it's 3 different streets and making it triangular rather than round really doesn't change that: it's a roundabout. | I think it's going to be a pretty miserable place. The current area at the foot of the Cathedral isn't too bad -- it's shielded from the traffic by the trees, and while that's never going to be enough to cover the fact you're right by a large busy junction, with the sculptures and the traders it's a nice spot to walk through. I don't see how the island site can live up to that given its location. | ANON-8G9D-FC59-K | 2017-11-22 15:36:01 |
| Dreadful, straight out of the 1960s. Will you be proposing leaded petrol to be used around this timewarp throwback. No priority for buses No priority or safety for cyclists in most directions Too little space for pedestrians and the remainder of the space is actively hostile and discouraging to travel on foot. An utterly isolated and compromised tram stop/interchange In other words, utterly car-centric | Public realm (gardens or paved square) connected to the cathedral WITH NO INTERVENING ROADS | ANON-8G9D-FC58-J | 2017-11-22 16:21:19 |
| I would rather keep the existing roundabout than this nonsense It is imperative that there is access to St. Mary's Cathedral for funeral and wedding access. Also for disabled people to be dropped off outside the cathedral. This plan does not seem to make any provision for this. I also don't like the fact that green space is being lost. It's so important for Edinburgh to maintain green spaces; more so than building more roads for more traffic and more congestion. | Something like St Andrew's Square with greenery but also a cafe. | ANON-8G9D-FC5Z-M | 2017-11-22 16:32:27 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>think of to make it worse would be the removal of the scant cycling provision. It is quite literally one of the worst conceivable designs for this space.</p> <p>To see why it so bad consider the hierarchy of space allocation in a transect across the gyratory;</p> <p>1) Private motorists; 3 lanes of at least 3m width, minimum 9m 2) Pedestrians; 1 lane of 3m 3) Cyclists; 1 lane of 2m 4) Buses; 0 lanes - 0m</p> <p>The correct hierarchy for a well-functioning city is;</p> <p>1) Pedestrians 2) Public transport 3) Cyclists 4) Motorists</p> <p>The plan creates an island cut off from the city by circling motor vehicles. A thoughtful design would create a public space.</p> <p>If motor vehicles are given priority then motor vehicle use will be induced. The council's own plans mandate a reduction in motor traffic.</p> <p>Motor traffic kills business. The council's own plans mandate a business-friendly city.</p> <p>Motor traffic kills place. The council is committed to place-making.</p> <p>Leith Street is currently closed to private motor traffic. Edinburgh has not collapsed. We do not need to dedicate our city centre to those wishing to pass through it in private motor cars. We've got a bypass on the outskirts for</p> | | | |
| <p>I think it will provide a poor environment for people on foot. It really represents a large traffic island that will have no use and will have a ghastly air quality. It will not provide a good quality public realm - I feel I can say this as I am an urban designer and planner. The space there now is horrible and underused because it is so horrid. I appreciate that the trams need to be accommodated. I appreciate that the St James Centre will change - though I have to say it is a dreadful scheme and a shameful decision for a city of world status.</p> <p>Please do not compound the injury to the city that is the new St James Centre with an equally poorly thought out scheme. Make the buildings and the people the priority. Do something about the volume of unnecessary traffic and make the city a more pleasant space for pedestrians.</p> | <p>Do not create an island site at all. It is a very, very bad idea.</p> <p>Also the council doesn't own all the land. Some of it is held in the common good fund, which does not belong to the council in the conventional sense. Traffic islands are very much not in the common good of Edinburgh's citizens.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC5P-A</p> | <p>2017-11-22 16:41:41</p> |
| | <p>I don't believe the island site should be created. Its a mistake. Go for a different layout and stop trying to coerce me into saying it should be used for commercial activity. It will be a horrible place, the island, it will be noisy and polluted. Do make a space with these characteristics. Change the form and give the cathedral a setting.</p> <p>This municipal vandalism wouldn't happen in Paris or Rome, why do it in Edinburgh?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC56-G</p> | <p>2017-11-22 16:46:06</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Central space is a complete waste. Not a public space or anything of the sort. Even if it were to serve some public good... Try going there with children etc. Surrounded by three roads of 2+ traffic. Absolutely disgusted at the proposals which prioritise movement of vehicles and offer no thoughtful consideration for the movement of people. At a time when other cities are thinking creatively this is a huge step backwards</p> <p>Given this 'redesign' has hardly changed much and takes nothing on board from other more thoughtful submissions and designs suggested I am not sure what else the Council are prepared to do here.</p> <p>I must be clear, this design is a massive wasted opportunity and a retrograde step.</p> | <p>A complete waste. Who wants to visit an island surrounded by busy traffic. It makes no sense whatsoever.</p> <p>Islands are isolated, hard to reach, solitary places. Why then make a feature of this. Why can't the space be managed to the public access doesn't involve crossing roads.</p> <p>What goes here... Must not be a commercial premises which will require vehicular access/deliveries as the whole junction will become unusable as a result.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC5V-G | 2017-11-22 17:02:30 |
| <p>Are buses and cycles being prioritised here? I can't see if bus lanes are in the pdf. If the CEC wish to reduce amount of traffic wishing to use this junction then something has to be discouraged. Looking at the diagram I would say there is still far too much road space for private vehicle and little sign of encouraging modal shift.</p> <p>City has obligation to reduce emissions so this should be a good place to start doing things differently.</p> <p>City also has a tradition of closing roads for festivals, road works, tram works. So if traffic capacity for private cars is reduced then it won't be exactly the end of the world.</p> | <p>A disconnected island surrounded by buses and cars is not an attractive place. Far better to join this public space to other areas around Omni. Crossing three lanes of traffic is a discouragement. Cycling and walking have been forced into a reservation disconnected from other established businesses. These should always be aligned close to business. Cyclists may well stay on roads. I see ASLs with no way into them. This is confusing and will likely result in people moaning about active travel routes not being used. Good design means the cycle and walking routes are always direct and obviously the best choice.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC5Q-B | 2017-11-22 17:06:31 |
| <p>I'm surprised there's only one lane for buses and cars going from e.g. Princes Street, York Place and Broughton Street down Leith Walk. The gentleman at the consultation told me traffic analysis suggests this is all that's needed. There are so many lights on this new arrangement - given the terrible problems we have at the moment - I hope this is correct.</p> | <p>I definitely DO NOT want any development of the island. There are going to be more than enough shops in the new development. We don't need any more hotels round here. Culture- hm- what? A coffee shop or something might be good. We don't want the drunks from in front of the cathedral moving down to the island- a coffee shop would mean there'd always be someone around.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC5J-4 | 2017-11-22 17:12:18 |
| <p>Where will the number 8 bus go? Can it turn at the very sharp corner beside the tram stop? This bus is well used and the only bus that goes from Trinity/Cannonmills to the Bridges.</p> <p>I think distinct pedestrian and cycle paths would be better than the shared space suggested.</p> | <p>I think this would be better used as a garden/park area. I would not want to eat/drink in the middle of 3 lanes of traffic, with the noise and pollution this causes.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC5M-7 | 2017-11-22 17:22:55 |
| | <p>I would like to see a wider pedestrian crossing (05) with refuge between York PI/Broughton St and Leith Walk lanes to reduce 3 lane crossing.</p> <p>I think there should be more liberal use of yellow box at 06 intersection to avoid traffic backup.</p> <p>The curve at 06 to Leith Walk is too acute particularly for artics.</p> <p>All Pollozzi sculptures should be together in front of the cathedral. (part of the original design)</p> <p>I still think there should be a left turn from York PI to Broughton St (save going around the gyratory)</p> <p>No apparent cycle-lane in Broughton Street.</p> <p>At 04 it may be necessary to separate the phasing of lanes to York PI and Broughton St so that the York PI lane has more time phasing (majority of traffic is to York PI)</p> <p>I would like to see a drop-down place for the Playhouse/Omni Centre.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC5B-V | 2017-11-22 17:37:47 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I walk past/through this junction every week day. I am a daily pedestrian and a weekend cyclist; only an occasional motorist.</p> <p>I see much to commend in the present design. In particular the creation of a dedicated cycle lane up Leith Walk on the Omni side of the junction. I also applaud the decision to make better use of the largely dead space on Picardy Place itself where the Conan Doyle statue presently sits.</p> <p>I do, however, have concerns of which the greatest is the suggested shared pedestrian/cycle space shown on this plan adjacent to the north eastern entrance to John Lewis and separately surrounding the Conan Doyle pub. At rush hour there is a huge amount of foot traffic in both these areas and expecting it to be shared sensibly by cyclists and pedestrians is a recipe for disaster.</p> <p>I am also at a loss to understand what use is intended for the central island. It is too small and likely to be too noisy ever to be regarded as useful recreational space. Will it not simply end up as a meeting point for the people who presently congregate around the Paolozzi statues drinking beer?</p> | <p>I regret that I cannot suggest any very obviously useful purpose for the island site which seems to me likely to be too small and too noisy ever to enjoy a beneficial recreational use. Frankly you might be as well simply sticking a wind turbine on it so that someone derives some benefit from it.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC5U-F</p> | <p>2017-11-22 17:41:46</p> |
| <p>It is really important that the Paolozzi and Sherlock Holmes Statues remain where they are. They are part of Edinburgh's heritage and must be protected. This part of Edinburgh was destroyed when the St James Centre was built. There is no need to make this area even worse in the 21st Century.</p> <p>It is time that all pedestrian crossings in the centre of town allow pedestrians more time to cross the road. Even young and fit people can barely cross in the time given. Hopefully the pavements will be repaired as part of the exercise. They are a disgrace following the time taken when the inadequate cycle lanes were made.</p> | <p>Turn it in to a green space. There is little enough greenery in this part of Edinburgh.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC54-E</p> | <p>2017-11-22 17:42:15</p> |
| <p>I really like this design. It will adequately deal with current volumes of traffic and allow it to flow much better than it does presently. At the moment there is quite often congestion caused by cars queuing to turn right down Broughton Street. This new layout should successfully eliminate that.</p> | <p>As this is a prime development site, I'd support selling it to a developer to maximise financial gain for the council.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC5T-E</p> | <p>2017-11-22 18:55:19</p> |
| <p>The use of shared pedestrian cycle space is inappropriate for a major interchange carrying high volumes of both.</p> <p>Space for trams and their impact on other modes of transport needs to be reconsidered. It is important that a mode of transport which only serves one route is not prioritised over other more versatile modes of transport.</p> | <p>I would support the use of the site for mixed residential, commercial and retail. This would be more in keeping with the historic use and enrich the urban space. It is important that the development reflects this historic context.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC5R-C</p> | <p>2017-11-22 18:57:59</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Pavement outside Omni Centre is too narrow to cope with crowds when Edinburgh Playhouse is running a show.</p> <p>Visitors to Edinburgh Playhouse frequently crowd onto the pavement outside the Playhouse before, during, and after performances. When leaving at the end of a show, they then flood uphill along Leith Street towards Princes Street and Waverley Station. As the Playhouse can accommodate over 3000 customers, this results in extreme, and sudden, congestion on the southbound side of Leith Street, usually at night (so in darkness).</p> <p>In addition, the Omni Centre frontage is depressed below ground level by steps, which in addition to being a severe trip hazard (such that temporary barriers are periodically deployed) narrows the pavement significantly at the northern corner of the Omni Centre. The pavement BADLY needs to be widened at this point.</p> <p>Alternatively, the segregated cycleway on Leith Street should be made dual use (pedestrian/cycle) to relieve congestion during these events.</p> | <p>Strongly dislike the idea of building up on this island; we need more open line-of-sight vistas in this part of town. Building on it will reduce its utility to pedestrians as a shortcut. Why not turn it into an open plaza, with seating (for the view out over the Firth via Broughton Street and down into Leith via the walk) and shrubbery?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC5Y-K</p> | <p>2017-11-22 18:59:08</p> |
| <p>The proposals will leave Picardy Place feeling like a place for pedestrians to turn round, not a place to spend time or continue through. It is currently poor, and the opportunity should be taken to improve it, as streets for people, not roads for traffic.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossings should be provided on desire lines for travel through the space. (Not as multi-stage crossings away from desire lines.)</p> <p>Pedestrian movement should not be in conflict with bike space, as is proposed. Bike lines should take space previously given to cars, and should not be routed through walking areas.</p> | <p>Development with active frontages would be positive, ideally returning to something similar to the layout before the previous demolition of the area.</p> <p>Any development should be required to be sympathetic in massing to Broughton St and the north side of Picardy Place, not another out-of-scale frontage like the Omni centre.</p> <p>However, the proposed layout might lead to a site feeling like the South Bank IMAX or Barbican Museum of London, with development appearing as an unapproachable island surrounded by traffic.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC5S-D</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FC5C-W</p> | <p>2017-11-22 21:20:19</p> <p>2017-11-22 21:39:48</p> |
| <p>Within this plan there is a pressing need to vastly improve the cycle provision from the top of Broughton Street to the cycle lane adjacent to the current Costas. There are two relatively easy ways to do this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase the width of the mixed space pathway on the Western end of the Inner triangle which runs North to south. This increased width would allow this route to be soft segregated between pedestrians and cyclists. 2. At the top of Broughton Street, have a cycle preferential traffic light which allows cyclists to get over the (proposed) tram tracks on to the path running adjacent to the church. Via this route they can join the Cycle pathway roughly where the current Costa is. <p>A further option would be to reduce the relative attractiveness (to cyclists) of coming up Broughton Street (from Bellevue / Broughton) by making the potential routes through Either Gayfield and / or Annandale street more attractive. In this way cyclist could find routes on to the cycle way (running in front of the Omni) which avoid or reduce exposure to Picardy Place altogether.</p> | <p>The Island Site is common land. It must not be given over to private developed for financial gain. This must remain a common space to be enjoyed as such.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC52-C</p> | <p>2017-11-22 21:52:08</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I like the idea of a dedicated bicycle lane from Leith Walk. However bicycle users coming in all other directions are poorly catered for. Also, I do not see any dedicated bus lanes, and I do not agree that the island is a "usable" space. It is stuck in the middle of 3 lanes of traffic.</p> | <p>It would be much better if the island was connect. ie if it was not an island. If a T junction is not acceptable (the council appear to have dismissed it) then could one of the roads be tunneled?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC5W-H | 2017-11-22 23:07:23 |
| <p>I assume you've got traffic lights at the top of Broughton Street, and the foot of Leith Street...</p> <p>My impression of traffic through the junction is that a lot of it is from Leith Street to Leith Walk. That traffic will back up from the Broughton Street lights (along the single right-turn lane), and jam the Leith Street ones.</p> <p>You have just one lane from Picardy Place down Leith Walk. Seriously? Currently, my impression is that most of the traffic through the junction goes down Leith Walk...</p> | <p>I think the Island Site will be dead space -- nobody will want to make the effort to cross multi-lane traffic flows/queues just to spend time in the middle of a roundabout.</p> <p>I think the Sustrans proposal (as at https://www.sustrans.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/files/Ideas%20for%20Picardy%20Place%20DLV2.pdf and not your modified version) is much better. Minimise traffic on Leith Street, and encourage movement between the St. James Centre and the Omni Centre.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCN9-C | 2017-11-23 01:01:28 |
| <p>This proposed lay out makes cycling and walking more difficult as priority appears to be given to motor vehicles. It makes it a very hostile environment for anyone not in a car, meaning environmental and health benefits seen with active travel will be lost</p> <p>Additionally by encouraging motor vehicles to the edge the city centre will move traffic congestion into a zone where there are a greater number of pedestrians</p> <p>This proposal also seems to be in direct conflict with proposed Low Emission Zones that CEC are evaluating</p> | <p>As this island will be difficult to access it'd hard to see anything that will benefit the public directly. Trees and other plants may be a solution, but in all likelihood it will probably be another terrible neon bill board</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCNE-R | 2017-11-23 08:45:04 |
| <p>Please do not build a gyratory traffic roundabout. Gyratory is outmoded, anti-social, noisy, smelly. Gyratory favours motor traffic over walkers and cyclists. Gyratory is contrary to Council's own plans for cars' share of city transport dropping from 42% in 2010 to 29% in 2020. Most people arriving at new shopping centre will be attracted to public transport, not motor vehicle, due to congestion on routes in to Edinburgh. Putting gyratory here creates more bottle-necks and does not alleviate congestion elsewhere. This gyratory plan has circuitous multi-stage pedestrian crossings which are contrary to pedestrian 'natural desire lines' - people walking prefer to go in straight line. There are too many points where pedestrians and cyclists are forced into same space and conflict. This is unnecessary. Please change to T-junction and create better pavement space for walkers (and cyclists). Thanks.</p> | <p>This is a waste of space. People will not bother to wait at pedestrian crossings to get to island. They will not want to spend time in island surrounded by gyratory of motor traffic, noisy and smelly with fumes. Better to put traffic on single route through the junction, in shape of T or Y, and used extra space for people walking and cycling. The people-space would then be better connected and utilised. Island is a white elephant.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCNZ-D | 2017-11-23 08:47:57 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The layout seems sensible but it looks like there is no provision for segregated cycle crossings at Leith Street, and there is discontinuity in the segregated cycle lanes at the crossing areas. This is not good in a busy pedestrian area: pedestrians do not mix well with cyclists.</p> <p>There should be marked cycle lanes at crossings, per Meadows/Forrest Road and Meadows/Melville Drive, and these should connect to the segregated lanes. This gives cyclists and pedestrians a clear guide as to who should be where, minimising conflict.</p> | <p>No building development here. Keep this as a public space/plaza, with cafe. Sculpture park, exhibition space, that kind of thing. Trees and greenery. Something culturally enriching for the weary commuters of our fair city.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNP-3</p> | <p>2017-11-23 09:04:35</p> |
| <p>It would appear that you have put on your consultation page the wrong drawing from Sustrans. The Sustrans proposal closes off the road to vehicles outside the Omni centre and reduces the traffic into the city centre. It does not make sense - or has ever proven to work - to allow for increased traffic. By providing further space for cars and catering for traffic you will only be providing space for cars to fill, which they will. By creating space which is more pleasant for pedestrians and cyclists, more people will use these, reduce traffic, improve air quality and the health of the population both through physical exercise and better air.</p> <p>Sustrans' design can be found here: https://www.sustrans.org.uk/sites/default/files/images/files/Ideas%20for%20Picardy%20Place%20DLV2.pdf</p> <p>Additionally, bringing traffic closer to the cathedral is unpleasant and the traffic island is wasted space as people will not want to linger in a space surrounded by traffic.</p> <p>Sustrans' design is by far the best and most progressive design and will help take Edinburgh forward as a modern city which moves away from the car-centric society that had been created. European cities which have done this are healthier and better places to live, with a smaller impact on the environment. Edinburgh should take the bold steps forward to start moving Scotland towards the right direction. Cars are not the future, we MUST move away from this and encourage people to NOT use their cars and travel as sustainably as possible, where possible. And it is the WHERE possible that matters in this case. Make it better for active travel and active travel will be utilised.</p> | <p>Nobody wants to hang out and be trapped in a space surrounded by emission-spurting combustion engines and the noise of 3 lanes of traffic on each side. If you were to go with this design then as green a space as possible with trees on the outside, would help create a better space. There are so few green spaces in this part of town and further shops and retail as you suggest is not something which is required in the city centre.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNG-T</p> | <p>2017-11-23 09:37:42</p> |
| <p>The addition of segregated cycle-ways is a welcome addition, but this is nowhere near 'pedestrian friendly'. The overarching priority should be to make this as practical as possible for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport (equal footing for all)...personal cars should not even be a secondary priority. If anything, the scheme should make it as unattractive as possible for personal cars, discouraging their use in what is (or at least was) the most connected ward in Scotland.</p> <p>Radical idea: design the city for people, rather than cars.</p> | <p>Why is an 'island site' presented as a selling point or an attractive feature? Do you reckon this will be a fun place to hang out, take the kids to enjoy some fresh air perhaps? Enjoy a nice coffee as the deafening roar of traffic surrounds you? Why bother going to Calton Hill, Holyrood Park or the castle, when you can bask in the NOX fumes, eh?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNQ-4</p> | <p>2017-11-23 10:27:41</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am really concerned about the joint pedestrian and cyclist area in front of the cathedral. If the new St James Quarter attracts the number of shoppers and visitors expected, this will be dangerous for both pedestrians and cyclists. In addition, you are planning to place bus stops here.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about the idea of keeping Leith Street closed. I live on London Road and the temporary traffic diversion via Montrose Terrace is causing considerable tailbacks in both directions.</p> <p>There appears to be no access to Broughton Street. This will impact on local businesses. In addition, access from Leith Walk to Queen Street looks restricted. How are drivers going to get to Queen Street? Via Annandale Street?</p> | <p>How are pedestrians going to gain access? Across a busy junction? I'm concerned about the access. I can't see how the area will benefit from a structure here.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCHM-T</p> | <p>2017-11-23 10:38:57</p> |
| <p>This is a poor "vision" as the great god motor car has won yet again! What you have at the moment is no traffic going up Leith street get that to work better. You have not included what happens to the cycle route at the top of Leith street yet again a lost opportunity.</p> <p>You have paid lip service "active" travel this is like waiting for Godot, come on go for it NOW, shock us with a proposal that is so left field it might get people to sit up and realise that the world is changing and the car is not the answer. I am a car owner but cycle in Edinburgh a lot so don't put me in the crank box.</p> | <p>This looks like a dead space. Dig it out and turn it into skate board park. Coffee shop and Macdonalds ? The return of the lighting up double helix c1984 ish? I look forward to the return of the artwork what happened to the clock at the London road roundabout ? not impressed!</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNU-8</p> | <p>2017-11-23 12:33:11</p> |
| <p>The proposal to create a gyratory with a disconnected island or space in the middle is not acceptable.</p> <p>Pedestrians need to be prioritised in this area. At the moment it is very difficult to walk between facilities that are close together, such as the Omni centre, John Lewis and Broughton Street. This style of junction is clearly prioritising motor traffic by giving it a flowing route, at the expense of disrupting the majority of people who access this area by foot.</p> <p>It is also important to have good bicycle connectivity between the City and Leith. Although there are businesses I would like to use on Leith Walk and beyond, I have given up visiting them because of the difficulty of cycling through this areas.</p> <p>I support the recommendations of Living Streets Edinburgh for creating a single junction without isolated space in the centre.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNB-N</p> | <p>2017-11-23 12:56:48</p> |
| | <p>A thing of beauty is what this island requires such as a stunning water fountain that you see in many European cities.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCN4-7</p> | <p>2017-11-23 13:04:33</p> |
| <p>The proposals are poor. We would lose the quite pleasant area of trees and planting at Picardy Place and there is nothing to suggest that traffic circulation would be better than at present. There is excessive provision for cyclists. I can only guess that this is an attempt to get the St James developers to pay for a scheme that provides for tram line extension, which the present layout would not easily accommodate.</p> | <p>Not an attractive site as it's inaccessible to pedestrians, being isolated by multiple lanes of traffic and to anyone arriving by road as stopping will no doubt be prohibited. That's before any prospective user starts worrying about the strange shape of the site. Trees might be the best answer.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNT-7</p> | <p>2017-11-23 13:19:59</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>pedestrian crossings in this area are currently a nightmare and having experienced the new cycle lanes in Leith Walk more 'shared' pedestrian/cycleways are not the answers - they are dangerous - I have no idea why Leith Walk cycleways were not all placed in the roadway - they come on and off the road/pavement at certain intervals, crossing pedestrian areas - if you want dedicated cycle lanes then keep them just for cyclist and separate from pedestrian walkways.</p> <p>The layout seems to be sensible, although there may be significant wear of the tram tracks at the north-eastern end of the junction where space has been allowed for turning of buses.</p> | <p>don't care but don't waste any taxpayers money on whatever you put there - this council wastes too much money consulting on things nobody cares about - nobody wants to sit in the middle of congested traffic so just pave it and/or stick the giraffes from outside Omni on it</p> <p>The island site should be used for a public amenity space, including significant green infrastructures. The provision of commercial/hospitality within this space would create traffic issues during deliveries etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNH-U</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCNC-P</p> | <p>2017-11-23 13:33:04</p> <p>2017-11-23 13:37:17</p> |
| <p>Street layout fine</p> <p>If the tram system must be extended, let us pray that the contracts will be handled far more competently than the previous appalling shambles. :-(Divine intervention may be the only way ...)</p> <p>Cycle provision MUST be improved! (It is two decades since I was hit by a passing car when cycling through this roundabout - I was lucky not to be injured - and the police took that as an excuse not to do ANYTHING about an instance of dangerous driving). This would be better & seems a reasonable & workable compromise...</p> <p>Did proposals ever consider a "pedestrian/cycling" underpass? Level entry from Broughton Street & Union Place/Leith Walk, ramps/escalators to York Place & Leith Street.</p> | <p>This is a 'gateway' into the city - it marks the terminus of Leith Walk's rise up to Edinburgh City Centre. It should not be left as an even bigger traffic island with no purpose, meaning or focus.</p> <p>I'd recommend the Council engaging with the University of Edinburgh School of Architecture - this site has long been a student project, creating ideas and proposals for the 'island' site, one that myself and many others have worked on. Mark Cousins - a well known and respected Edinburgh based Architect - has taught and led this project within the University for several years. I suspect there are several interesting student projects which may prove appropriate and inspirational.</p> <p>Whilst a piece of architecture would be an amazing opportunity, I feel that the 'island' nature of the site does not lend itself to anything meaningful that will be used.</p> <p>A simple and easy option could be high quality landscaping, perhaps an art installation (could it not be similar to London's 'Fourth Plinth' - where art work is rotated on a quarterly basis? A mixture of local artists and more established UK/International artists could be exhibited), or featuring a large sculpture (such as Andy Scott's Heavy Horse, or even more out there, something similar to Anish Kapoor's Cloud Gate in Chicago)?</p> <p>If artwork is considered, it needs to be thoughtful and engaging, and help to create a sense of 'place'. The island cannot become another barren Festival Square, which is unloved and (largely) unused, with artwork as an afterthought.</p> <p>How about doing something for Edinburgh residents, instead of yet more business development - that would make a nice change! (And pigs might fly...)</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCN7-A</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCN2-5</p> | <p>2017-11-23 13:39:23</p> <p>2017-11-23 13:44:13</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I am a civil engineer who has worked on roadworks in towns I find the map difficult to read I am a pedestrian, user of public transport, cyclist in the city, car owner and occasional, not daily driver in the city</p> <p>Why are the traffic lights not shown It is unclear where the pedestrian crossings are of how pedestrians get to the island Why is the cycle lane discontinuous Why is there not at least a stub cycle lane to Broughton Street Why do you need cycle boxes at what I assume are traffic lights when surely the cyclists should be confined to their cycle lanes If cyclists need to cycle on the road then the scheme is defective and you will get the idiot fringe of cyclists playing silly antics on the road when they should be in the cycle lane</p> <p>This city has a lot to learn about provision for cyclists, has any of the people drawing this up ever cycled in a cycle friendly city? If so then they have clearly not applied the lessons that they should have learned</p> | <p>keep it a "green" as possible and bear in mind that is you encourage large numbers of people to go there you are exposing them to HARM; dust from vehicle brakes; vehicle exhaust, noise and the like So no coffee, no christmas hogmanay or other promotions</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCNN-1 | 2017-11-23 14:04:40 |
| <p>It looks like there will be only one lane to allow traffic to join Leith Walk as it is approached from the South, while there are two 'turn back' lanes connecting Picardy Place to Leith Street. This seems a bit back-to-front, as I would assume the majority of traffic coming from York Place/ Leith Street would be trying to access Leith Walk.</p> <p>Also, the worst congestion point for traffic has always been towards the southern end of Leith Street - will any measures be taken here to help ease that?</p> <p>Finally, will the clock from the second roundabout on the Leith Walk be reinstated anywhere as part of this plan?</p> | <p>This site should not be given over to commercial interests. It should purely serve the community, as a green space, a mixed use space for community groups, or perhaps a space for LOCAL small businesses to hold pop-up events.</p> <p>The view of the Forth from the top of Leith Walk should not be compromised by high-rise buildings.</p> <p>I would also like to know what support services will be put in place for the numerous homeless people who currently use the space immediately in front of the cathedral.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCNW-A | 2017-11-23 14:29:54 |
| <p>unclear how to navigate by bike, coming south from leith walk to york place/queen street? good there's a bike lane going up leith street and into town, but a lot of traffic (most?) including bikes want to go to york place.</p> <p>Not suggesting you can't do this, and I'm confident enough on a bike (at the mo) to use traffic lanes, keeping up with traffic, but others may be less so. is it easy to to dismount outside john lewis etc and then make way to york place this way?</p> | <p>not retail please or hotel. nice 'piazza' might be good with outdoor food market (or 'street food' if your a hipster). as long as there's some cover round the edge etc for when it's raining. but not another farmers market kind of thing. more of a place where you could get a cheap bite to eat before going to cinema or theatre etc would be good to have size, so could make a more informed opinion of what would fit best.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC18-E | 2017-11-23 15:47:22 |
| | <p>Predominately green space for temporary exhibitions, crafts market, cultural events etc to take pressure off St Andrew Square gardens.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC1P-6 | 2017-11-23 15:53:43 |
| <p>First impressions are that this is really difficult to understand in one image. There are too many sections and layers to make sense and understand the flow of any type of traffic (pedestrian, cycle, car , bus, etc) and in turn make an educated comment on the layout.</p> <p>The whole thing looks complicated, too focused on motor vehicles , and lacking safe space the the tremendous volumes of pedestrian and cycle traffic that frequents this area.</p> | <p>Ridiculous. You are encircling the island with three lanes of heavy traffic congestion! That's not welcoming at all. Who's going to want to sit in a bowl of fumes and poor air quality?!</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCNA-M | 2017-11-23 16:24:05 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| | To improve amenity use, think of how to minimise the impact of nearby vehicle traffic through trees, screens, grass/plant areas and landscaping. Otherwise there may be a lot of traffic noise and fumes which will deter people from using the space for recreation or hospitality purposes. | ANON-8G9D-FC1G-W | 2017-11-23 16:34:19 |
| Public space has no amenity value because it is central to an over-sized road junction. Poor, unintuitive public transport interchange. Pavements as shared spaces with walking and cycling, within already busy constrained areas. Cycle infrastructure appears as the best of a difficult retrofit, rather than a solution for a new design. Excess general traffic is optimised rather than controlled. The design fails on every measure of success for a forward thinking city. | Nothing should be built in Picardy Place unless and until such time as the gyratory is removed, unless ample space is left to the south of the tram stop for two lanes of traffic, cycle lane and pavement. Otherwise its proximity to the tram stop would mean that development would prevent the gyratory from ever being removed. Any development should follow creation of successful bus/tram interchange. | ANON-8G9D-FC1Z-G | 2017-11-23 17:08:37 |
| As a pedestrian, I am concerned that there are circuitous, multi-stage pedestrian crossings and too many potential walking / cycling conflicts. The horrible gyratory road system remains in place making life difficult for pedestrians and should be replaced by a T or Y junction, allowing more green space, wider pavements and easier road crossings. Please look at a option where you get rid of the horrible island - see my response later on | Please remove this horrible island as it is a wasteland. It is no good for anything except cars travelling round it. Why not remove the island completely? | ANON-8G9D-FC16-C | 2017-11-23 17:58:30 |
| Not clear where the pedestrian crossings are located. traffic is consistently backed up from the York place junction back down Leith walk, this could prevent people accessing Leith street. What is the bus layby for - is that a bus stop if so how many services is this servicing. There could be limited space during busy times like Festival and Christmas. | Should be used for more greenery and planting. Area is already surrounded by concrete and it would soften the area if less planted. Why is there a van parking in this area in the proposed plans? | ANON-8G9D-FC1Q-7 | 2017-11-23 18:02:56 |
| Looks awkward for all road users approaching from Broughton Street | Some useful paved public space for events would be preferable | ANON-8G9D-FC1K-1 | 2017-11-23 18:19:57 |
| The Paolozzi installation is a world class sculpture designed in relation to the Cathedral, Leith Walk and Calton Hill. The new scheme should retain the installation in its current position and the highway adjusted to accommodate this. It is far more important to preserve this installation than to have a large and relatively useless central space. There is an elegant solution to this problem, which will accommodate the Paolozzis, the tram stop and traffic - but designing it requires skills beyond those of the traffic engineers. Please, please seek outside expertise so that we end up with something that caters for residents, visitors, art lovers, cyclists and vehicular traffic. The proposal puts traffic ahead of everything else. Frankly it's an insult! | The island site is not going to create any sort of desirable destination - it's in the middle of a gyratory system. You should reduce the size and allow Cathedral Lane and the Paolozzi installation to remain intact. A smaller island could then be used as a pop-up destination for the Festival, science festival, rugby internationals etc - all the events that require overspill space. Edinburgh does not and will not need additional retail, hotel or restaurant space. What it does need is breathing space when the City welcomes large crowds. Let's leave this bit for a while and see how the City changes with the opening of the St James Quarter. It's quite obvious that residents don't want inappropriate development here. Landscape it and use it for marquees for a few years. | ANON-8G9D-FC1M-3 | 2017-11-23 21:51:55 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I think because of traffic flow you need to consider the London Road junction, Leith Street, York Place & Broughton Street in context with this layout. I think the possibility of pedestrian subways could be looked at especially Leith Street and York Place. This would make it a lot safer for pedestrians and also increase traffic flow. I also think trees need to be part of this environment. Bus lay-by need be able to accommodate at least two buses at a time. Clear markings warning for cyclists anywhere near tram lines preferably keeping them well away from tram lines.</p> | <p>I don't think it should go back to being developed I would suggest an open area with cafe outdoor seating area with trees maybe used for farmers market etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC1F-V</p> | <p>2017-11-24 07:25:45</p> |
| <p>Why is the proposal designed to accommodate current traffic volumes? The council's Local Transport Strategy has a target of reducing car use for travel to work from 42% (2009-2010) to 29% (2020). Picardy Place is a major transport node and traffic behaviour at this point impacts the wider area. If you are making no attempt to reduce car use through the new layout you are in effect giving up on this target.</p> <p>You state that the number of lanes of traffic could be reduced as more people switch to active travel. You must be familiar with the well evidenced concept of induced demand. Traffic will use the available space until it is made too difficult to do so. Your proposals make no attempt to introduce barriers to vehicle use and your assertion that more people will switch to active travel is not supported by any evidence.</p> <p>The overall proposal is for a traffic gyratory harking back to the worst type of car-centric traffic management where public transport, cyclists and pedestrians are viewed as inconveniences to the unrestricted flow of vehicle traffic.</p> | <p>The proposed traffic gyratory will serve as a restrictive collar around this site. The noise, pollution and barrier generated by the surrounding three lanes of traffic militate against its effective use. If the traffic proposals remain as they are, there is no use of this site which would persuade me to use it, regardless of any development.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC1R-8</p> | <p>2017-11-24 10:28:24</p> |
| | <p>"Green" landscaping along with hard-landscape for possible "pop-up" functions and events. No permanent commercial use.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC1S-9</p> | <p>2017-11-24 10:42:11</p> |
| <p>The plans look a bit unimaginative and to have a bus stop right outside the cathedral looks somewhat brutalist. Taking away the disabled parking which is a vital resource also not ideal. Not impressed and it looks like a concrete jungle</p> | <p>A park? There is little greenery in this area</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC1D-T</p> | <p>2017-11-24 10:44:35</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>there is no failure to take account of what is secured NOW in relation to what may developed LATER ON for example on the island site or at the roundabout area at London Road/Elm Row (is the clock still in storage?). A lack of joined-up thinking seems to have been the main problem created by the St James/Growth Accelerator Model lock-down without due regard to proper community consultation at the RIGHT TIME concerning Picardy Place.</p> <p>Broadly the proposed layout meets the needs of multiple user groups, provided detailed attention is given to:</p> <p>(a) public transport and</p> <p>(b) place-making.</p> <p>I consider it right that DELAY AND CONGESTION is minimised in order that the free flow of PUBLIC TRANSPORT is prioritised so that commuter journeys and bus users with DISABILITY IMPAIRMENTS who cannot travel actively, are not impeded by an over-engineered focus on active travel through-routes. Leith has long suffered a disconnect with Edinburgh (in a journey time sense) by crew changes, part-route services terminating at Elm Row and severe congestion. An EVIDENCE BASE from MODELLING of the finalised Picardy Place layout should demonstrate NO NET DETRIMENT in this regard and be presented to the relevant committee for decision.</p> <p>There are three place-making priorities (urban design, public realm, street design) which the proposed layout can accommodate with minor enhancements having regard to the following national policy statements: Designing Streets >> http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/307126/0096540.pdf, Creating Places >> http://www.gov.scot/Resource/0042/00425496.pdf and Green Infrastructure: Design and Placemaking >> http://www.gov.scot/Resource/Doc/362219/0122541.pdf Using those toolkits there are opportunities to:</p> | <p>I support the principle of the island site to complete and re-establish the high density character of this part of Edinburgh. Develop the island site without a sacrosanct preservation of long views to St Mary's Cathedral from Elm Row by an undue limit on building height. This would create as sense of surprise when turning a corner of the redeveloped island block and discovering a church and plaza, as one experiences in most high density old towns in European cities. See also my comments above on street seating in the public realm. Since the council owns the site then in that regard, it is important that public realm remains public not private.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC17-D</p> | <p>2017-11-24 11:11:50</p> |
| <p>T Junction, not a roundabout, as proposed.</p> <p>There should be easier crossings for pedestrians outside the Playhouse across to Tesco area (see: https://twitter.com/reggietricker/status/931951730559942659) if the existing crossing just outside the playhouse is taken away.</p> <p>Separated areas for cyclists and pedestrians, and barriers between pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>Less grey - more colourful please. Edinburgh is too gray</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC1N-4</p> | <p>2017-11-24 11:36:16</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>At the moment I usually drive in Edinburgh but would far rather take public transport and walk, or cycle. The area around Piccadilly Place has lots of shops, cinemas, theaters and restaurants. Looking at the current plans it will not be a pleasant place to spend time. The centre of the junction is shown with trees, but it will not be relaxing sitting in the centre of 3 lanes of cars belching out fumes. It looks like the tram stop is also located in the centre, meaning passengers will have to cross busy roads which is crazy. Surely public transport should be the main priority, along with segregated bike lanes and wide pavements. The current road works have shown that transport can cope fine if Leith St is totally shut - so please come up with a more pedestrian friendly design for people relaxing in our beautiful city. Nobody wants to spend time next to 3 lanes queuing cars, people will come out of the theatre and rush straight home - what about some pavement cafes, more trees, less tarmac. Lets encourage people to get out of their cars (me included)</p> | <p>It will be a horrible, noisy polluted space bounded by 3 lanes of queuing cars. Nobody would want to spend any time there.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC1W-D</p> | <p>2017-11-24 13:33:47</p> |
| <p>The latest iteration of the plan makes sense for all the reasons set out in the presentation. The three distinct streets is a good idea; the cycle lanes can only help - better for the buses and the safety of cyclists; the large island offers potential for respite/rest as well as safe crossing. The single lane of traffic to Leith Walk may be a bottleneck but that will depend on the flow through the next two junctions (London Rd and Annandale St). Get that right and there is no problem!</p> | <p>Would be preferable to have an arboretum of architectural trees and a café space but not plant beds and large shrubbery - makes some feel vulnerable. Trees are important and echo nearby Queen St and Royal Terrace.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCS8-G</p> | <p>2017-11-24 13:54:47</p> |
| <p>Review of the latest Air Quality Progress Reports, show that Leith Street experiences pollutants above the EU and Scottish legal limits. Broughton Street, York Place, London Road and Leith Walk also experience levels of air pollutants at or near the EU and Scottish legal limits. The Council recently (early 2017) applied to the Scottish Government to declare the first Low Emissions Zone (LEZ) in Scotland, and whilst unsuccessful against Glasgow, investigation to implement an LEZ in Edinburgh is ongoing. The areas mentioned above are prime candidates to be included in any LEZ, experiencing as they do, levels of pollutants at or above the EU and Scottish Legal limits, and being within the existing City Centre Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Consideration should be given to the layout of this junction from the outset to "discourage" motor traffic within the capital and its City Centre, in line with recent comments by Kenny Macaskill MSP aimed at tackling Climate Change and air pollution. Should the areas mentioned above be included in any potential LEZ, such a vast area devoted to motor traffic will become redundant. It could be argued that by the time the plans for Piccadilly Place come to fruition, an LEZ may have been declared, or be close to being declared, rendering redundant the space devoted to motor traffic before it has even been used.</p> | <p>The island site represents a significant area of land that could be used. Consideration should be paid to the fact that this area sits in the middle of three roads carrying heavy levels of traffic, large numbers of diesel buses and a large number of diesel commercial vehicles that will contribute to very high levels of air pollution at the centre of this gyratory. The necessity to have traffic waiting during light controlled junction phases leads to increased air pollution as a result of the higher emissions produced by idling engines as opposed to engines running at moderate and peak efficiencies. Given the high levels of air pollutants monitored on the roads leading up to the gyratory, as quantified in the council's annual air quality progress reports, the island site is highly likely to become an area where the EU and Scottish legal limits for air quality will be exceeded. Given the layout of the junction, it is possible that these exceedances will be of a level that the hourly safe limits for air pollutants from EU and Scottish legislation will also be exceeded. This means that the levels of air pollution at the island site at the centre of the gyratory have the potential to provide a significant health risk for any people using the area for recreation, or any persons working for any businesses that may subsequently use the site.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC11-7</p> | <p>2017-11-24 14:12:30</p> |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I am strongly opposed to the Councils proposals, and broadly welcoming of the alternative Sustrans proposals, or any proposal that puts public space and public transport ahead of car traffic.</p> <p>The Councils proposals prioritise the car at the expense of public space, pedestrians, cyclists and public transport. The idea that that lanes of traffic can be removed as more people change to active travel is the wrong way around: design comes first! Design should lead behaviour by encouraging the public to use public transport & active travel. There cannot be an easier location in Edinburgh to do this with more links to public & active travel paths. Disappointingly, the council have proposed a system which looks like the worst of 1960s car-focused traffic engineering.</p> <p>The Sustrans proposals are much closer to what I would like to see; a place where people will want to spend time whilst allowing the easy movement of public and 'active' transport. I would be much more supportive of any design that puts public space first, followed by public & active travel second, and lastly cars. The claim above that the alternative proposal will create an "overspill" of cars into residential streets is an outdated argument from traffic engineering of the 1960s. This is an idea which has been consistently proved wrong since then, including developments inside Edinburgh. If this is the case, why is it not happening now due to the closure of Leith Street? There will be no overspill if fewer people drive around the city centre.</p> <p>I urge the council to move closer to the Sustrans proposal and ditch the 1960s car-led proposal.</p> | | | |
| | Anything, just not another hotel. | ANON-8G9D-FC12-8 | 2017-11-24 14:29:41 |
| <p>I believe that if the pavement is reduced or taken away at the entrance steps to St Mary Cathedral will have a massive detrimental effect to the people who attend the church. To take away access for the disabled and frail parishes is totally morally wrong. I ask that this decision is stopped.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCSE-W | 2017-11-24 14:44:54 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>plans to alter the public space directly outside Saint Mary's Metroplitan Cathedral on Picardy place, Edinburgh.</p> <p>This is an iconic landmark serving 2500 parishioners not to mention a large volume of transient foreign visitors who visit our popular city and bring both faith and curiosity to our church. I believe more consideration and thought must be taken regarding the detrimental impact that having a busy, double bus stop right outside our beautiful church will have. This decision lacks vision, sensitivity or insight into aesthetic and practical town planning. The Cathedral has stood on this sight since 1814 and will probably outlive the council's current proposals by a long way, and as such should be treated with greater longevity.</p> <p>Currently the public space outside mirrors some of the peace one might expect to come from the internal space, and is also an important artistic site with 3 popular and prominent Eduardo Paolozzi sculptures easily seen and accessed. The market space and seating areas are a gathering space for many and a place to take stock within a very busy centre, but more importantly it serves our disabled parishioners including my father who need clear vehicle access with set down facility to attend mass.</p> <p>A church and it's community exists to support life and morality. It fundamentally and spiritually marks the birth, marriage and death of individuals who gain meaning, strength and existential purpose in life through attendance at mass and are nurtured by simply being a part of something much bigger. It is therefore disgraceful to demolish and disregard the space needed for a person's last journey. Our Cathedral requires funeral cortege access and it is quite simply outrageous and degrading to deny this.</p> <p>This catholic community deserves access and space to operate and flourish with a basic right and dignity to continue as we have done for hundreds of years. Our needs as a parish should have been included in the original</p> | | | |
| <p>This feels like back to 1980. Too much car priority in the space. Most of us living in Leith don't own cars. The uphill (omni) cycle lane is "shared" on a very narrow pavement, next to 4 lanes of private car space, cut in half by access to/from Omni car park, with pedestrians bowling around because it's so squeezed in. I would rather you just hit pause button and left this for the next lot to work on.</p> | <p>Something environmentally sound or cultural</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCSZ-J</p> | <p>2017-11-24 14:57:07</p> |
| | <p>Would make good makeshift hospital/morgue zone for treating cyclist casualties who were just trying to cross multiple lanes of cars (uphill, importantly) to go from Leith Walk to York Place.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCSG-Y</p> | <p>2017-11-24 15:38:35</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>appealing option for this new road layout.</p> <p>As a cyclist who commutes to work via this junction everyday, it is the part of my cycle commute that i have always dreaded the most. i also drive on occasion - also via this route and i can say that if the roads felt safer - here in particular i would cycle every day instead, happily leaving the car at home.</p> <p>I was shocked by a comment made to me at the open consultation by one of your representatives. he stated that the cycle paths were for encouraging new cyclist nervous of cycling on roads, and not for confident commuters who already cycle. this is completely mad. a cycle path should feel liek the best and safest route for all cyclists.</p> <p>by putting the paths on the pavement - as has already proved unsuccessful on leith walk, you force confident cyclists back onto the road.</p> <p>these plans make no sense - putting cyclist at an area where large crowds gather - outside a cinema is just asking for problems. this will be un safe for cyclist and pedestrians.</p> <p>There is a further issue with having no provision on your plans for cyclinst crossing york place - when the tram hub goes in this is going to be made further dangerous. people want to take the shortesd route and will not be encouraged ot take the long eay around.</p> <p>Finally i would ask why there is the need for this junction int he first place. this is an area that could become a low traffic and pedestrian friendly space at a dynamic area of town where a big commercial development is underway. 4 lanes of traffic will make it polluted an noisy and unusable. this route to town should be car free, leading to a car free princes street and seeing an incredible trasformation of the city center.</p> <p>the best way to encourage more people to cycle and improve our health air</p> | <p>this island should be part of communal open space out side cathedral - and not an island at all - it will always be dead space when there is busy traffic on all sides</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCS6-E</p> | <p>2017-11-24 15:43:24</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| falls short of the scheme suggested by Sustrans. | | | |
| <p>I live nearby (Gayfield Street) and will therefore cross this junction multiple times each. I do not ride a car as I can reach anywhere in Edinburgh easily by bus or on foot. My main concerns with the proposed changes are the following:</p> <p>* No separation between spaces used by cyclists or pedestrians. Much like the new design seen on bus stops on Leith Walk, this will cause constant issues between cyclists and pedestrians who are forced to cross each other's path. This will, most likely, mean that most cyclists prefer to ride on the street as both a faster and safer alternative. This, unfortunately nullifies any perceived advantage of providing "cycling infrastructure".</p> <p>* The "island" / "roundabout" design is very car centric as it forces all other traffic members to cross car traffic with the associated risks. It furthermore means that what could have been turned into an actively used, beautiful space into one that is surrounded by heavy traffic.</p> <p>* The main focus of the redesign should, in my opinion, be on improving the bus/tram interchange, cycling routes and providing straightforward and fast routes for pedestrians. This would encourage more people to actively use public transport, cycle or walk which is desirable for many reasons (health, air quality, lower stress levels due to not having to cross heavily used streets where cars exceed the 20 MPH speed limit regularly (why are you guys not enforcing that at all? I mean seriously ..)</p> <p>This is a wonderful opportunity to redesign a public space into something that will influence the life of people for years to come. Think about the kind of city you love to live in and "heavy car traffic" normally doesn't come to mind. You'd think of parks, efficient public transport, cafes and pedestrianised zones that allow humans to relax.</p> <p>I am concerned that the area outside the Cathedral would go under this plan. This would impact severely on disabled people being able to access the cathedral.</p> | <p>Please don't make it an island .. it should be accessible from at least one side for pedestrians without having to cross heavy traffic.</p> <p>A world class playground, small shops and trees would be very welcome in the resulting space!</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCSJ-2 | 2017-11-24 17:32:52 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FCS3-B | 2017-11-24 17:35:07 |
| The layout remains too car dominated. The design does not align with CEC or Scottish Government policy to prioritise active travel and to achieve a modal shift away from private car use. The design should be reconsidered. | The whole concept of development on a traffic island is horrendous. I agree with principle of expanded public realm and a mix of uses but not the traffic on all sides. | ANON-8G9D-FCSU-D | 2017-11-24 21:17:11 |
| More public space. More trees. | Open public space | ANON-8G9D-FCSY-H | 2017-11-24 22:23:25 |
| The old clock from the roundabout should be featured in any new setup. | This looks like it will congest the flow of traffic onto Leith Walk horribly. | ANON-8G9D-FCSD-V | 2017-11-24 23:21:59 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>The proposed gyratory design squanders the huge potential of this critical city-centre gateway site, because it hugely prioritises cars above pedestrians, cyclists & people using public transport.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The gyratory design with multiple lanes of traffic on each side of a central triangle means the whole junction will remain dominated by cars & traffic. - Negotiating this junction will therefore remain, as now, difficult, unpleasant and unsafe for pedestrians & cyclists (pedestrian crossing points & bike path connections are unintuitive & convoluted) - The only meaningful extra public space created (in front of the cathedral) is relatively narrow, and next to a very busy 3-4 lane road, meaning it will be noisy, and polluted, and so very unlikely to be the kind of space people actually want to spend time in (ie exactly like the space currently in front of the Omni) - The opportunity to use the island to create a larger potentially high quality public space has been lost as the central triangle has been severed from the cathedral by the road <p>Please acknowledge that traffic flow should not be the primary determinant of how we design our public spaces, drop the gyratory, and redesign the junction to give priority to people & quality of space!</p> | <p>A high quality public space connected to the cathedral should be created in that area by removing the road between the two.</p> <p>This would allow room for a proper multi-modal transport interchange, including bike share</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCSH-Z</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCSS-B</p> | <p>2017-11-25 01:16:04</p> <p>2017-11-25 09:18:44</p> |
|---|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>While clearly an improvement over the existing roundabout, the proposed gyratory design is a massive missed opportunity.</p> <p>The alternative Sustrans design (and the similar other alternatives, from Spokes and from Living Streets), with a Y or T junction, and preserving the pedestrian spaces outside the cathedral, are clearly solutions that are in better alignment with the council's own published transport policies, and with national policies. Now, in the 21st century, almost all major European cities are shifting layout in the direction of active travel, prioritising pedestrians first, cycling next, followed by public transport by tram, rail and bus, and trying to make streets and public places become attractive places for people, and where businesses will therefore flourish from greater footfall.. For these other cities, this is a welcome shift of emphasis, recognising that the last 50 years of prioritising private car use above everything else has resulted in dismal unattractive public places where nobody wants to be.</p> <p>Edinburgh appears to be stuck in the past. For whatever reason, none of the alternatives appear to be being considered, and we will end up with something from the early 1970s, a gyratory of noisy smelly traffic.</p> <p>It appears to be the case that council officials have, without any democratic oversight and prior to any public consultation, signed contracts that have locked us in to this, with the usual massive penalties (£20 million?) for any significant divergence. How can this have come about?!</p> <p>The previous administration made a complete mess of the project to introduce the modern tram line, with huge damage to its reputation. It looks like this is just more of the same, with complete lack of any transparency in the process, and council officials apparently calling all the shots.</p> <p>Please reconsider one of the so-much-better alternatives!</p> | <p>The site should be of public benefit. Please don't sell it off to developers or build on it, and please don't just leave it as an unloved barren wasteland. It could be a place of trees and parkland, maybe with cafés and such like, like you would expect to find in a modern European city.</p> <p>If you progress with your proposed multi-lane diesel-fumed gyratory, then of course it won't be a pleasant place to be, but you could at least mitigate that a bit.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCS2-A</p> | <p>2017-11-25 10:15:40</p> |
| <p>The proposed design appears to do very little to create an attractive and sustainable place and shows little consideration of quality urban design. The private motor-vehicle is given dominance in this design and pedestrian and cycle routes seem to be an afterthought. The layout of the cycle lane in particular is of poor quality and will be difficult and inconvenient to use, which will deter use of this route. The central island will not be a usable or pleasant public space and will be loud and oppressive, as seen at other sites in the city. The design doesn't seem to follow guidance put forward in Designing Streets as to the hierarchy of street users, as a consequence walking and cycling will not be encouraged by this design and so it does nothing to create a sustainable city. Instead of drastically reducing space for traffic as has been done in similar circumstances elsewhere in Europe (which has been shown to reduce traffic levels), the gyratory system will increase traffic.</p> | <p>I find it hard to believe that this island will be usable at all, given its position in the midst of so much traffic. It seems to be a waste of an opportunity to create a pleasant and usable public realm and a step backwards in terms of urban design.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCSW-F</p> | <p>2017-11-25 11:06:37</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>proposed layout, I have the following comments:</p> <p>Placemaking During the past decade, Scottish Government has been actively promoting 'placemaking' as a collaborative design approach to improving the quality of the built environment, to create well designed spaces which meet the needs of all users and respond to the distinctive characteristics and attributes of each place to improve the overall quality of life for people. 'Quality places are successful places' underpins the Government's approach to this issue. Whilst this approach applies to all urban and rural places, it is of specific relevance to our urban environment and particularly to spaces such as Picardy Place, where the challenge of meeting a range of often competing issues and considerations is considerable.</p> <p>Analysis of the current proposals indicates that they fall significantly short of the high standards of placemaking anticipated by Scottish Government. Provision for transport movement and circulation has taken a pre-eminent role in determining the proposed layout, with little or no consideration of creating a distinctive, welcoming or pleasant environment for pedestrians as an integral component of the proposed approach. It is extremely disappointing that no urban design strategy for this important space has been presented as part of the proposals, which would set a context for the preparation of a layout which seeks to balance transportation requirements with civic design, pedestrian amenity and other factors related to the uses and roles of buildings forming Picardy Place. One of the key objectives of placemaking is the creation of safe and pleasant environments – the large-scale central space resulting from the proposed layout is unlikely to fulfil this objective, and will appear as an isolated left over space with no purpose or role in contributing to the public realm character of the city. Picardy Place offers an immense opportunity to demonstrate a considered, holistic and integrated design approach to contemporary placemaking to rival similar projects being undertaken on the Continent – an opportunity which the</p> | <p>See previous comments.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCS1-9</p> | <p>2017-11-25 12:41:40</p> |
| <p>I attend St Mary's Catholic Cathedral weekly, along with 2,500 others. I find it incredible that your consultation page names it as St Margaret's Cathedral. The proposal will be a extremely negative for the cathedral and the many funerals and marriages that take place there. Where will the hearses and wedding limousines park? Where will the disabled parishioners park? The proposals have taken no thought of the impact on the many people who attend the cathedral, many of whom are visitors to Edinburgh, including many from minority ethnic communities. Please do not do this.</p> | <p>It could be part of a stunning piazza just in front of the Cathedral, highlighting this historic building and celebrating its role for the many visitors to Edinburgh, including the huge Polish (Catholic) population who attend it.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC6X-K</p> | <p>2017-11-25 13:37:51</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>access and road layout (i.e. public transport and individual car traffic).</p> <p>Cycling: While I very much welcome the introduction of segregated cycle paths in this area, I still have the following concern regarding it. Note that this might only be due to lack of detail on the visualisation provided. On it, it is not quite clear how cyclists can turn from the path next to the Omni centre onto York place. The proposed pedestrian crossings do not seem to include a crossing for cyclists and the dedicated cycle stopping lines on the road indicate that cyclists that wish to turn onto York Place need to re-join the carriageway. This is a major concern as entering the road at such a busy junction might deter a lot of cyclists from using the new facilities.</p> <p>Pedestrian Access: The development of the St James quarter will definitely cause an increase in the number of pedestrians on all sides of the new development. Therefore I very much welcome the proposed increase in space available on walkways. However, I find it concerning that some of the pedestrian crossings are split into two parts with pedestrians forced to wait on an island in between the two carriageways. That causes delays to pedestrians, which should be prioritised in such a central area of the city.</p> <p>Road layout (i.e. public transport and individual car traffic): My major issue with the proposed development concerns the road layout, as it highly prioritises car traffic over any other mode of transport. Strikingly, there are currently no bus lanes included in the proposals which will cause major delays to public transport users and will thus discourage people from using buses. Most concerning, however, in the proposal is the following passage which says that the new layout "allows for the number of lanes of traffic to be reduced over time as more people change to active travel." For a city that pretends that it is truly committed to active travel this is shocking. A much more sensible approach would be to reduce the number of car lanes to</p> | <p>As the main aim of this consultation regards the road layout and the use of the island site needs to go through a separate consultation, I will not give detailed comments here. I do however believe that the area would benefit from added green space.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC69-M | 2017-11-25 13:40:59 |
| | <p>St Mary's Cathedral requires parking space for disabled persons who wish to go to church, funeral cortège, weddings & special occasions that the Cathedral may hold. Consideration needs to be given to those who have the need of transport</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC68-K | 2017-11-25 14:04:04 |
| <p>Mild concern for pedestrian areas around John Lewis and Cathedral being reduced making it less accessible to some.</p> | <p>A science museum would be good, or a gardening project</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC6P-B | 2017-11-25 14:39:27 |
| <p>I am concerned that the Cathedral will lose much of the space directly in front of the Cathedral; the pedestrianized area and the parking/drop-off area will disappear altogether and will be replaced by a "double bus stop". This will have serious implications for disabled parishioners who rely on cars to get back and forward to the Cathedral. There will also be nowhere for Wedding or Funeral corteges to stop outside the Cathedral. Such changes are likely to have a detrimental impact on the church community and may put further stress on vulnerable people who need easy access to the church.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FC6E-Z | 2017-11-25 14:59:57 |
| | <p>have it as an open space, no retail.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC6Z-N | 2017-11-25 15:07:39 |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| | As someone who regularly visits St. Mary's Metropolitan Cathedral, I am concerned about how this development would impact access to the Cathedral. The present layout in the area affords access, especially for disabled users. A civic space outside a Cathedral of this importance is found in many cities in the world, building something that obscures the Cathedral appears retrograde, it would negatively impact the cultural environ that has been enjoyed by all of the public for many years. | ANON-8G9D-FC6G-2 | 2017-11-25 15:21:50 |
| seems reasonable | put a statue of a WOMAN FROM SCOTLAND in it | ANON-8G9D-FC6Q-C | 2017-11-25 16:00:13 |
| In general, this looks like a much improved layout for Picardy Place. However I would make the following comments: - Whilst it is right to improve facilities for public transport, pedestrians, and cyclists, this is a key intersection for road users and I would like to see improved provision for road traffic. - A single lane from Picardy Place to Union Place appears likely to constrict traffic (there are currently three lanes which service this purpose) and I object to this narrowing. I would prefer to see a minimum of two lanes for this through route. - A constriction of the road outside the Omni centre, from three to two lanes (numbered 12 on the map) looks likely to cause congestion, and I object to this. I would prefer to see this as three lanes in line with the rest of the road layout on the Omni Centre side of Picardy Place. Any extra width could easily be taken from the island. | The new island seems a good size and shape. Due to the lack of greenery in the area, I feel this area would benefit from trees, grass and plantings. I would object to any commercialisation of this island - there is already plenty of retail and commercial space in the vicinity. A small park here would be a great way to bring people together, especially as this will be an intersection for people using public transport. | ANON-8G9D-FC6V-H | 2017-11-25 16:12:45 |
| | A green area. An open space filled trees and grass and flowers | ANON-8G9D-FC6K-6 | 2017-11-25 16:53:41 |
| Why is the cathedral going to lose the drop-off area, which is a necessity for funerals and wedding ceremonies? Not to mention it's usefulness for disabled persons attending the cathedral? | | ANON-8G9D-FC6J-5 | 2017-11-25 16:55:06 |
| I object to the current proposal as it is seen in isolation from Leith Street to the South, York Place / Broughton St to the West and the London Rd / Elm Row roundabout to the North. This key junction is part of a series of spaces and needs to be designed with these areas at the same time. I disagree the tram position creates a suitable interchange for public transport and Elm Row would be much more integrated with buses (see Haymarket as an example). I think the imposition of the tram stop here creates the issues. If public transport is the priority behind the design then why do the City Council not follow the Sustrans design? Car spaces should be minimised and public transport and active travel maximised. | Affordable homes of a tenement scale (as per historic use) for rent to those who need them above a mix use of retail and restaurant cafes etc. Also no car rental businesses should be located in this area. Waverley or elsewhere provide this function. NOT A HOTEL | ANON-8G9D-FC63-E | 2017-11-25 17:26:25 |
| I walk to work, going up Broughton Street and up Leith Street to get onto Calton Road. There is a lot of pollution and there are a lot of pedestrians waiting to get across the road. I think the proposed layout has too much space devoted to cars. I would like to see wider pavements, zebra crossings to give priority to pedestrians, and part of the current road space converted to segregated cycle lanes. For the road space, buses should take priority. | I think the creation of a small island surrounded by busy roads is a poor use of the space. It would be better to avoid it. | ANON-8G9D-FC6F-1 | 2017-11-25 18:07:23 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am a dedicated Catholic and a regular attendee of mass at St Mary's metropolitan Catholic cathedral. These plans will have devastating consequences for many people who attend this church.</p> <p>For a start, old people will find it difficult if not impossible to get access to the church if these plans go ahead (it's already bad enough with the road closure for st James redevelopment).</p> <p>It will also mean that wedding and funeral vehicles will have nowhere to drop off and park.</p> <p>Is the real reason for these plans to try and cut off and kill the Catholic population? There's no need to carry out these drastic plans which does beg the aforementioned question.</p> <p>We live in a secular society and religion is being drowned out by those in a position of power.</p> <p>Myself and the whole Catholic population will fight this.</p> | <p>This site is used for wedding and funeral vehicles and by taking this away you will be coming between God and those who worship him and want to be married or go to heaven.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC6B-W</p> | <p>2017-11-25 18:13:52</p> |
| <p>While no expert, I would be concerned that the proposed bus lay-by to the north-east may not be big enough on some occasions. Buses "queuing" for a space down Leith Walk/Greenside Place could be a real problem at peak times.</p> | <p>The island site would not be a pleasant space. If big enough and the practicalities could be overcome, could the area below be used to increase the number of Greenside parking spaces? Possibly with an underground walkway arrangement linking York place pavement, Cathedral and Omni Centre, etc. etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC64-F</p> | <p>2017-11-25 18:36:01</p> |
| <p>There's much that's good about it but respecting the cathedral, its parishioners and access of the community to the cathedral is important - please take account of these concerns</p> | <p>Not retail and commercial! Culture yes</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC6U-G</p> | <p>2017-11-25 19:17:23</p> |
| <p>how can you possibly put a double bus stop at the bottom of the cathedral steps ? i mean have any of you actually been to the services and seen the amount of elderly and disabled people that use the space along the bottom of the steps.....a good idea would be to send someone out to do a survey at all the times of the services and count up the number of elderly and disabled people that use the space at the bottom of the steps.. then you might just consider leaving it as it is. And what about funeral and weddings ? You can hardly park up somewhere and carry a coffin through all the traffic and people on the street How undignified is that ? Hope this crazy idea is put to bed .</p> | <p>leave well alone as edinburgh is dug up enough</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC6Y-M</p> | <p>2017-11-26 06:31:05</p> |
| <p>I think this arrangement prioritises business over the daily activities of the cathedral, which deserves the right to be able to function as well as the other activities in the area. It is a major place of worship for a significant group of Edinburgh citizens. To have a bus stop placed right outside the cathedral means that funerals, weddings and drop off for disabled and elderly will be severely curtailed. I think proper provision should be made for these, some of which involve prominent Edinburgh citizens. As a disabled person myself (and a non catholic or worshipper) I have no difficulty in using the bus stop on York place or the taxi rank at John Lewis after using the shops at the St James area so I cannot understand why a bus stop needs to be placed directly outside the cathedral. Please have a heart and recognise that life in Edinburgh is not all about money and shops.</p> | <p>It could be used as a social space for cathedral users with a space for wedding cars and funeral cortèges with underground access to the cathedral. I would combine this with a well designed garden along the lines of the successful one in St Andrew Square. The area itself could do with a bit of nature as it is very built up and it would be great for wedding photographs as well as a natural space for folk who want a break from the shops or from their travels. I would give it a woodland theme with some strong trees in the garden for height and the prominence of greenery which I think would be a nice follow through from the gardens in London Road and Queen Street. This would also make a modern change from the usual manicured look that is popular on roundabouts. And I think it would combine the needs of both cathedral, business and transport. I grew up in this area so have seen it in its many guises and have always thought it too dominated by ugly buildings.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC6T-F</p> | <p>2017-11-26 11:42:24</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| Proposed street layout from York Place to John Lewis main entrance on Leith Street should not be reduced in width, under any condition. It is necessary for the ambience of the width, which currently allows a pleasant walking experience, to remain and to keep safely at a distance the proposed flow of heavy traffic you have envisaged with, to me, the unnecessary removal of the roundabout. A separate cycleway should be allowed from the John Lewis corner, past the cathedral, on to York Place on the OUTSIDE of the above mentioned pavement that could also continue down Leith Walk. On the Omni side a cycleway can be allowed to take up some of the pavement area which is currently very wide, at least up to the crossing opposite J Lewis. I cannot suggest a suitable cycleway route up Leith Street beyond J Lewis as the street is so narrow anyway. I do however, wish to condemn the current rumour that Spokes wishes to CLOSE Leith street completely to traffic, permanently, with the exception of cyclists. I do not believe the loss of this highway into the main hub of the City and Princes Street, the Bridges etc can be overcome by the current temporary detours undertaken by all public transport and cars. | Foe safe visibility to all in the vicinity, the island must be flat with no obstructions ; planting possibly the only answer. | ANON-8G9D-FC67-J | 2017-11-26 15:27:34 |
| Access for disabled people, Weddings and Funerals to the Cathedral. Church requires access. | | ANON-8G9D-FC6C-X | 2017-11-26 17:28:58 |
| | It's an opportunity to create a very high quality civic space with a notable landmark building. | ANON-8G9D-FC6S-E | 2017-11-26 17:38:35 |
| As a driver, pedestrian and cyclist, the plans do not appear to provide the contiguous cycle lanes that many cities in mainland Europe have developed. Contiguous cycleways allow reduced traffic with clear benefits of less pollution and personal health. | Being surrounded by traffic, the area is unlikely to be fully utilised. Underpasses to allow pedestrian access would be suitable. | ANON-8G9D-FC65-G | 2017-11-26 18:02:30 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>The 'island' site is useless as public space because it's surrounded by 3 lanes of traffic on all sides.</p> <p>Trying to accommodate all forms of transport is clearly not working here, so you need to make some decisions about which to prioritise - that has to be public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, as per council policy. Trying to 'balance' those modes with the current use of private motor vehicles isn't going to work.</p> <p>My suggestions:</p> <p>Close Leith Street to all motorised vehicles except buses.</p> <p>Extend the cycle lane to the top of Leith Street so that cyclists can access Princes St and North Bridge</p> <p>Remove the road in front of the cathedral and make an attractive public space extending from the cathedral forwards to the 'island' site. Allow motor vehicles through this space to access the cathedral only, at <5mph, with the design of the space making clear that it's a space for people.</p> <p>Put a segregated, clearly marked, cycle lane through this space.</p> <p>Allow motorised vehicles to use Leith Walk, York Place/Queen Street and Broughton St.</p> <p>This is a once in a lifetime opportunity for CEC to make a high quality public space for residents and visitors to Edinburgh.</p> <p>Leith St is currently closed and the sky hasn't fallen in. If it was open to buses and not to cars that would encourage people to make different travel choices.</p> <p>I live in Abbeyhill and have daily experience of a 3 lane gyratory system while Leith St is closed. It has significantly affected the quality of life for many people in the neighbourhood. It's polluted, noisy and dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists as drivers of motor vehicles get frustrated and take stupid risks. Please don't put a permanent 3 lane gyratory just down the road at the gateway to a World Heritage Site.</p> | <p>Change it to a peninsular site so that it is actually useable as quality public space and will be attractive to businesses.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC62-D</p> | <p>2017-11-26 18:05:31</p> |
| <p>The final plan is better but why is the emphasis still on traffic-can it have anything to do with the parking (1600 places) I believe has been agreed to .</p> <p>Surely a forward looking city would be looking towards a pedestrianised centre.</p> <p>I'm also sorry the trees and plants are to be removed-hopefully a larger number will be planted.</p> <p>I don't really believe the statues will be "returned" as the costs of removal will be incredible-however Hillside Crescent Gardens are better than disappearing for ever.</p> <p>One lane for traffic from Picardy Place to top of Leith Walk?? Looks like a bottleneck waiting to happen.</p> | <p>Trees and plants PLEASE-not any buildings at all.</p> <p>Something green and floral</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC6N-9</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FC6A-V</p> | <p>2017-11-26 18:09:35</p> <p>2017-11-26 19:33:25</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Cars once again prioritised. Pedestrians and cyclists are an afterthought in the plan.</p> <p>Picardy Place could be the kind of great public space seen in other great cities but will just be another access for a variety of businesses.</p> <p>The Edinburgh New Town was a real vision. If these plans are followed it will be just another part of Edinburgh like Haymaker, Princes Street and George Street that you avoid when cycling or walking.</p> | <p>The Sustrans proposal is rejected on the basis that traffic is adversely affected in the area.</p> <p>It's ironic then that the development proposed including retail etc will also add to traffic.</p> <p>Make it a park? Have cycle ways and pedestrian ways cutting straight across it and really start to dissuade people from driving into a city that can't cope with them any more.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCX9-P | 2017-11-26 21:21:19 |
| <p>I would first like to say that I do not support the whole concept of a gyratory for this junction. Gyratories are;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Highly unpleasant experiences for all road users, the current example at Abbeyhill has proved unpopular with pedestrians and cars alike. - Such a traffic centric / motorway style layout should have no place in a historic city centre like that of Edinburgh. - While it would ease congestion in the short term, once drivers work out that the city centre route is faster than ever, the traffic will increase to fill it. <p>I would much prefer a design that only allowed buses, pedestrians and cyclists up Leith Street. With private car access to the car park only. I think this would allow cut down on the congestion by only allowing private cars to follow one route. And Leith street is so thin and easily congested as it is.</p> <p>However, in the interest of this consultation, where only suggestions to the proposed layout are allowed. I have some comments that I think would help promote a better balance between buses, pedestrians, cyclists and cars (as that should be the order of priority).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Implement priority bus lanes on the inside lanes of all sides. The centre lanes could be dual turn and the middle for turning around the gyratory only. This would allow buses to flow through the system much faster at peak times. 2) If you change the inside lane to a bus lane then at 2 where the statues are, you could turn the bus layby into more pedestrian and cycling space. Possibly keeping more of the statues and more of that nice, market area. 3) Loose all the 'shared space' as this will just promote conflict between pedestrians and cyclists. It's telling that in the temporary lanes in Leith Street for peds and cyclists they have had to become increasingly separated. 4) Use only one phase pedestrian crossings. Crossing a gyratory as a pedestrian is not a nice experience. There should be plenty time to cross and you should only have to wait once if you are only crossing one road. This single phase crossing should include Leith Street and the tram stop. | <p>I'll be quick and frank here. The idea that effectively a traffic island in the middle of a 3 lane gyratory could be used as any sort of a public space is just ridiculous. The gyratories at Abbeyhill and Morison street do not create nice spaces in the middle. They are hard to get to and surrounded by noisy, smelly, queuing traffic.</p> <p>If some hotel developer still wants it for a hotel then hell mend them. I can't imagine it would be a nice place to stay...</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC6D-Y | 2017-11-26 21:29:51 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Although I am happy to see the city continuing its expansion of cycle lanes, I think it is clear that the proposed layout would have a negative effect on the life of the Cathedral. Without a drop off area that has direct access to the cathedral it will make life very much more difficult for disabled visitors. Beyond that, it will also cause problems for reception of remains and funeral processions. It would therefore like to register my concerns about this proposal, and hope a revised plan may be introduced that allows for a usable drop off area for the Catholic worshippers of the city and the Archdiocese.</p> <p>With sincere thanks for your time. Kindest Regards, Martin Eckersley</p> | <p>Perhaps the site might work well as a green space. The surrounding area is quite built up and it would be nice to have a space (even a small space) to it break up. One thing I would be slightly worried about is how it might work as a space for children considering the roads surrounding it. To that end I would probably avoid using it as a play park.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCXP-D</p> | <p>2017-11-27 11:54:44</p> |
| <p>I am very surprised that you do not include St Mary's Cathedral in your headings, which implies that its role as a religious and community centre, and therefore its needs are not sufficiently taken into account by the plans. I noted that in your opening paragraphs in Current street layout state "Picardy Place is also a popular leisure area: immediately nearby are the Omni Centre, Edinburgh Playhouse, and a number of restaurants and hotels". I suggested that this could be rephrased as below "Picardy Place is also a popular community and leisure area: immediately nearby are the Omni Centre, Edinburgh Playhouse, St Mary's Cathedral and a number of restaurants and hotels".</p> | <p>Certainly I think that, following continental models of town squares etc, there is a clear case for cafes with outdoor facilities lining the island block opposite the cathedral .</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCXE-2</p> | <p>2017-11-27 13:03:29</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| <p>introduction(enhance the public realm; improve pedestrian and cycling provision; support the existing public transport network)</p> <p>The proposals do nothing to improve the public realm, providing access to a small triangle in the surrounded by traffic is not an appealing place to spend time.</p> <p>Pedestrians seem to lose out as the pavement is now to be shared with cyclists. One example(and there as several in this design) of a potential major conflict area is at the Conan Doyle pavement where pedestrians queue to use the pedestrian crossing to the north side of York Place/Broughton Street.</p> <p>Reducing the size of the pedestrian crossing island at the same time as sharing the island with cyclists is madness, it is busy enough with pedestrians without adding bikes too.</p> <p>Removing the bus lane in Leith Street makes the public transport network worse and will increase bus times.</p> <p>The proposed cycle lanes are adjacent to areas which are very busy with pedestrians which will lead to conflict both on the pavements and at the crossings.</p> <p>The only mode of transport that would not appear to be affected by the proposals is general motor traffic.</p> <p>Please consider closing Leith Street to everything except buses and cyclists, perhaps trialing it immediately after the current closures end. The current Abbeyhill diversion could be improved by clearly marking the 2 right hand lanes going uphill in Montrose Terrace would allow the traffic to flow (currently cars form a single queue at this location when there is space for 2 lanes which when you turn right into Abbey Mount it becomes 3 lanes). Install more cameras in the bus lane to keep the bus lanes clear so public transport can flow freely.</p> <p>It would be a complete waste of money implementing this design as it is so awful and does not meet any of the objectives.</p> | | | |
| <p>This plan does not take into consideration St Mary's Cathedral, it's parishioners and visitors. Currently the space to the front of the cathedral is used by disabled parishioners, wedding and funeral corteges. This plan ignores this vital aspect of Edinburgh's community and needs to be really thought.</p> | <p>Hard to see potential of a small area surrounded by traffic. Plant some trees to replace those you plan to remove</p> <p>Make the island smaller to accommodate the requirements of St Mary's Cathedral for wedding and funeral cottages and disabled parishioners and visitors.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCXV-K</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCX3-G</p> | <p>2017-11-27 13:58:38</p> <p>2017-11-27 15:01:53</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I am a parishioner of St Mary's RC Cathedral, Edinburgh and have only now been made aware of the Council's proposals for the redevelopment of Picardy Place, the area immediately in front of the Cathedral.</p> <p>The proposed changes would rip the heart out of the Catholic community in central Edinburgh. With no disabled access and no room for funeral or wedding corteges, it is almost as if this is a deliberate attempt to marginalise the Catholics in this city. The Council's attempt to push this through without consultation leaves a very bad taste in the mouth, and one that will be remembered for years, if not generations, to come.</p> <p>I ask the Council urgently to reconsider their plans for this area. Now more than ever we are in desperate need of community life, and this short-sighted plan will contribute to a severe break-down in community spirit and leave Catholics in particular feeling that they are being needlessly victimised.</p> <p>It is also worth pointing out that the area as it stands at present is a lovely local space where calm and order prevail in a sea of busy-ness. No price can be put on the maintenance of such an oasis of peace. This will be even more relevant once the hideous shopping complex to the rear has been completed.</p> <p>I urge the Council to think again and to take into account, amongst other things, the needs of the faithful worshippers in this area.</p> | Leave it as it is. | ANON-8G9D-FCXB-Y | 2017-11-27 16:02:46 |
| <p>Would appear to be similar to the old system from 50 years ago but would require more info on traffic flow, traffic light sequences etc.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCX4-H | 2017-11-27 16:58:11 |
| <p>I am a regular parishioner at St Mary's Cathedral and we were very upset to hear about these latest plans that we feel will have a hugely negative effect on our parish community. St Mary's is made into the great Cathedral it is partly because it is situated in its own quiet island so the bustle of the roundabout etc is not a disturbance. With these new plans and the implementation of a double bus stop it will necessarily become busier and so impact on the spiritual life of the parishioners.</p> <p>Additionally it appears we will lose much of the space directly in front of our Cathedral. We have many parishioners who find it difficult to walk and so are dropped off in this area by car. Losing this ability would mean they might become unable to attend services at the Cathedral and feel more isolated through not being able to participate in additional social events in the Cathedral.</p> <p>We have also considered that the developments will make it more difficult or impossible for wedding and funeral corteges to stop outside of the Cathedral which is of great concern to us.</p> <p>As a very regular user of the area I urge you to reconsider the plans with the Cathedral and its community more in mind.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCXT-H | 2017-11-27 17:18:25 |
| | I have no objection to the island design. However I do have objections to making it harder for people to attend their place of worship. | ANON-8G9D-FCXR-F | 2017-11-27 17:22:07 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Why is a tram stop on Picardy Place required? Will this be in addition to the York Place stop or a replacement to this stop. Two stops within such close proximity seems unnecessary. The proposals appear to reduce the amount of pedestrian space/pavement (particularly in front of the Cathedral & Tesco) while at the same time creating a road layout which surely reduce traffic flow and increase congestion. I would question how this is an improvement on the current situation, particularly considering it will involve the removal of several mature trees. It also appears that there is no proposal for the central island other than it being a slightly larger roundabout than was there previously. Given that this will be a space surrounded by queueing cars, therefore not a pleasant space to wait for any length of time, I struggle to see what use this space can have and how the increase in size can be justified. Would a reduction in the size of the roundabout, fully pedestrianizing the area outside Tesco, increasing pedestrianised areas outside Cathedral & Omni centre (to incorporate separate cycle lanes) not be a feasible alternative?</p> | <p>I do not believe that the provision of an Island Site (i.e. enlarged roundabout) is the correct solution for the site. The site will be surrounded by queueing traffic and whatever is proposed for this area will struggle to create a nice environment for pedestrians given the surrounding noise & pollution. I would rather see the existing roundabout size reduced to a minimum and pedestrian areas outside Cathedral, Omni Centre & Picardy Place enhanced through a combination of; increase in size, additional cycle lane provision, additional planting and artworks. The reduced roundabout at the centre of the site could then become either a singular work of art (of scale/ambition along the lines of the Kelpies) or the centre point of a raised pedestrian bridge linking the three distinct sides of the site. Or a combination of the two! Unless the council commits to a drastic reduction in the volume of traffic within the city I do not see the above proposal succeeding.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCXD-1</p> | <p>2017-11-27 21:35:12</p> |
| <p>Regarding the Revised Council proposals for New Road Layout Outside St Mary's RC Cathedral:</p> <p>Hello</p> <p>Access for funerals and weddings and disabled parking, which are essential functions of the Cathedral and community, is literally disappearing !</p> <p>The public green space in front of the Cathedral is at the moment a safe and inclusive space away from the traffic. It is much appreciated by the local community and visitors to the city.</p> <p>The cycle path and bus route should not be allowed to interfere with the requirements of the Cathedral and wider community.</p> <p>The proposed plans will cause extensive damage to the community including the cathedral.</p> <p>We hope you will take into consideration our concerns.</p> <p>Regards Mrs Holm and family</p> | <p>The island site above would need to include the cycle path and bus stops - that have been planned in front of the Cathedral to its detriment.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCXH-5</p> | <p>2017-11-27 21:48:11</p> |
| <p>The large amounts of cycle & pedestrian shared-space are wholly inappropriate for this busy, city centre location. Cycle and pedestrian provision must be totally segregated at all times throughout the junction. To do otherwise invites dangerous conflict, or forces cyclists onto the even more dangerous carriageway. Additionally, it is disappointing to note that the council's focus has primarily been on motor-vehicle movement throughout the design and modelling process. A holistic approach which considered the movement of people rather than vehicles would undoubtedly have produced a more people-friendly design to serve our city for the future.</p> | <p>I believe that the site should not be developed until the council's City Centre Transformation programme has reached its conclusion; developing this site before this process is complete would severely limit traffic reduction options for Picardy Place.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCXS-G</p> | <p>2017-11-28 00:44:31</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The central triangle should definitely not be used for any major development. The size of this triangle could be reduced to allow more flexibility and widening of pavements and roads to accommodate the new plan. The taxi rank needs to be closer to the main user (the Playhouse) i.e. close to where it is now. A right turn from London Road to Leith Walk should be considered otherwise it is a very lengthy detour which would also encourage rat runs.</p> | <p>The island site should not be the site of any major development and should remain relatively open allowing views of the Cathedral, Carlton Hill etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCXN-B</p> | <p>2017-11-28 09:40:59</p> |
| <p>Only one lane of traffic going down into Leith Walk seems insufficient given that there are three lanes at the moment.</p> | <p>PLEASE not more retail outlets! Trees, shrubs grass instead.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCX5-J</p> | <p>2017-11-28 09:51:28</p> |
| <p>So long as the traffic flows easily any change will be good.</p> | | | |
| <p>Keep and create as much green space as possible.</p> | <p>Create an oasis of green</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC99-Q</p> | <p>2017-11-28 11:37:29</p> |
| <p>Please keep Leith Street closed to motorised vehicles, if you are prepared to ignore your own strategic plans to reduce traffic ,why are you accepting an external developers plan to make it easy for motorised vehicles to access 1650 parking spaces in central Edinburgh?</p> | | | |
| <p>In summary the layout is designed to facilitate motorised transport and clearly limits the potential for direct, continuous and coherent cycling and walking routes in Central Edinburgh. If you are serious about reducing the space given to motorised vehicles over time why not set a fixed time limit for this to happen?</p> | <p>Keep is as open free to access public space with trees, plants, benches and infrastructure designed for people to sit on and enjoy the views. Do not sell it off for the grubby purpose of extracting as much cash as possible from property developers and citizens. Perhaps remove the fast moving traffic encircling it as well.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC9X-P</p> | <p>2017-11-28 12:05:37</p> |
| <p>This is a terrible design which prioritises car traffic over pedestrians, public transport users and cyclists. There is huge potential for this to be quality public space, not a big, noisy, polluting road junction with dead space in the middle surrounded by roads with 2-3 lanes of traffic.</p> | <p>Great potential for development of an interesting and engaging public space, with small-scale cafe developments / food stalls and space for markets etc. But not if it is surrounded by busy roads on all sides.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC98-P</p> | <p>2017-11-28 12:19:28</p> |
| <p>It seems to be a reasonable compromise between all the users vying to be catered for... I'd favour something that at the very least makes it a more attractive area - a place for the existing artworks + representing something of a gateway to the city from Leith direction and vice versa. I guess there's a lot of infrastructure to cram in to / funnel through this area - no avoiding it; that cars, pedestrians, cyclists, public transport + deliveries all have to be accounted for ...</p> | <p>"One option is a mixed used development comprising of retail, commercial, cultural and hospitality. This could be delivered as part of the Edinburgh St James and Picardy Place redevelopment." - the meaning I take from this is that the council might potentially give the space over to commercial interests. I am NOT in favour of this - public spaces are increasingly being used for Festival, Christmas activities, packed with tacky amusements that detract. I have heard mention of a hotel being built in this space - again I'm not in favour of this. An open space, with the existing public art works on display would be great to see.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC9G-5</p> | <p>2017-11-28 14:22:56</p> |
| <p>This proposal is based on priority to vehicle movement with walking and cycling through the area made the more difficult option. Sitting in a car would be preferable to having to walk/cycle through this area.</p> | | | |
| <p>The conflicts with most Council and national objectives to reduce car use and encourage people to become more active.</p> | <p>I would support the use of this for a civic building and public space. Maybe temporary pavilion type buildings would work well on say a 2 year cycle.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC96-M</p> | <p>2017-11-28 16:09:35</p> |
| <p>It isn't clear how the various cycle lanes/shared spaces link together. Experience of the Cameron Toll cycle path shows there is a tendency to, when in doubt, put in a "cyclists dismount" sign, and leave it at that! Also, there would have to be clear signage as to the intended route, and the beginning and end of shared space.</p> | <p>Green space please!</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC9Q-F</p> | <p>2017-11-28 16:40:19</p> |
| <p>There doesn't appear to be much room outside the cathedral for funeral/wedding cars and disabled parking . I think this should be a consideration and a bit more room made there</p> | <p>Given there's traffic all round it it won't be a nice place to sit. maybe a visual art space</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC9K-9</p> | <p>2017-11-28 21:02:05</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| It's important that the junction does not become a block between the centre of town and Leith. It should remain open and flexible to changes to transport provision moving forward. | I do not agree that this should be used for development - it would form a block between town and journey to leith and would restrict future transport flexibility. | ANON-8G9D-FC9J-8 | 2017-11-28 21:15:00 |
| <p>Nowhere in the reasons for change or the important features of this proposal is there mention of maintaining current traffic volumes however that seems to be the main reason for dismissing any alternative schemes. The council policy is to reduce modal share of private vehicles yet this scheme actively supports maintaining current levels. How is the council to meet its objective if they are unwilling to take steps to make it happen?</p> <p>The current proposal creates an island surrounded by a moat of traffic, what 'future development' could possibly go there? Surely the use of the central feature of the development should be decided before consulting the public on its merits, at the very least the proposal should propose something!</p> | <p>Picnic area?</p> <p>The centre of the current roundabout is hardly idyllic, I can't imagine changing the shape from a circle to a triangle with similar amounts of traffic surrounding it will improve matters.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC93-H | 2017-11-28 23:34:10 |
| It's impossible to please all interested users - vehicles, pedestrians, trams & cyclists never mind local residents and allow appropriate access to the Cathedral. There has to be compromise and while cycling is flavour of the month, an outcome too heavily weighted in their favour will alienate a lot of residents & local businesses if they lose access to accommodate cyclists or indeed any other one party with an interest. I would be in favour of something that ensures vehicle access (at all times) to the Cathedral, allows a good flow of all traffic within the area & allows necessary safe crossing points for both pedestrians and cyclists | Green would seem obvious but with traffic it is unlikely much would thrive & regular maintenance would be required. Perhaps somewhere to store & rent bikes but this may also need some sort of maintenance & what is to stop anyone with little or no experience getting on a bike & wobbling about the new layout - then again as there is no official need to prove ability or be licensed for a cycle this can already happen. Perhaps a place for pop-up events - as long as there was safe access onto the area to ensure children don't run onto the roads. Advertising space as long as lighting was not effecting local residents - I think their views are the most important | ANON-8G9D-FC9U-K | 2017-11-29 10:13:23 |
| <p>I wish to raise my concerns about these proposals particularly as they affect parking and access to St Mary's Cathedral. There has been a lack of proper consultation with the cathedral about this including Monsignor Burke.</p> <p>As a regular visitor to the Cathedral, and bearing in mind that it needs to cater for a range of requirements, it is absolutely essential that:</p> <p>(a) there is sufficient disabled parking available in the immediate vicinity of the cathedral - given I understand there is a proposal for business kiosks and a taxi rank in Little King Street, that doesn't appear to be the case;</p> <p>(b) there needs to be sufficient access at the front of the cathedral for funeral and wedding corteges</p> | see my earlier comments | ANON-8G9D-FC9F-4 | 2017-11-29 10:14:16 |
| There is an insufficient area for funeral and wedding corteges in front of the cathedral. There is also no place for disabled parking near the cathedral or at least a dedicated drop off for those who require it. Promising access on Little King Street, which is also where you have promised a taxi queue that is being removed in front of the Omni Center, is not nearly enough. Access to the cathedral by carriageway is essential to the functioning of the church. | | ANON-8G9D-FC9B-Z | 2017-11-29 10:41:01 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>As a member of St.Mary's Cathedral, I would like to express my point of view to you regarding the proposed plans for the new layout. I believe that the needs of the parishioners of the Cathedral ought to be taken into consideration. For example there is the importance of having parking space for the disabled, and also for wedding and funeral corteges. It is probably something like a civil right for people to have access to the church and for the important functions of the cathedral to be able to take place without gross inconvenience. Why you would want to take that from the members of the church in order to put a bus stop in its place is incomprehensible as the needs of the people should surely come first. It is also more beautiful to leave the space free from excess traffic and unnecessary development which is in keeping with the overall plan for Edinburgh -that it should look nice. I would be grateful if you would consider taking into consideration the important needs of the cathedral and act with fairness and generosity towards the Church which has been in existence for so long now. Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Zena Rita Mundell</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FC94-J | 2017-11-29 10:48:40 |
| <p>The bus stop outside the cathedral could cause congestion. Buses 10, 11, 12, 16, 19, 22, 26, 44 will all stop there. Due to traffic, many of those buses arrive at once (I live near York Place). I there is not enough room at the stop, buses will queue round the island resulting in blocking the island. Buses travelling towards Leith Walk will have to negotiate four sets of lights (although allegedly the fourth will remain at green. Surely pedestrians could be trained to walk a bit further resulting in one light at Broughton Place and one to get to the island. I realise you are trying to discourage cars, but being stopped every few yards is also frustrating for bus passengers. Bear in mind that Edinburgh has an aging population (me included) who actually live here and get little advantage from tourists. They do not want to walk or cycle but often use a car. The world has changed from when we couldn't afford cars so they are now a fact of life so make allowance for them.. Having one lane to Leith walk will result in massive traffic jams. Apart from traffic accessing Leith Walk there is also traffic from South Edinburgh trying to access Leith Walk. There does not appear to be a right turn from York Place into Broughton Street thus traffic have to travel all the way round the island. The obvious question is, does the island have to be so big</p> | <p>It is rumoured that a hotel might be sited here. If so, where will taxis and cars drop of guests. An open space will encourage the homeless to loiter all day similar to currently outside the cathedral.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC9Y-Q | 2017-11-29 12:02:39 |
| <p>I think the triangle in the centre of the place has the scope to become dead-space that is difficult to access and therefore under-utilised. I recommend Sustrans proposal of merging one side of the triangle with the surrounding pavement to create a proper public square. Further, the cycle lane on the east side of the proposal looks to include traffic in both directions. However, this goes against the cycle lanes provided on Leith walk, meaning that at some point north-bound cyclists will need to cross over the tram tracks in order to rejoin north-east bound traffic on Leith walk. This seems to add an unnecessary complication to the cycle provision.</p> | <p>As previously noted, this seems to risk being an underused dead-space. Pedestrians will have little reason to cross into, except for getting to the tram stop, and it will be difficult to use for any other purpose, being surrounded on three sides with traffic. It seems to be cut off from the cultural amenities in the area, like the Omni centre or Cathedral.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC97-N | 2017-11-29 12:59:47 |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| Glad to see dedicated cycle ways split off from main road, rather than buses having to cross cycle lanes at each stop | Plenty of plants & trees please - how about a building with a vertical garden? Not too high to block views and light A public park / square on the roof (e.g. New York high line) to take advantage of views / be somewhere for folk who work there to eat lunch, great views & something different for tourists / shoppers, including some kid play equipment. Or even adult swings! | ANON-8G9D-FC9N-C | 2017-11-29 21:33:06 |
| I believe the area should stay as is. It has a mix of green space and I don't think cyclists should be catered to as much as they have been. I have no issue with how it is currently therefore I believe it should remain. | | ANON-8G9D-FC9W-N | 2017-11-29 23:15:28 |
| One of the consequences of increasing the size of the roundabout (the new layout will increase its size by at least 3 times) is that most of the land in front of the cathedral will disappear. The consequences of this are that there will be no room for funeral and wedding corteges which are essential for the cathedral and it means that disabled parking will disappear. The cathedral, which is in use 7 days a week with at least 3 services every day, is an important amenity for the city and reasonable vehicular access is essential for it to continue to provide the services it does. By reducing the size of the proposed triangular-shaped roundabout, the cathedral could continue to operate without significantly impacting the flow of traffic and the location the new tram stop. | The island site should be reduced in size (to something like the size of the current roundabout) and planted with a garden surrounded by lawn. In view of its proximity to St Marys Cathedral any statues or monuments should be Christian. | ANON-8G9D-FC9T-J | 2017-11-30 14:03:08 |
| As a person often visiting the Cathedral, I think the suggestion to remove the space in front of the Cathedral and replace it with bus stops is outrageous. Remember that the Cathedral is a place where a dynamic community meets - it is not a transportation hub. I propose you instead brainstorm how the area in front of the Cathedral can be made more open, human-friendly and good for pedestrians. | It should become a park with trees and cafes. | ANON-8G9D-FCAX-X | 2017-11-30 16:14:04 |
| This layout is completely dominated by motor traffic. At a time when the city is trying to reduce car domination, this is exactly the wrong design, Specifically, it requires multi-stage crossings for pedestrians, and builds in conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. Despite the addition of cycle ways, it would still be very difficult to travel from York Place to Leith Walk, or from Leith St to Broughton St, by bike or on foot, whereas the route for cars is easy. This is completely the wrong balance between modes of transport. | | ANON-8G9D-FC2A-R | 2017-11-30 16:59:32 |
| I can't see any vehicle access to the Cathedral steps such as is at present and is necessary for Funeral cortège and likewise Wedding cortège. Also there is a need for disabled parking for the Cathedral as the Congregation comprises many elderly and disabled. In the interests of equality and diversity provision should be made for religious minorities to continue to peacefully and freely practice in the city centre. | | ANON-8G9D-FCAG-D | 2017-11-30 22:57:02 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I visited the exhibit in Vin Café and found it very interesting. We would like to make four comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We think it is inappropriate to put out for consultation traffic management proposals without an outline plan for what is happening in the island in the centre. The activity in the middle is bound to impact traffic flow either through traffic for whatever is happening on the island, or impact on sightlines for road and cycle way users. 2. We note that the proposal is to surround the island with double yellow lines. We think that it would be more appropriate to have double red lines to outlaw stopping rather than parking. Of course, this would have to be backed up by enforcement (certainly more rigid enforcement than is currently applied further down the street). 3. I saw no mention of parking of buses outside the Holiday Inn. Currently buses (and taxis) often park on the pavement. What is going to happen to them under the proposals? 4. There is good provision for cyclists with dedicated lanes and traffic lights. What is going to be don to ensure that the cyclists obey the law, comply with the traffic lights, do not cycle on the pavements etc? Will there be red light cameras focussed on illegal actions of cyclists backed up with rigid enforcement? | | ANON-8G9D-FCA6-V | 2017-11-30 23:24:15 |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Cathedral in Edinburgh. The Saint Vincent de Paul Society is an international organisation whose mission is to help the poor, sick and infirm. My group runs regular events at the Cathedral that provide a vital lifeline to the housebound. Each event hosts around fifty people who enjoy the opportunity to socialise with old and new friends. In addition, the group also performs a vital function of community life by transporting housebound, disabled and elderly people to Mass and functions at the Cathedral each week. My group must use their own cars because the people we help cannot access the bus and neither can they walk very far.</p> <p>The Picardy Place proposals soundly ignore the needs of those who have no option but to use their own mode of transport to visit the Cathedral to practise their faith. I am deeply concerned that the proposals make no provision for disabled parking directly outside of the Cathedral, which my volunteers and the friends and family of parishioners rely on. Many of the most vulnerable in our community – the old, the sick and the infirm – will become isolated if they cannot be taken to the Cathedral by car because there is no suitable place to park near the entrance.</p> <p>The people in the care of the SSVP at the Cathedral are too frail to take the bus. The Council prioritises 'active travel' but it is discriminatory to do so when it disadvantages the elderly and disabled – those who cannot walk long distances because it is either not possible or it physically hurts, or those who cannot take the bus due to bad health or disability. Many people cannot jump on bicycles to get around town and I am aware that even Sustrans has disowned your plans.</p> <p>The proposals have gone through many iterations conveniently ignoring the Cathedral in general. The Cathedral is a thriving community with more than 2,500 regular parishioners attending Mass each weekend. Let me be clear that you are not designing around an ordinary church that you wish would go away. St Mary's is a metropolitan Cathedral and the seat of the Archdiocese</p> | <p>I am opposed to any plans that block the view of the cathedral or compromise access to it.</p> <p>Why do you need to develop on this land? It doesn't seem big enough.</p> <p>Couldn't you use the space for the Island Site for more room for bicycles and trams?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCAQ-Q</p> | <p>2017-11-30 23:59:26</p> |
| <p>Strongly disagree. Creating a road directly in front of the cathedral will make it impossible for disabled people to stop and have easy access to the Cathedral, as well as funeral and wedding cars being unable to stop outside.</p> <p>It is important that there is availability of disabled parking for parishioners of St. Mary's Metropolitan Cathedral. In addition adequate space for funeral and wedding corteges.</p> | <p>It is important that the space is kept open, giving a sweeping façade to the top of Leith walk. There should be no buildings to overhang the Cathedral with its popular A-listed steps.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCAJ-G</p> | <p>2017-12-01 09:45:53</p> |
| <p>1. The ambition should be 'to make Picardy Place more attractive than St. Andrew Square'. I think the plan needs more trees and green areas (grass) like at St. Andrew Square.</p> <p>2. Currently pedestrians have to wait too long at the traffic lights to cross (corner of Conan Doyle to Broughton street). Will this waiting time be reduced with this new planning?</p> <p>3. What about taxis in front of OmniCenter? Will they have enough space to wait?</p> | <p>Again, the ambition should be 'to make Picardy Place more attractive than St. Andrew Square':</p> <p>1. This means more trees/flowers, green areas, more security, and no homeless people / beggars. Currently Picardy Place and surrounding area is full of homeless people sitting all day and begging, the place does not feel safe nor attractive.</p> <p>2. It would be good to have a charming patisserie / coffee/tea cottage on the island for people to relax or have take-aways, like on St. Andrew Square.</p> <p>3. Picardy Place should be designed flexible enough to accommodate ad-hoc cultural and gastronomic activities on the place, such as a giant Christmas tree, Christmas market, open air exhibitions, organic food market every Saturday, etc..</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCAM-K</p> | <p>2017-12-01 10:52:26</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>one. Perhaps if the dual-carriageway A1 were to be delivered to Picardy Place from Portobello on concrete stilts? But I don't want to give anyone any ideas.</p> <p>CEC's own business plan;</p> <p>http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/file/9797/council_business_plan_2017-22</p> <p>sets out how Edinburgh will become all of the things that this plan isn't;</p> <p>Vibrant, full of Opportunity, Forward Looking, Resilient, Empowering.</p> <p>Vibrancy comes from having people and businesses. Cars kill both. Opportunity comes from having access. Cars prevent access. Forward Looking? We already decided that private cars are a legacy in city centres.</p> <p>Resilient. Resilience comes from independence and diversity. Walkers and cyclists are fit, strong and resilient.</p> <p>Empowering. Does anyone think a giant roundabout empowers anyone to do anything other than pollute, block and eventually flee our city?</p> <p>This is a plan to put the private motorist first and foremost. If you dispute that look, measure even, which mode of transport has the greatest surface area and the unbroken network. Is it pedestrians? No. Is it public transport? No. Is it cyclists? No. Is it motorists? Yes, yes it is.</p> <p>Picardy Place, between a cinema complex, a cathedral and the gay quarter would, in any European city taking itself seriously, be largely pedestrianised. Motor traffic could be tolerated on the edges but would never be predominant.</p> | <p>Do not create an island site. Do. Not. Create. An. Island. Site.</p> <p>Why on Earth would we cut part of our city off behind a whirlpool of automobiles? Have we all gone mad or something?</p> <p>This should be a pedestrianised space fringed with business units, maybe even a hub for Green businesses.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCAF-C</p> | <p>2017-12-01 11:02:48</p> |
| <p>Leith Street should remain closed to private cars. I live in Abbeyhill and being able to walk onto Princes Street without having to wait the at the Leith Street crossing in recent weeks has been fantastic. Buses travelling along Regent Road are so much quicker than when they went down London Road and around Picardy Place.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCAY-Y</p> | <p>2017-12-01 13:58:31</p> |
| <p>I have concerns cycle provision seems to be largely for cyclists moving between Leith Street and Leith Walk/London Road neglecting the other roads around Picardy Place which I regularly cycle.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCA7-W</p> | <p>2017-12-02 15:39:28</p> |
| <p>I welcome the creation of more pedestrian and cycle space. However, I urge the Council to minimise any shared spaces- pedestrians and cyclists need to be using their own segregated space. As a cyclist, I don't think pedestrians have much respect for cyclists in the shared spaces, and often expect us to dismount in busy areas (e.g. the Canal Path causes a lot of conflict). I also wanted to express support for the Sustrans proposal of creating a more direct route for cyclists wanting to get from Leith Walk to York place. Finally, I would like the Council to ensure that any two-way cycle paths are wide enough (at least 2.5m for a two-way path). Having them any narrower than that makes them unsafe.</p> | <p>I think the Council should seriously consider keeping Leith Street closed for private traffic, which would significantly reduce traffic in this area and open new opportunities for the traffic island, including, for example, the option to turn it into a park or another public space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCAS-S</p> | <p>2017-12-02 19:33:27</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| In general these proposals seem reasonable, however it is important that sufficient access is maintained for ceremonial vehicles (wedding and funeral cars) to stop in front of the Cathedral without causing obstruction and stress to others. The limited width of the proposed roadway could be a problem. Why not allow the continued 'shared use' which currently exists? | Nothing too high, the view from the top of the Cathedral steps should remain unobstructed down Leith Walk. | ANON-8G9D-FCAC-9 | 2017-12-02 21:53:42 |
| There does not seem to be any disabled parking nearby for the Cathedral. Please also consider space for access to the cathedral steps for funerals and weddings. | | ANON-8G9D-FCA1-Q | 2017-12-03 12:46:16 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FCAA-7 | 2017-12-03 14:10:07 |
| As a cyclist my preference is to have a dedicated cycle lane for cyclists that connects both down to Leith walk and to York place/Broughton Street. Sharing with pedestrians is dangerous and also inconvenient for cyclists. And having to stop and cross car traffic (whilst safer than the current risky shared gyratory arrangements) is sub-optimal to say the least. | | | |
| If you really want to increase active transport by bike you need to give cyclists from all directions in this arrangement more direct and convenient links. | As this is a major project impacting on local residents such as myself my preference would be for this to be a community space - for example a park with a café facility | ANON-8G9D-FCDX-1 | 2017-12-03 15:40:00 |
| Where is the provision for funeral and wedding cars. Also disabled patrons of the parish rely on easy access to allow them to attend church. A small number but should by no means be discriminated against. This cathedral is a landmark in Edinburgh and hugely important to many people. To sight a double bus stop outside is insulting ! | | ANON-8G9D-FCD9-2 | 2017-12-03 15:40:47 |
| Concerns regarding the following plans: "The creation of a new bus stop outside the cathedral will provide better access to the St James Quarter as well as the tram." The creation of a new bus stop seems to lead to reducing the space outside the cathedral which is used by so many parishioners, including those with disabilities needing to use special transport or using their relatives to help them get to church services. Also, the space in front of the cathedral is vital for wedding and funeral corteges to use in order to have access to the cathedral building. Claiming the space outside of the cathedral for better access to St James is at a huge cost to the cathedral, and is rather unreasonable especially as St James already enjoys a lot of pedestrian space. As much as the city seems to be wanting to provide for the St James business for them to maximise their future profits, it should really have a bit of decency and respect towards the place of Christian worship, never mind some imagination. What are planning for next? Claiming the cathedral building ?! | | ANON-8G9D-FCDP-S | 2017-12-03 20:17:55 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am disappointed not to be able to comment on the proposal provided by Sustrans, that I have heard about. As a result, I don't think this is a very effective consultation. To comment on the two proposal that have been provided, I don't think either proposal is particularly effective. The gyratory option appears to make a centre space which would be a very unpleasant area, surrounded on all sides by three lanes of traffic. Indeed, movement of traffic appears to dominate this. There are some cycle paths, but it is notable that cycle movement is not prioritised. To join the cycle way from St Mary's cathedral appears to require crossing two 2-lane carriageways. This is hardly conducive to encouraging cycling. Any passengers getting off the tram at Picardy place will have to cross a three-lane carriageway to get anywhere, whatever the destination. It seems an inadequate solution. The alternative proposal for this consultation at least improves the public realm space. Of the two, I think I prefer it, although for some of the reasons indicated in this consultation, it is not ideal. I prefer the proposal made by Sustrans, although not included in this consultation, in which cycle transport is prioritised, the tram stop is in a destination area and not in the middle of a gyratory island and bus island on Leith street seems a good idea. During the works, it appears to me that the single lane road on Leith st works okay. The other suggestion I've seen of trees and maybe garden area on Leith street would be great too - it's a hell of a street to walk up - not pleasant at all.</p> | <p>I don't think this is usable at all. Sites like this, inside island spaces, tend to be really unpleasant and not a place to have as a 'use'. George Square in Glasgow is probably a little bigger and has traffic all around it (fewer lanes) and is not a great space in my opinion. It is okay, but characterised by being surrounded by roads with diesel fumes. Not a great place. Trafalgar square in London did have a large island which was very popular to visit as it hosted nelson's column and various other statues. Again that was not a pleasant place to be. The changed it so as not to provide an island and the experience was so much better, so much better than I would have expected too. it showcased the buildings in front of it much better, without being separated by a road. It would definitely be a backward step to build a gyratory system with isolated island. One alternative (which would improve Leith st, would be to make leith street a tunnel with a garden on top with cycle paths, walking and potentially buses, whilst cars and lorries go under. that way, the island at Picardy place wouldn't be an island. I would go all out to avoid and island at that position. I think it is a big mistake.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDE-E</p> | <p>2017-12-03 23:01:32</p> |
| <p>This would appear to be a great opportunity to improve the traffic flow and offer a better environment to pedestrians and cyclists. The bus lay-by is an improvement. It is well-sited and should not impede traffic flow too much. The increased size of footway at the Conan Doyle and Union Place corners are excellent. The tramway is the main problem. It takes up a lot of room and is restrictive as it needs to be straight. What is going to happen at the next roundabout down Leith Walk - How do cars and buses get to London road? How sure is the Council that the tram will continue to Leith? The cycleways are problematic also. Cycles should not be mixed up with traffic going around this island. There will be a serious problem if the single traffic lane down Leith Walk is held up by a cyclist at the front of the queue. Why do Edinburgh's planners continue to plan cycleways in combination with major arterial routes in Edinburgh? Nicolson Street/the Bridges followed by Leith Street is already extremely dangerous and is a route I would never use as a cyclist. The new development in the High St offered the possibility of a bridge to Waterloo Place combined with future cycleways through the new St James Centre and linking up with Abbeyhill etc. The new cycleways could also be pedestrianised which would add to the pleasure for tourist walking routes (and for residents of course) Our house is in Albany Street Lane, very close to this development, and I am excited by the possibilities of improving this site but 'i am extremely concerned by your plan for cyclists . The island, itself, will hopefully be a crossing place which is used by pedestrians rather than a sterile central island.</p> | <p>It should be as green a space as possible. If it were to have a coffee stop on it how would any cafe/shop be provisioned as there are no loading bays allowed for at present.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDM-P</p> | <p>2017-12-04 10:28:09</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>City of Edinburgh Council</p> <p>4th December 2017</p> <p>Dear Craig McConnell,</p> <p>Proposed arrangements for Picardy Place: consultation process</p> <p>A response from the Royal Scottish Academy of Art & Architecture concerning the future of the sculpture "The Manuscript of Monte Cassino" by Eduardo Paolozzi HRSA</p> <p>We are concerned about the future placement of this significant sculpture by Eduardo Paolozzi, who was an honorary member of the Royal Scottish Academy, following the completion of the proposed development of Picardy Place.</p> <p>The sculpture which is in three related parts has been situated in its current position in front of the Roman Catholic Cathedral looking down Leith Walk for nearly thirty years, presumably that position being agreed by Paolozzi who was still very active at the time the sculpture was bought and presented to Edinburgh. The position of the sculpture was significant to Paolozzi. He wrote later, "The history of the Leith Walk area is firmly united with my autobiography. I worshipped at St Mary's Cathedral, shopped in the stores at the top of [Leith] Walk, dreamed in the local cinema, and played around the Calton Hill columns and the Leith Goods Depot [Leith Central Station]." In our opinion the sculpture should remain as it was originally intended and arranged – in front of the Cathedral, with all its parts together and accompanied by the stones rescued from Leith Station and the related planting.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCD3-V | 2017-12-04 12:18:19 |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>seems to do so above all other concerns. There are also significant omissions and the whole plan is predicated on several conditional situations that may never come to pass.</p> <p>First, it assumes that the tram extension will go ahead. This is the whole rationale of the length of the isolated island in the centre, providing its top length and therefore also the angles of approach on the other sides. It also is the reason the pedestrian crossing, already onerously long for pedestrians, will have to be staggered even further. Completing such a plan is likely to put pressure on the decision to extend the tram line as it will be used as a sunk cost rather than allowing the value of money of the tenders to be weighed.</p> <p>Second, it assumed that the roundabout at London Road will be done away with (which is in itself conditional of the tram extension) and replaced with lights. At present, if a Y-shaped junction was used at Picardy Place, traffic coming from Leith Street and York Place could simply continue on to the roundabout and head back in the desired direction. There does not seem to be any provision in the plans of the roundabout replacement to change the dreadfully dangerous London road staggered crossing, which requires pedestrians to first cross Blenheim Place.</p> <p>Third, it assumes that road traffic will stay the same or increase, when in fact it is desirable for everyone involved to actively reduce private road transport. Walking and cycling provision should be prioritised at the expense of motor vehicles wherever possible, and I find it appalling that a junction that is already slow to cross will be made even less desirable by a series of staggered crossings. This in turn will lead to a risk that pedestrians will take desire lines that are dangerous to avoid long crossings (such as directly across from the Playhouse to Picardy Place).</p> <p>There are also serious omissions in planning for taxi ranks. It has been suggested that the northbound carriageway be reduced to one lane to allow taxis to park during certain hours. This can only lead to queues northbound, and raises the likelihood of collisions between cyclists and pedestrians or taxi doors.</p> | | | |
| <p>The proposed layout does not appear to allow access to the Cathedral for a funeral cortege or for wedding parties and for that reason I object to these plans being implemented</p> | <p>As above, this should not be an island, but a peninsula, and some form of public amenity such as a concert hall, would be most desirable. There should not be more housing nor retail built here.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCWT-G</p> | <p>2017-12-04 13:19:18</p> |
| | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDF-F</p> | <p>2017-12-04 13:44:41</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Concerns about shared space between pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Not much room for the volume of foot traffic often encountered by the Omni Centre.</p> <p>Concern at two way traffic for cyclists. Confusing / passing issues, which could lead to spillover into pedestrian area.</p> <p>How will cyclists go from two way traffic at Picardy place to later on being on one way traffic?</p> <p>Cycle paths need to be coloured red - as at the foot of Leith Walk, and indeed should be general EDC policy. (Would have helped with some of the confusion on the latest development of Leith Walk.)</p> <p>Some parts of the plan look downright dangerous for people with no sight, and / or limited mobility / use of wheelchairs, etc. There will be confusion for the former, as EDC seems to have different policies in different places, which may often be quite near each other. The latter will have limited room for manoeuvre at certain points, plus put extra pressure on pedestrians.</p> <p>Concern at the amount of space for the bus stops on Leith Street. A number of issues have arisen at the latest development on Leith Walk, particularly with people trying to cross the cycle lanes when the buses come in. It is not simply a matter of people getting used to a new system, as Edinburgh is a city full of tourists / visitors / new students etc., who will often only be here for a short period, and thus there is a high turnover of people faced with this different system.</p> <p>There needs to be a link up with a cycle path on London Road.</p> <p>The Leith walk clock needs bringing back.</p> | <p>A garden, with broadleaf trees.</p> <p>Statues to some of the women who have helped develop / make the city famous - as there is presently a paucity of them!!!</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCDU-X | 2017-12-04 13:45:59 |
| <p>The proposed roundabout does not help pedestrian access and is hazardous for bikes, it encourages more congestion and pollution in an already polluted environment, as a regular user of this junction, I urgently call for a T junction instead of the unhelpful circulation system proposed. I have good friends living very close to this junction who are elderly and object to the pollution and to the heavy traffic which makes disabled access and healthy living very hazardous.</p> | <p>I object to the proposed island site and request a T junction for the reasons outlined in section 4, dedicated bicycle and bus and tram routes should have priority in the city centre.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCDB-B | 2017-12-04 21:52:03 |
| | <p>I would much prefer to see the Island Site as a green space or some sort of cultural space. More hospitality, retail or commercial redevelopment would be disappointing. It would be lovely to walk out of the hustle and bustle of the Edinburgh St James and come across a beautiful green space to sit and watch the world go by before heading down Leith Walk.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCDY-2 | 2017-12-05 15:33:48 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The design for Picardy Place depends on the transport strategy to be adopted by Edinburgh. The principle strategy for transport which Edinburgh needs to implement is the complete eradication of any motorised vehicles, including buses (whether conventional diesel or alternative fuels) from Princes Street, a vast increase in the frequency of trams between the bottom of Leith Walk and Haymarket (so one in each direction every 2-3 minutes minimum), which presupposes the extension of the tram line, and this coupled with the implementation of a "fishbone" public transport infrastructure, where the bus lines would be the "bones" perpendicular to the backbone of the tram line. Once this is accepted, then the design of Picardy Place becomes a lot clearer. The tram line has absolute priority. Second there would be no vehicle traffic on Leith Street except buses going to or from North Bridge. If any private traffic would be allowed over North Bridge, it would be diverted off along Waterloo Place/Regent Road and NOT down or from Leith St. Thus from the bottom of Leith St, bus traffic would either go down Broughton St or down Leith Walk. There might be bus traffic from London Rd to Broughton St. It is a question as to whether any through-traffic for private vehicles would be allowed from London Road after the junction with Regent Rd/Easter Rd. The only private traffic would be from Leith Walk to York Place/Queen St and vice versa. A roundabout is not then necessary at all. There is a "Y" for the bus traffic with respect to Leith St. Public transport and bicycle/foot traffic takes precedence over ALL private motorised traffic. The current design should be thrown out and redesigned in the light of this strategy.</p> | <p>This is going to become a major transport interchange between bus and tram, and should be designed and used accordingly. All the stances/stops AND the roadway to the West and East of the "island" should be roofed over, allowing passengers to transit to and from the tram stop without being exposed to the weather. Not something halfhearted and totally ineffective like at Haymarket (which should be improved). A serious, light, but effective design. How much space would be left for development would be a question to be resolved. Thinkable would be a second storey above, and using the height difference coming down Leith St. to lead a raised but flat walkway directly onto the upperstorey, with lifts or escalators to the interchange below, thus the roads would be crossed by the upper storey. Solar collectors above to contribute to running the whole edifice</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDT-W</p> | <p>2017-12-05 21:18:01</p> |
| <p>The design as proposed does not meet the needs of the areas as a leisure destination or the needs of the local residents. It is simply focused on allowing motor traffic to flow through the area. The design as proposed is out dated and contravenes both council policy and government aspiration and has been developed without meaningful consultation with the citizens of Edinburgh.</p> <p>The island is unlikely to provide any meaningful public space; pedestrians and cyclists are repeatedly put in conflict with each other; the increase in motor traffic will lead to increased levels of pollution, made worse by the loss of vegetation in the area. The plans do not seem to take other works in the city into account including the East-West cycle route or the Leith Walk programme.</p> <p>These plans are a disgrace and show a fundamental lack of vision for Edinburgh and we will have to pay for it again when in a few years time the whole junction will be ripped up and fixed.</p> | <p>I believe that part of the island is common good land which is held in trust by the council not owned by it? I am happy to be corrected on this.</p> <p>The island when surrounded by traffic on three sides will not be safe or suitable for public use due to traffic noise and pollution. Or in true Edinburgh fashion we could put a cheap bar in the middle and take bets on the first causality as drunk crowds tire of waiting five minutes for the lights to change.</p> <p>If the gyratory goes ahead as planned the only safe use is plant trees to mitigate the pollution generated by the motor traffic.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDR-U</p> | <p>2017-12-05 23:33:25</p> |
| <p>Access is needed for disabled drivers to park close to the Cathedral. Sharing parking space with taxi drivers on LittleKing Street would not meet the needs of the disabled. Where are they to go if there is no parking space left?</p> <p>Wedding and funeral access at the foot of the steps to the cathedral or as close as possible is also important? How will this be accommodated?</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDD-D</p> | <p>2017-12-06 09:12:28</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Too much emphasis on motor vehicles Not enough consideration for usable public space (I do not consider the middle of a roundabout as usable public space) Picardy Place Development should be part of the integrated Transport plan for the whole of Edinburgh City Centre. Should be a form of option appraisal - not presented as a fair accompli. Tram extension not yet decided: how can Council assume it will happen and develop accordingly?</p> | <p>I live in Broughton Place. In order to access the 'island site', I would have to manoeuvre two crossings at the top of Broughton Street, then cross over the three lanes of traffic to use this space. Who would want to take their family into the middle of a roundabout surrounded by busy, noisy traffic? This island site is to accommodate road traffic and cannot be considered as public space. More consideration must be given to people living in the area. The city centre residents should be allowed usable and accessible public space and not in the middle of a roundabout.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDS-V</p> | <p>2017-12-06 10:41:41</p> |
| <p>I believe will have a devastating impact on St Mary's Cathedral. I cannot begin to understand why the people at Edinburgh Council are proposing this new road layout, which will affect the lovely paved area for pedestrians at the front of the cathedral, and have an impact on the current availability of disabled parking for people regularly attending mass at St Mary's. I am originally from a small Highland town where the sense of 'community' was always valued highly. I think this is an important part of many local parishes. It can be a key part of someone's social calendar. It is not something we should lose sight of, or abandon in place of financial gain. It is clear to me the main focus of these new plans is centred around travel and leisure. I understand this is important to the public, but what members of the public with religious beliefs? It will be a great pity if the disabled parking allocation at the front of this beautiful cathedral is taken away to allow for a 'double bus stop'. What about the rights of people with a disability? What about the needs of the frail, elderly population who may struggle with their mobility? They may depend on the disabled parking spaces to enable them to attend weekly mass at St Mary's cathedral. The Scottish Government continually try to implement policies and strategies to encourage all members of society become and to remain active in their local community. There are numerous health campaigns raising awareness about the benefits in keeping active and maintaining a good social circle. I appreciate that public transport links are important – however, for some people public transport may not be appropriate for safety reasons. I strongly believe the disabled parking spaces currently available at the cathedral are essential in supporting the vision of the Scottish Government in enabling members of society to keep physically and mentally active in their community. In relation to other activity which regularly takes place at this cathedral, there will now be no suitable area for a funeral or wedding cortege. How can this be allowed to happen? For some people they may have attended this beautiful cathedral throughout their life and they may wish for their funeral mass to</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDC-C</p> | <p>2017-12-06 11:35:17</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>As a local resident who daily transverses this area as a pedestrian I welcome a redesign.</p> <p>I fully support the need for a the new tram stop and accept the design places this in the only practical place.However I am greatly concerned that the creation of a gyratory traffic system gives too much precedence to road traffic at a time when volumes should be discouraged within this already congested area in favour of pedestrians, cycling and public transport.We know that pollution levels are already of concern and that the volume of traffic will only increase if the roads are built to accommodate it. So why are we not taking more radical steps to increase the footfall within the area by decreasing the road traffic and making a public place as a destination for public enjoyment and recreation? The loss of planting of mature trees, the loss of public space in front of the Cathedral, the creation of an island as a kind of "no mans land" in the middle of a traffic choked gyratory is not the kind of thinking that is needed.</p> <p>It would be a disaster for this area if the scheme went ahead as currently planned.</p> | <p>We should not be creating an island site.The site should be in effect a promontory connected to the front of the Cathedral.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDW-Z</p> | <p>2017-12-06 16:44:08</p> |
| <p>As set out in our separate five-page response to the consultation (summarised below), we recommend that the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • undertake traffic modelling for a T or Y junction, based on constraining car traffic and enhancing the alternative modes • model journey time impacts for key pedestrian routes affected by the proposed circuitous, multi-stage pedestrian crossings • explore options for (i) bus-only access on the south section of Leith Street (and some bus re-routing along Waterloo Place) and (ii) banning through traffic on (or making bus-only) Broughton Street north of its junction with Picardy Place and York Place • redesign pedestrian crossings to provide high-quality connectivity along pedestrian desire lines – without multiple stages – with pedestrian and cyclist flows segregated • ensure that all footways meet the Street Design Guidance 'desirable minimum' width of 4 metres or more • eliminate 'shared space' for pedestrians and cyclists, replaced by segregated provision • move segregated cycleways out of the centre of footways, relocating them between the footway and the carriageway. | <p>As set out in our separate five-page response to the consultation, we recommend that the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •enhance the public realm and green space, by eliminating the gyratory (removing its south to north-west arm and the isolated 'island') •improve future interchange on foot between bus and tram, and on foot from bus / tram to the St James Centre, by eliminating the gyratory and the isolated 'island'. | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCDA-A</p> | <p>2017-12-06 17:03:22</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>This proposed layout is a backward step. Although the 'historic street layout' is restored, the immediate effect will be of a giant roundabout, as previously existed here in the early 1980s, and even with buildings the effect will be little better - it will be like the gyratory at Haymarket (Torphichen Street) which is unpleasant for pedestrians and cyclists alike. This layout may include improved facilities for cyclists, and is better for pedestrians than earlier versions of the proposal, but it still prioritises motor traffic at just a time when the council should be looking to reduce private car use (whether fossil-fuelled, or electric for that matter). This is surely in opposition to current planning policy and national trends.</p> <p>The Sustrans proposal, or the ZONE Architects scheme, are worth more detailed investigation for their prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists, and could be coupled with the conversion of Leith Street into a route for buses/taxis only if there were fears of congestion at York Place.</p> | <p>Hard to see whether a hotel here would prosper - or, for that matter, much else. The site is not that big, is hemmed in by traffic, and requires crossing the road. Drop-offs etc will lead to congestion as taxis/coaches wait as per other hotels in the city centre (e.g. the Ibis South Bridge)</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCM9-B</p> | <p>2017-12-06 18:22:32</p> |
| <p>the area. I previously lived at Gayfield Place so crossed the route by foot and bus innumerable times. I now live in Portobello and going through this roundabout is my main access to the city centre. I understand that traffic flow is important but in my personal experience a roundabout system cuts off the traffic. This is because in peak times traffic stagnates all the way down Leith Street, buses end up halted on the roundabout, and then even the people who want to turn right into Queen Street cannot do so. Interestingly the friends I have who live on Leith Walk and work in Newington have told me that now Leith Street is closed they are getting to work faster because they are no longer wasting 20+ minutes on that particular Picardy roundabout and instead are travelling on a bus which moves quickly along the Waterloo Place diversion. This is contrary to their expectations and does prove that the gyrator system is not appropriate here.</p> <p>Secondly, as a cyclist and frequent user of the Omni, I find that the current proposals are unsympathetic to bicycle and pedestrian traffic. It is already a great frustration to have to traverse so many different timed crossings to get from Broughton Street to the Omni, and I often do not cycle across town because I am too scared of this particular roundabout. The Sustrans plan is far more sensible in terms of prioritising sustainable forms of transport, which ties in with government and council targets on climate change, public health, and making cities enjoyable places to live.</p> <p>I am also appalled that the Paolozzi statues are going to be relocated. The space in front of the cathedral is constantly used by children, markets, pedestrians, and is a lovely public space despite the blight of the nearby mis-designed junction. In contrast opening up a space in the middle of a gyratory is a terrible idea. Who wants to sleep in a hotel in the middle of three streams of traffic? How would that be a suitable area for children to play? It makes far more sense to remove the island and allow extra public space either at the cathedral or at the Omni. I have seen suggestions that this 'island' be accessed by footbridge. In my experience foot bridges are frightening late at</p> | <p>See my previous comments. This concept of this island is not suitable. Why would we remove a lovely large space in front of the cathedral with its beautiful Paolozzi sculptures for a corporate space in the middle of a gyratory? Who wants to stay in a hotel in the middle of three lines of traffic? Or let their children play in a park surrounded by cars on all sides? Please do rethink this gyratory system, and remove the island in favour of increased public space either in front of the cathedral or the omni centre.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCMX-A</p> | <p>2017-12-06 18:35:02</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| Keeping the roundabout without traffic lights could accommodate reasonable flows of traffic without excessive congestion. If the proposed layout will not be able to accommodate the same volumes before congestion arises then I would suggest it is avoided. Colour differentiated cycle lanes at the junction would encourage cycling in line with the relevant transport strategies. | A park/green space would be optimal as this site is surrounded by busy roads with moderate levels of pollution. | ANON-8G9D-FCM8-A | 2017-12-06 19:51:57 |
| I worry that the island is a wasted space cut off from all sides by traffic. Not a pleasant place to be with traffic on all sides. I think the island should ideally be as small as possible and pavements on the streets at all side should be increased especially on front of the cathedral and at Picardy Place. | I don't see any use for the back slabs site. It would not be a pleasant place to be cut off on all sides by traffic. | ANON-8G9D-FCME-Q | 2017-12-06 20:50:56 |
| If any building is done at all on the island site the whole proposal is a nightmare. The new St James is already an eyesore and is an embarrassment. Let's have no more short term thinking but really apply ourselves to working out radical improvements instead of killing Edinburgh the goose that has laid the golden eggs of tourism, retail etc. How is it that planners and developers come up with all the proposals that then take a terrible toll on the lives of ordinary people. By all means have the 3 roads, but let's have an empty space in the middle....or at least something that stands up as good building and able to abut the beauty of the New Town | Please ,not more development. How about an oasis of green with a park . Each new development brings noise, air pollution, and more money for the developer with less notice paid to local needs. I would love nothing to happen on the island site except trees and flowers to be planted ...no more retail or hotels and CERTAINLY no more building. Edinburgh is unable to breathe. And our city is being ruined by development. Ordinary citizens do not benefit from development. | ANON-8G9D-FCMZ-C | 2017-12-06 22:06:02 |
| <p>The areas requires space for pedestrians to walk in the area.</p> <p>The are needs for space for trams, even if this space is not required at the moment. If it is not required at the moment, then additional space can be give to pedestrians.</p> <p>The area requires space for two bus lanes in each direction. This will allow buses to pick up and drop off passengers without holding up other buses.</p> <p>The area requires space for two cycle lanes in each direction.</p> <p>There is no requirement for any on-street parking or loading in the area. There is no requirement for anyone to drive a private car in the area. Shops that require additional stock can arrange for their delivery drivers to use nearby loading bays, or the loading bays in the new St. James's Centre.</p> <p>If there is space, there can be one lane of cars, lorries, taxis, private hire vehicles, vans in each direction. No parking should be allowed by these vehicles in the area.</p> | Some trees, grass, flowers and seating would benefit the whole area. | ANON-8G9D-FCM6-8 | 2017-12-06 22:57:51 |
| This is just a giant round -about that will not be used as a public space at all. More consideration should be given to extending the area outside the cathedral and to pedestrians and cyclists. I think this plan a retrograde step. I am distressed by these plans They totally affect the area outside The Cathedral This is a beautiful practical area Displaying amazing Sculptures, giving all people easy access to the Cathedral and a spot to be not part of just a big junction This area should be respected not destroyed. People who have lived in this area for many years are being disrespected. I feel strongly this should be re thought | Islands as we all know are hard to get to!!! And it has to be really special to be worth the effort. I cannot see anyone spending time of any qualityon a major traffic round about | ANON-8G9D-FCMK-W | 2017-12-07 04:30:19 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FCMJ-V | 2017-12-07 07:26:05 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>More traffic will move through the New Town which is a Heritage Site. Consider the damage to the streets just to the north of York Place. The Paolozzi sculptures should be given prominence as they are an iconic part of Edinburgh's heritage and should be the focus of an area for people, including space to just 'be' in Picardy Place which is one of the historic approaches to the city enabling views from there to Carlton Hill etc. This is going to become a traffic interchange more appropriate to a city ring road, not the centre of an historic Georgian area of a world heritage city.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCM3-5 | 2017-12-07 08:31:50 |
| <p>Traffic. Proposals are traffic dominated- aiming to improve and increase flows, which will only attract and increase traffic. Pedestrians are given no consideration Island amenity space. Will access by lights/ underpass? It will be isolated and a token Approach to historic city centre. Keith Walk heralds the historic city. The proposals reduce this approach to a traffic junction</p> | <p>Difficult of access, surrounded by congested traffic. Too small to create its own ambience. The amenity space must be attached to the cathedral precinct</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMU-7 | 2017-12-07 08:37:38 |
| <p>The layout to me appears biased in favour towards motorised transport, it looks unpleasant and awkward for pedestrians and to a lesser extent cyclists to use. The current proposed layout would encourage me to avoid the area and find an alternative route when on foot or bike although I wouldn't avoid it if driving. I'd like to see an alternative design that favours pedestrians, cycles and then public transport, I think private cars need to be discouraged given the amount of traffic now on Edinburgh's roads and the effect that has on air quality on some of the busier routes in the city. There is too much road area in this design, some of the space should be given back to foot traffic/public realm. Specifically on the proposed design I can't see a an obvious or convenient cycle route for travelling from Leith Street to Broughton Street, this is a well used route and the proposed design looks like it will be far more awkward and time consuming for cyclists than the current roundabout. The large alienated traffic island in the middle would make a fairly unpleasant public space with the noise of traffic and resulting vehicle fumes, its not somewhere I'd like to spend time. If it wasn't surrounded 360 degrees by what is likely to be busy traffic then that would be a vast improvement.</p> | <p>I don't think the entire yellow area should be developed if this scheme goes ahead, there is a lot of foot traffic in this area and forcing pedestrians and cyclists to share the purple area around it will cause conflict especially at peak times, the shared pavement area is too small and adjoined 1 side by traffic, more provision for foot traffic needs to be accommodated. If it is developed then a reduced size version of the scheme above would make sense, I don't think the area would make a pleasant open air public space given the amount of traffic likely to be surrounding it.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMM-Y | 2017-12-07 08:38:55 |
| <p>Despite the changes the layout has still been designed around the motorised vehicle first - this is clear from the number of lanes and the amount of space given over to blacktop. Pedestrian crossings especially from Broughton Street - Leith Street are not clear, direct or convenient. There is no sense of place created here and generally this will not be a nice environment for people to walk / cycle or spend time in. If you plan for cars you will get cars.</p> | <p>The island site as it stands will be surrounding by at most times by stationary and queuing traffic so will not be a nice place or easy to access. An urban park free to use and access and would be of benefit to the whole city</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMF-R | 2017-12-07 10:17:45 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>My thoughts on what the exercise should achieve are well captured by the points below:-</p> <p>Create a public plaza outside St. Mary's Cathedral Make Picardy Place safe and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists. Easy access to public transport. Reduce traffic through this area in line with Council Policy. Avoid displacement of traffic to other streets. Turn Broughton Street into a proper High Street, not a traffic corridor. Don't simply remove access to parking for all residents and local businesses. Come up with a suitable location for the Paolozzi sculptures to remain together, rather than splitting them up and defeating the purpose of them. Above all, take time to consider properly other options that reflect a balance of needs – not just traffic flow – and address local people's concerns which the current consultation fails to do.</p> <p>An alternative plan whereby the entire front of the cathedral is pedestrianised, far better cycle routes and pushing out to cover over the sinking roundabout exists and is far better for all concerned.</p> | | | |
| <p>It would take six junctions to go from London road down Leith walk if the trams went ahead because there would be no right turn directly What would Hertz, Tesco, holiday inn, cathedral do about people leaving, deliveries, funerals when any vehicle was outside of these premises it would be chaos a lot more chaos given the funneling nature of the traffic. Traffic would be funneled down Broughton Street which should be seen as an important high street and local community not a transport corridor The design is so aged that cities throughout the world are ditching them and redesigning areas Car traffic will decrease and public and active transport used more if people are prevented from driving in these areas The Paolozzi statues are situated in an environment and gifted and should not be moved under any circumstances (we are still waiting for the elm row pigeons to return!) The area in front of the cathedral is an important community hub and useful market space, it should be increased not decreased The triangular island will never be used for public realm. Who wants to cross four lanes of traffic to sit in the middle of an area. Indeed it could be a terrorism magnet It is the most awful gateway to a world heritage site</p> | <p>The island site can be a good public space (for markets etc.) but only if it's Southern end is not bordered by a proper roadway with poor pedestrian access.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCM4-6 | 2017-12-07 11:51:53 |
| <p>The area in front of the cathedral should be left as one big public area with traffic requiring access to Broughton Street continuing down to a left turn junction outside the Playhouse. Also making Leith St accessible to bus, taxis and cycles only as well as cars exiting from Greenside car park would reduce the amount of traffic at this junction.</p> | <p>It shouldn't need to exist and should be attached to the area outside of the cathedral. If it goes ahead it should be community use public realm. Tree lined and if buildings are on it should be small in terms of height and footprint. They should not be offices. This is the gateway to the world heritage site not an industrial estate for offices.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMY-B | 2017-12-07 11:54:32 |
| | <p>Creating a landscaped area that provides seating and relaxation away from traffic would be excellent. This area is currently very drab. Limiting car parking in the island would be essential to provide a usable space.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMT-6 | 2017-12-07 14:21:28 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I think the council's current plan is utterly wrong for our, or any, city. Given the general acceptance that we need to reduce motor traffic in our cities and increase safer, healthier and more efficient and sustainable forms of transport, it is inexplicable that the council is promoting this road dominated layout. It has no redeeming features.</p> <p>I would fully support more progressive solutions as proposed by Sustrans and Zone Architects which provide much more of a balance on the competing need for space and, just as importantly, make it a space that residents and visitors may actually want to spend time in.</p> | <p>It should not be an island. I can't see show any development can work here when it is surrounded by three or four lanes of traffic.</p> <p>It should be an open public 'square' . The east end of the city is lacking in such a space suitable for events, performances, markets. A small commercial development for food perhaps.</p> <p>This will preserve the character of the area, the views up and down Leith Walk, the catheter, Picardy Place itself (and unfortunately the Omni Centre)</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMR-4 | 2017-12-08 09:51:38 |
| <p>'travel with impunity' on A roads i.e. dark clothing, minimal/zero lights in some cases, and chameleon like in their ability to travle - often at great speed - across and along pedestrian areas. This is not a rant, but a plea for balance. I am bored listening to the rights of people on bicycles trumping every other method of movement. That is your context. Mamils (middle age men in lycra) are the worst. Allegedly of course. Many seem to view travelling on two wheels as some sort of personal timed training activity, immune to all other road and pavement users. This state of affairs is compounded when they are 'wired' for sound if not other stimulants. In every circumstance, near misses are frequent and doubtless the driver of any four wheeled vehicle is painted as the fiend. My suggestions are three fold and under noted.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus on the flow from the end of York Place to the roundabout at the top of Leith Walk. Give up Leith Street for all wheeled vehicles except buses, licenced black cabs and pedestrians; full pedestrianisation risks turning it into another ' no go' drunk tank ghetto at nights per other non-vehicle parts of the city centre. 2. Give the cyclists one route and also lobby their vocal and various organisations to sign up to taking shared responsibility for safe movement of all. 3. Maximise the green space, by which I mean proper turf, trees and plants not concrete and bland blocks pretending to be public parkland, and re-instate the various sculptures and monuments to places of prominence as a matter of urgency. <p>Those are my main suggestions. A further observation and suggestion is below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. I appreciate it is a separate thing but the access for service vehicles to the 'turd' and environs when the gap site from the St James Centre is built must be planned concurrent with all other changes in this area to avoid gridlock or worse still, digging holes and filling them in if one detrimentally affects the | <p>As above. Ensure traffic flow with priority for four wheeled cars and pedestrians in the surrounding areas. It is a roundabout and could usefully adapt to traffic lights or stay as is - ironically the flow of vehicles moving along from Queen Street towards The Playhouse end of the route works better - in my experience of walking and driving - right now with the interim measures better than it did when Leith Street was open. I think so much has been lost from the area since the 1960's that it is now better to suck up reality i.e. get a proper flowing set of junctions with salvaged green space in front of the cathedral area to maximum extent, rather than try and be all things to all people.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMD-P | 2017-12-08 11:22:30 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>plan focuses on housing in Leith and employment in the west and south of the city; clearly there need to be improved transport links from Leith to the west and south, and not just the possible tram extension (still not confirmed). The junction must allow all modes of transport - cycle, bus, tram, and vehicle.</p> <p>There seems insufficient provision for buses. It is the main bus route from Leith into the centre of town, either via York Place or Leith Street, yet there is a lack of segregated bus space. The trams are not a sufficient substitute: they do not serve large parts of the city and in the absence of fully integrated transfer ticketing, many journeys will be made by bus even along the tram route.</p> <p>The cycle coverage is also poor. Segregated routes are needed to allow pedestrian movement and protect cyclist. Cycle routes on the pavement to the east zigzag back and forth across the pavement. Pedestrians will be placed in danger and cyclists will be impeded. Many cyclists object to the presence of pedestrians and other obstructions and if a route is not fast enough, they will instead use the unsegregated road, putting themselves and others at risk.</p> <p>It is also crucial to allow vehicle access to Leith Walk, to allow the economic development of the area and allow residents to access employment in the rest of Edinburgh. There is an obvious conflict of interest between the developers of the St James site and other traders in the area, and other traders must not suffer by poor vehicle access. This is a major vehicle route to Leith, while other connections to Leith Walk from the east and especially west are poor (Constitution Street, The Shore, Lower Granton Road, Bernard Street, East Hermiston Place, Pilrig Street, Iona Street, Dalmeny Street, Montgomery Street, Easter Road, etc, are not suitable for HGV traffic or other large volumes of traffic, and Great Junction Street is intended as primarily a shopping space with a 20mph limit).</p> | <p>This space should be used for traffic, tram stop, bus stop, etc, rather than as a leisure space or hang-out. It will never be a particularly pleasant space to be: a triangle in the middle of a busy junction with noise pollution, air pollution, awkwardness of crossing the road, and large amount of through traffic (including cycles and pedestrians). There are other public or semi-public spaces nearby that are quieter or more accessible and could be used more intelligently: new spaces in St James Quarter, Gayfield Square (currently underused); St Andrew Square; the gardens on Leopold Place; outside Register House; top of Waverley Market; etc.</p> <p>Another factor is that surrounding buildings do not currently engage with this space at all: the Omni Centre is oriented away from the junction with bars and restaurants at the back and a big, largely unutilised, space at the front; the cathedral is not a space for looking out of windows; nor is the Playhouse Theatre; the basement clubs on Picardy Place likewise. It's hard to see how they could engage with this space across roads without impeding traffic or putting pedestrians at risk. All this suggests a functional rather than aesthetic focus.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCM7-9</p> | <p>2017-12-08 12:32:25</p> |
| <p>The proposed street layout does not show an adequate access to the Cathedral and therefore alterations should be made for access for Funeral and Wedding Corteges to the foot of the steps of the Cathedral and adequate provision of disabled parking around the Cathedral.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCMW-9</p> | <p>2017-12-08 20:27:10</p> |
| | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCM1-3</p> | <p>2017-12-08 21:16:21</p> |
| <p>I like on Annandale Street so I use (outwith the diversion currently in place) this route at least twice a day six days a week. At the moment I feel as if this is a place for cars to pass through. This new proposal feels like something which would make people - PEOPLE - want to stop and think about where they are and what is around them whilst still moving traffic. I would feel, travelling through this space, like part of the the city of Edinburgh as opposed to someone who lives there inconveniently for the tourists, the students, the traffic, delivery vans and buses.</p> | <p>Lots of crossings! Also, the compass on the old roundabout is beautiful and should be reinstated to bring the focus for locals and tourists alike beyond Princes Street. Perhaps ask City of Literature to join in with links to RLS, Leith, Calton Hill, etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCMA-K</p> | <p>2017-12-08 23:05:29</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>is a major project with far-reaching consequences. It is misguided to try and effect these changes before the Council's City Transformation project – looking at long-term traffic management in Edinburgh's centre – has even begun. We need holistic strategic thinking which also takes into account: other major projects in the city centre including the new concert hall in St Andrew Square, the George Street and First New Town redesign; perhaps rethinking what kind of motorised traffic is allowed to use Leith Street; publication of the Council's long-delayed Manifesto on Civic Space .</p> <p>1.2 Proponents of the plan say that it has the potential to adapt to reduced traffic flow in future, and the incremental creation of a continuous pedestrian promontory extending out from the pavement outside the Cathedral. Without knowing the conclusions of the City Transformation project, this is no more than a fond aspiration. For it to have any credibility, we need more robust research findings, firm political promises, and a clear programme of how and when motorised traffic volumes would be reduced and how and when the creation of a promontory would be achieved.</p> <p>1.3 I would delay signing-off any plan for Picardy Place until the City Transformation has reported and been agreed.</p> <p>1.4 I would delay signing-off any plan for Picardy Place until the Council has made a firm commitment to extending the tramway to Newhaven.</p> <p>1.5 The design claims to be future-proof but is actually backward-looking. Motorised traffic volumes on the scale envisaged are not desirable or sustainable for the city centre. Gyratories are inadequate solutions of the past, and are being replaced with better alternatives by forward-looking local authorities elsewhere in the UK.</p> <p>2.1 The design clearly starts from the position of facilitating motorised traffic flow. It does not set out to reduce motorised traffic or to prioritise pedestrian and bicycle uses (active-travel) as championed in the Council's own 'Local Transport Strategy 2014–2019'.</p> <p>2.2 The danger here is that facilitating current levels of motorised traffic flow (plus the extra vehicles attracted to the vast St James car park) will</p> | | | |
| <p>This looks incredibly poorly thought out.</p> <p>Yet again CEC shows a lack of consideration for pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>Terrible crossing proposal next to the playhouse</p> <p>Will look awful - road going straight by the cathedral, paolozzi sculptures sidelined, no green space, reduced pavement space.....</p> | <p>It is undevelopable as an island surrounded by traffic. Nobody would wish to go there. No business would thrive.</p> <p>Turn it into a continuous promontory from outside the Cathedral. Deliver quality public realm, with foliage. Very limited kiosk-style development might then be appropriate. Perhaps include a public toilet.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCRX-F | 2017-12-09 11:48:01 |
| | <p>Why?</p> <p>An island site surrounded by multi lane traffic!</p> <p>Let's turn central Edinburgh into an M8 interchange</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCR8-F | 2017-12-09 15:02:48 |
| | <p>That design means difficult access for pedestrians.</p> <p>i think you should talk to the people who live here.</p> <p>Some of whom are disabled.</p> <p>denise</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCRP-7 | 2017-12-09 17:27:52 |
| <p>It has been prioritised for motor vehicles and cyclists will detour to avoid the junction (unless travelling south on Leith Walk)</p> <p>That will make this space unpleasant for pedestrians (vehicle noise and pollution)</p> <p>Not much better than a roundabout.</p> <p>Progressive European cities focus on diverting vehicle traffic away from the city centre rather than facilitating it.</p> | <p>With 3 lanes of traffic going around, it will be unpleasant for any pedestrians.</p> <p>What about a glass dome with fresh air accessed by underpasses from the 3 sides.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCRE-V | 2017-12-09 17:55:39 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>professor of urban studies, University of Glasgow</p> <p>Let's take a step back from the technical detail.</p> <p>It is Edinburgh's topography, its built heritage and its status as capital city which have attracted the skills and learning and investment which together make our city prosperous and of world-wide renown.</p> <p>Being prosperous means we have lots of traffic. And the very things that make us prosperous make the management and planning of that traffic difficult. Our traffic planners have needed to respond with care and imagination.</p> <p>One time when they didn't - in the 1960's - the eventually aborted "inner ring road", planned to slice through the Meadows, Calton Hill and the New Town, left the present unlovely roundabout at Picardy Place in its wake. It contributes nothing to the city other than a traffic interchange. The large empty spaces contribute no economic value to the city, its "green" spaces offer little useable public value and it detracts from rather than supports the "outstanding universal values" of world heritage.</p> <p>In a compact and populous city like Edinburgh we can't afford to sustain value-less space. The fundamental question is therefore this: how do we take this once-in-a-century opportunity and re-design Picardy Place to create value for all its users?</p> <p>How do we create sustainable economic and commercial value that make a city prosperous? We provide for increased pedestrian footfall through easy access and connectivity. The tram stop and bus routes will bring people here, so will good safe footways from nearby car parks. Useable green spaces and active frontages with shops/cafes will encourage them to linger.</p> | <p>Let it not be an ISLAND. There is essentially one side of a motorway wrapped around this piece of land (don't argue - that's what makes it an island). No one is going to go there. It will have no social, environmental value and therefore precious little commercial value. Thinking about its use is therefore meaningless - except perhaps as an "island" of urban woodland to help absorb carbon dioxide.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCRG-X</p> | <p>2017-12-09 18:18:20</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>None of the designs will reduce congestion, traffic flows and improve pedestrian & cycling around the Picardy place, leith street, York place & leith walk.</p> <p>Traffic movements north and south of Edinburgh really require major infrastructure investment.</p> <p>Leith street & Picardy place really requires an under pass down on leith walk onto London road junction area to remove traffic, bottlenecks and improve street scape for the area.</p> <p>Pedestrianise leith street at street level with connecting segregated cycle routes.</p> <p>York place is now a bottleneck with buses crossing lanes bus stops and then parking. The bus station is in the wrong location in the city, ideally west end would be better reducing coaches crossing the centre.</p> <p>I would suggest Jan Gehl to design these areas but he has been asked 15 times but typical Edinburgh CC have never taken his advise yet continue to cause unnecessary issues.</p> <p>Good luck but major infrastructure investment is desperately needed for Edinburgh as poor productivity is really affecting the city & businesses.</p> <p>We do require less traffic in the city but we also need better traffic flow and the city needs to process map and re engineer.</p> | <p>I would have all this area pedestrianised with underpass for traffic from leith street onto leith walk and london road.</p> <p>The designs are too basic and the island is meaningless but a pedestrian area would open up the whole area and give life and opportunities to the area</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCRZ-H | 2017-12-09 18:50:38 |
| The Island Site Should not be developed and should be a public Space. | I believe the island site should be a public space and not developed. | ANON-8G9D-FCRK-2 | 2017-12-09 19:06:39 |
| <p>Whilst acknowledging that both public and private traffic needs to flow easily in this area, the proposed plan seems to prioritise vehicles over pedestrians. This is contrary to trends to reduce and minimise vehicular traffic in city centres. Already pedestrians wait for long periods to cross roads around this junction, only able to cross some half way and have to wait again to cross a second carriageway. I would prefer to see a proposal that prioritises pedestrians and cyclists and creates space for sitting and children to play outside, especially around the Paolozzi sculptures.</p> <p>Reduce the proposed detached and isolated triangle island, reroute road and bus/tram stops away from the Cathedral and create a large, quiet and green space, with the sculptures, in front of the Cathedral which is a significant building in the city.</p> <p>I am especially opposed to the "gyratory" design, because</p> | <p>Make it a park - there are enough shops, galleries and cafes. Green, clean quiet open spaces are what residents and visitors need.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCRV-D | 2017-12-09 19:13:06 |
| <p>1. It removes a considerable amount of public space in front of the cathedral and Picardy Place. This will be to the detriment of residents, pedestrians and cyclists. The Council has a policy of reducing traffic, yet this development appears to make traffic flow the main driver(!). Edinburgh needs more public, accessible green places - not less.</p> | <p>The Island Site needs to be an attractive, safe, easily accessible green and enjoyable space, ideally with public sculpture and children's swings.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCR3-A | 2017-12-09 20:27:06 |
| <p>It would seem that public space is being sacrificed for the motor car. The triangular area is effectively isolated from all the other pedestrian areas. It is unclear why this idea is being pursued, when car use will need to be reduced significantly in order to reach climate change target. Also it is not clear whether this represents the best allocation of space between pedestrians and motor vehicles, considering the relatively greater number of pedestrians in this part of Edinburgh.</p> | <p>How can the space be considered usable when it is surrounded on three sides by roads?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCRF-W | 2017-12-09 22:41:20 |
| <p>All trees should be remained. The Paolozzi statues need to remain in the area and given better attention with public information notices.</p> | <p>The site needs to blend in with the character of the area.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCRT-B | 2017-12-10 09:47:48 |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| Through comparison of the 'before and after' photographs it appears that the new layout merely changes a round-about to a triangle-about, reduces the public space currently used by pedestrians and widens the road. I fail to see how this will improve what currently exists. | The general public will not use what is essentially a triangular-shaped roundabout as a public space. Furthermore, providing access to the island through traffic lights or pedestrian crossings will increase the pedestrian traffic wait times at the crossings, thus holding up the traffic. Public spaces should be created at the edges of roadways not in the middle of them. | ANON-8G9D-FCMN-Z | 2017-12-10 11:12:32 |
| <p>You state that 'This creates more useable space in the form of the island site, and allows for better pedestrian movement from one side of Picardy Place to the other' - given you have yet to decide the final purpose of the island site, how can you state that it will be more useable? Surely this depends on its final purpose? And this is NOT better pedestrian access - it is different but but better because all the roads are now wider with more traffic and I assume you shall maintain the current prioritising of vehicles over people.</p> <p>You state that 'The junction ensures the tram stop site is properly aligned for any extension, and has good pedestrian access and links to other public transport' - this is a change to public transport links rather than an improvement given the crossings you have planned.</p> <p>You state that 'segregated / shared cycleways in the junction will make bicycle travel safer and easier between all streets accessing this junction' - will it? How will you ensure the safety of pedestrians in these shared spaces?</p> <p>Have you really fully explored other options? Could you perhaps explore options that reduce the flow of non-essential vehicles using the city centre, thereby reducing emissions? How can you further encourage active travel and the use of public transport?</p> | | | |
| Very poor CEC proposals, based around traffic flow and not developing quality public space for pedestrians. | If you must insist on an island site, surely those people who live and work in the area should be properly consulted on its use? Perhaps they would like you to replace some of the public space lost as a consequence of this redesign - for social areas, for markets, for parking etc? | ANON-8G9D-FCR7-E | 2017-12-10 11:38:52 |
| | It should be completely redesigned | ANON-8G9D-FCRH-Y | 2017-12-10 15:54:57 |
| Having an island as proposed is a not pedestrian friendly, effectively surrounded by 3 lanes of traffic will not present an amenable public space. Thought should be given to a proposal that removes southbound traffic from Leith Street, with buses only northbound and implementing dedicated full size cycle lanes both ways. | Remove the southbound Leith street access and you don't have a problem with what to do with the island. Open up the whole area in front of the Omni centre as a public space, no road through it. This provides much more opportunity for leisure expansion. | ANON-8G9D-FCRC-T | 2017-12-10 17:09:00 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| <p>As I understand it, the council has got itself into a very unwise contract with developers, presumably making this consultation into a sham. Anyway:</p> <p>The plan entire contradicts the Local Transport Strategy 2014 - 2019.</p> <p>The strategy state amongsst other things:</p> <p>" When traffic management or other schemes involve significant works to roundabout junctions, there will be a presumption in favour of replacing the roundabouts (other than 'mini' roundabouts) with traffic signals."</p> <p>Junctions are very clearly the better fit for Picardy place. Other, less backward places, are trying to the more disgraceful town planing, such as gyratories, from half a century ago. Restoring the 1971 layout (and calling that 'historical') is shameful.</p> <p>The strategy also sets targets for massively reducing car modal share. The proposal seeks to increase it.</p> <p>The proposal mentions in the briefest way possible the ability to turn back buses. I understand this is required due to a long overdue ambition to reduce or eliminate buses on Princes Street. It appears to me this could be achieved by rerouting some buses from London Road onto the A1/Waterloo Place/Regent Road and reconnecting routes appropriately.</p> <p>Importantly, the proposed tram location appears to be poor for any sensible layout. If not a central position, then on the north side until beyond the London Road/Leith Walk junction.</p> <p>In summary, the layout is dangerous, contradicts transport strategy, hinders future progress and backwards.</p> | | | |
| <p>I go out of my way to avoid walking or cycling here despite living near the top of Leith Walk. This proposal won't change that for the following reasons. If anything gives cars even more space - this will increase not reduce traffic. At the expense of the small market and trees the centre of the roundabout will be even bigger (this will never be a nice space to be in). The paths look convoluted which will lead to conflict between road users. This space has huge potential, please rethink these proposals.</p> <p>As a local resident I really feel that this is a step too far as it destrys the pedestrian area and will turn the surrounding space into a REALLY bustly thoroughfare, which nobody requires or wants !!</p> | <p>An island surrounded by an incredible amount of traffic? Some kind of industrial use? I can't imagine it'll be anything other than an unsightly urban wasteground.</p> <p>Traffic islands are never thriving public spaces - they are unpleasant, polluted, any pedestrians will just cut along the sides, and misses an opportunity to use existing buildings and trees to activate a site that has huge potential.</p> <p>Disaster :((((</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCR2-9</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCR5-C</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCR1-8</p> | <p>2017-12-10 18:12:03</p> <p>2017-12-10 19:03:05</p> <p>2017-12-10 19:41:54</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I am very disappointed at the proposed layout. Before the building work began the area in front of the cathedral was used for local market traders and as a space for people to sit, drink coffee and enjoy both the sculpture and the vista of Leith Walk, which is a lovely street. The current proposal uproots existing trees and relocates public space to a traffic island in the middle of busy lanes of traffic. It's unlikely anyone would find this a relaxing place to sit in.</p> <p>Traffic should be reduced and not increased in this area. Residents have been and continue to be subjected to a lot of upheavals in the demolition of the St James Centre. It's only fair that time is taken for a wider consultation that takes local residents' wishes into consideration and doesn't replace pleasant public areas with endless streams of traffic.</p> | See preceding comments. | ANON-8G9D-FCRA-R | 2017-12-10 21:23:24 |
| <p>It is difficult to get a visual reference from the proposed layout. From my reading of the drawing it appears that there will be a significant loss to the ground in front of the Cathedral. This suggests that parishioners who have mobility issues or a disability will find access very difficult. More worryingly is the effect on wedding and funeral services. It appears there is no space for hearses or wedding cars to park outside of the building.</p> <p>The placing of bus stops in front of the cathedral are not in keeping with a building of this stature.</p> | Looking at old pictures of Edinburgh illustrates the issues with this particular site - not least of which is its odd location. I understand the desire to build yet more commercial space but that hardly seems to be a problem in Edinburgh at the moment - indeed the rebuilt St James Centre will more than cover that need! | ANON-8G9D-FC89-P | 2017-12-10 21:26:41 |
| <p>Current plans look not good for cyclists and active travel.</p> <p>The gyratory traffic system is old fashioned is and is being deliberately reworked in European cities that are becoming more people friendly. The decision by Edinburgh to create this would be unwise and favouring the motor car again.</p> <p>You could take a place-based approach to this important area of the City, putting pedestrians at the heart of their transport policy. This means a T-Junction, not a roundabout. This approach should make it easier for people to cross roads using direct routes and desire lines, without diversions and multiple staged crossings.</p> <p>Pedestrians and cyclists need their own dedicated space to avoid frustration, conflict and safety concerns. Footways need to be wide enough, especially beside the Cathedral, and important areas of public space and art should be retained. Design in space and convenient crossings to a tram / bus interchange which is easily accessible for people with disabilities.</p> <p>Keep Leith St closed to traffic to decrease through traffic in this area.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FC88-N | 2017-12-10 23:39:56 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I read an articles on Picardy Place in the Spurtle website and then saw the Zone architects proposal on the spurtle website. I wrote to the Spurtle with my opinion on the proposals, and asked them how to best contact the City Council. They informed me of this consultation. So I am very grateful to have an opportunity to give my opinion.</p> <p>I have lived in this area for 20 years, first in Gayfield square, now at the top of Easter Road, so London road, Leith St and Picardy Place are what I experience all the time.</p> <p>I access the city centre if I walk, usually via Leith St. and York Place. I shop in Leith walk, Broughton St. and John Lewis. I catch the tram in York Place. I go to the Vue at Omni with my children. I meet friends in St. Andrew's Square. I get the bus along London Road, or now Regent Road. I walk or use buses up these routes SO regularly.</p> <p>For decades I have hated Leith St./Picardy Place, because:</p> <p>The tunnel effect in Leith St means the noise of buses is oppressive, since all the new buildings were built.</p> <p>The steepness of Leith St makes vehicles rev their engines so it is bad for exhaust smell.</p> <p>I hate walking up it, because of the above, and the the new buildings are so disappointingly ugly, but it is the natural route.</p> <p>The Picardy Place roundabout is so long-winded to get round. When I want to go home along London road from Broughton st I always feel exhausted in advance.</p> <p>My children like the Paolozzis to play on, that space is a natural stop if you have come out of John Lewis and they need a play after having to behave indoors, but cars can drive over the bit in front of St Mary's so I can't relax I'm always tense shouting 'car!' each time.</p> | <p>As stated before, I still think it would be an unpleasant island to be on, moated by traffic. I feel the space should join onto 'Mulberry hill'.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC8X-N</p> | <p>2017-12-10 23:47:20</p> |
| <p>Why are you currently putting the same width of pavement back alongside the office buildinf immediately south of the Omni Centre?</p> <p>The route here up to Calton Road is very busy with pedestrians - who often are forced on to the road due the narrow pavement here.</p> <p>There is a well area immediately in front of the office block. If the pavement cannot be widened into the roadway then this well are should be bridged to provide a wider pavement.</p> <p>This area is one of the worst pavements for pedestrians in Edinburgh - and dangerous to boot.</p> | <p>The bus stops in front of the cathedral are only half of those which serve buses going down Leith Walk or along London Road. Effectively bus users have to choose which bus stop to use - and have therefore less buses to choose from. The bus stops should all be in Picardy Place.</p> <p>Keep the tram stop in York Place - and also have a tram stop at Elm Row.</p> <p>The island site could house a cafe or something similar. A hotel or housing in the middle of all this traffic doesn't look an attractive proposition to me.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC8E-2</p> | <p>2017-12-11 08:01:20</p> |
| <p>While this solution is perhaps preferable to the existing roundabout, it is still a far cry from a kind of solution that meets the needs of people who actually live in the area, giving far too much consideration to traffic and little regard for pedestrians or cyclists.</p> <p>Even more troubling is the mysterious dead space in the centre of the triangle, ringed around by three lanes of traffic.</p> | <p>Given that it is surrounded by lanes of traffic, it is difficult to imagine any positive use for this site.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC8V-K</p> | <p>2017-12-11 09:49:58</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Maximum space left in front of cathedral for drop-off. Greenery kept and increased. Pavements increased. No road dividing sculptures, the John Lewis-cathedral area should be entirely for pedestrians. Gyratory not appropriate for Edinburgh, ugly eyesore more for an industrial cities.</p> <p>those participating in active travel.</p> <p>There are significant issues for pedestrians already, with dangerous level of congestion on pavements, especially on the west side of Broughton Street at York Place, outside the Playhouse, outside Baillie Gifford by all the bus stops, at the pedestrian island outside John Lewis. These plans appear to either worsen or not address these pinch points.</p> <p>I would strongly favour better provision for pedestrians through widening pavements so that they are not stuck on a road unable to make it onto a congested pavement as traffic, some with drivers with little sense of sharing, roar towards them.</p> <p>Whilst the roadworks on Leith Street have been in place, drivers have become used to less space - currently one lane in each direction. Why not maintain this level and provide the extra space once the roadworks are completed to active travel means and possibly public transport?</p> <p>You appear to be designing in contentious areas between pedestrians and cyclists just as at St Andrew Square. Please can you stop prioritising drivers over pedestrians and cyclists? Public transport and park and rides are excellent in Edinburgh, so discouraging people walking in the city centre is ludicrous.</p> <p>You appear to not have accommodated the dangerous desire lines of pedestrians crossing between Picardy Place and the Omni Centre - and may have exacerbated the danger by making the crossing even more multiphase for pedestrians. I understood that best practice is to accommodate desire line, to improve pedestrian safety. People cross from the Omni to the roundabout to the greenery by Picardy Place, as is evident from the trodden earth and lack of plants in one area there. Under the proposed design, there are still 3 separate crossings to be made. Pedestrians may well make 2</p> | Landscaped gardens | ANON-8G9D-FC8Q-E | 2017-12-11 09:54:30 |
| <p>The cycles facilities are not sufficient.</p> <p>None of the advanced stop boxes have suitable feeder cycle lanes so in heavy traffic it wont be possible to filter through traffic to use them.</p> <p>There is no provision for separate phasing of lights to give cyclists a head start on junctions where they will have to cut across 2 lanes of traffic to turn right.</p> <p>Cyclists will have to cut across many lanes of traffic to make right turns across the junction.</p> <p>There is poor provision of a cycle lane for cyclists travelling from Leith street to union place. There needs to be segregated cycle lanes on both sides of the roads.</p> <p>Cyclists turning right from Picardy place onto Leith Street seem to have no access to the segregated cycle way, and if a gap in the segregation was made it would be unsafe to join the cycle path here as it would cause cycle crashes.</p> | <p>This a barren and ugly area currently. Without significant greenery around the edges it will remain a hostile and unwelcoming area.</p> <p>rather than the shared pedestrian and cyclist path around the traffic island, why not have an area of greenery between the disgusting traffic fumes and the shared use path, and then a smaller island?</p> <p>I trust that you will not allow it to remain an ugly, hostile, unloved area, and actually use it to some good effect. Without hedges and some trees, to reduce traffic fume effects, this won't be possible.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC86-K | 2017-12-11 10:20:23 |
| | <p>It should be kept as an open space so people could walk and cycle through it. it should be planted with trees.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC8J-7 | 2017-12-11 10:46:31 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>increase the amenity or add to the appearance to this well-used pedestrian area. Both will be much reduced.</p> <p>2. The Cathedral will no longer have its drop off point for Weddings, Funerals, or people who need assistance (ie wheelchair users)</p> <p>3. It is disappointing to see the planned rearrangement for the Paolozzi Monument, due to the reduced space. Not good!</p> <p>4. The traffic flow in the area is likely to be much increased by the gyratory design. This is counter to a general nation-wide policy of reducing traffic for reasons of health and pollution levels.</p> <p>4. The plan is detrimental to the appearance of area. Traffic will no longer be screened from view (at present screening is provided by the 2 attractive curved lines of trees at the Cathedral and on Picardy Place). The area will be greatly 'unenhanced'.</p> <p>5. The enlarged central island is a complete misuse of space. Members of the public would be endangering their health by spending any time in the middle of heavy traffic. That idea should be abandoned and the space should be returned to the Cathedral frontage as it is.</p> <p>As a local resident I do not understand the purpose of going ahead with plans that no-one in the area seems to want - and probably does not need.</p> <p>It would be good if due consideration would be given to the many objections being raised. We would ask more time be given to proper consultation with those whose lives will be daily affected (to their detriment) by this increased volume of traffic, while the area succumbs to a plan which is both brutal and dated in its approach.</p> | | | |
| <p>I oppose the gyratory design.</p> <p>I am against the removal of the public space in front of the Cathedral and around Picardy Place. A forward thinking Council should be planning to reduce the number of cars in our city, and designing the space with pedestrians and cyclists in mind.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FC8K-8 | 2017-12-11 10:48:04 |
| <p>Having Leith Street as a pedestrians and cycles only has been very good for air quality and people's safety in this area while the construction is going on. This route has been very heavily used by pedestrians and cyclists, which shows how popular this would be if pedestrianised permanently. This would benefit the businesses along this street and probably those in the new St James Quarter as well.</p> | <p>I do not believe that the site would benefit from development. Better if it is a green space.</p> <p>The island must be retained as public land with some green space to reduce air pollution and be a space for people in the community. A garden with seating areas and some good hedges and trees would be most welcome in making this entranceway to the city beautiful and welcoming. Don't just pack another hotel or theatre onto the site, that is no good to the quality of life of the people of the area.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC8U-J | 2017-12-11 11:05:43 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FC8B-Y | 2017-12-11 11:28:05 |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>serves the community well, and allows disabled parishioners to park when attending mass. It also enables Wedding and Funeral corteges to stop outside the Cathedral. The proposed replacement of this viable pedestrian area with a double bus stop would result in disabled parishioners being unable to access church services. This would, in my view be discriminatory.</p> <p>At present Edinburgh born Sculptor Sir Eduardo Luigi Paolozzi's work: The Manuscript of MonteCassino, aka the 'Big Foot' is a three-piece sculpture situated outside the cathedral.</p> <p>The sculpture is an allegory of a pilgrimage - the foot which travels and the connecting ankle and the hand receiving alms or hospitality; the sculpture also makes reference to giant Ancient Roman sculpture on Capitoline Hill in Rome. It is designed to collect rain water and to allow children to play on the sculpture. Most of us will have at some point viewed children playing on the sculpture and tourists taking photographs.</p> <p>Paolozzi said of the work 'Edinburgh, with its fine historic architecture must be complemented with works of suitable grandeur. On the site I can see these very parts of the landscape that were the back-cloth to my childhood. A great deal has disappeared, which makes it a privilege to add something significant to what might have become an urban gap...'</p> <p>Indeed: 'A great deal has disappeared' It would be fundamentally wrong to remove these famous and loved sculptures.</p> <p>The proposed plans would destroy the appearance of the area. Further they would result in the destruction of the setting and character of St Mary's which is a listed building. The renowned appearance of the area would be irrevocably changed for the worst.</p> <p>I urge you to review these proposals. Communities need space and</p> | | | |
| <p>There seems to be a lot of road for something that is intended to be more pedestrian friendly. I would be happier if the provision for private vehicles was reduced, possibly making Leith Street pedestrian, cycles & public transport only. The area in the middle of the junction would be nice if it was made green space. I wouldn't want further development to take place in the middle of it.</p> | Grass and flowers. Benches. There is no need for a Costa or such ilk !!!! | ANON-8G9D-FC8T-H | 2017-12-11 11:37:39 |
| <p>We lose a decent, if under-used pedestrian space.</p> <p>The impact on St Mary's Cathedral is ludicrous. Don't get married, don't die and don't ever have to evacuate the building. Because there is nowhere you can go.</p> <p>Just so that we can have bus stops to service the pretend tram system?</p> <p>And turning the current shambles of a roundabout into a triangle - any tram extension will doubtless mess up the triangle as much as it did the old, proper roundabout.</p> | <p>I would not want more development to happen in that area, certainly not a hotel. Some nice green space would be my preference.</p> <p>Oh, a mixed use development. Not enough of them being proposed, are there? I guess that anything is better than another hotel. How about some greenery and flowers? You know, stuff that would benefit the actual Council tax payers. At least, please, not Omni Centre 2.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FC84-H | 2017-12-11 11:42:24 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FC8M-A | 2017-12-11 11:45:58 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Paolozzi was a major artist with a strong international reputation; Edinburgh is exceptionally lucky to own a major piece by him. | | | |
| <p>This sculpture is a singular sculpture made up of 3 elements which relate to each other. Separating them will compromise it intellectually and aesthetically. The layout should be reconsidered and the sculpture re-sited as intended with all the elements together.</p> <p>I consider this proposal to be a retrograde step designed for increased traffic flow and reduced convenience and safety for pedestrians and cyclists. The reduction in public land around the junction and the increase in the number of crossing points is detrimental to use on foot.</p> <p>The council have predicated this plan on issues connect to the future tram developments, but these are also still under discussion.</p> <p>This has been a rushed plan and alternatives should be developed and put out for proper consultation.</p> <p>As a nearby resident (east end of New Town) who uses the area almost daily for walking back and forth to work and for shopping, I am not at all happy with the plan.</p> | This site is not "on the way" to anywhere - I can't believe it will be much used. | ANON-8G9D-FC8R-F | 2017-12-11 12:10:09 |
| <p>I feel that the area of the Catholic Cathedral is being compromised, with the prospect of the provision of insufficient disabled parking. Access to the cathedral for funeral and wedding corteges will also become impossible. These are important rites for all – regardless of belief, and access for these should be provided. It appears that there will not even be provision for an area in which those who are disabled can be dropped off outside, before cars are parked elsewhere. This cathedral sees 2,500 congregants at Mass on a Sunday with more attending during the week. Whilst religious attendance is not for everyone, the Cathedral provides a considerable force for community cohesion in a very mixed area, both socially and ethnically, and it seems very short sighted to undermine the work that is done in this area by so comprehensively limiting access.</p> | The island site will be stranded in the middle of a multi lane highway on all sides. It will almost certainly be given over to commercial development and will be little used other than by those who opt to go onto the site. | ANON-8G9D-FC87-M | 2017-12-11 12:15:42 |
| | See previous comments. | ANON-8G9D-FC8H-5 | 2017-12-11 12:31:20 |
| <p>I wish to object to this layout. The proposals are over dimensioned and cater for predicted increases in traffic rather than for a reduction in general traffic in accordance with the Council's general traffic reduction proposals. Edinburgh cannot continue catering for ever increasing general traffic and must adopt ideas for removing traffic from city streets and giving much greater priority to public transport. If Leith Street remains closed to general traffic then Picardy Place should allow for only for limited general traffic.</p> | This site should remain as public open space. | ANON-8G9D-FC8C-Z | 2017-12-11 12:53:43 |
| <p>The plan is too focus on traffic without sufficient though for other users. Safety has not been fully considered. Disabled access/parking not sufficient. The plan for sculptures is inappropriate. Not welcoming for pedestrians. Not forward looking, should go back to the drawing board and redesign completely. Not fully taking into account impact of increased trams and what knock effect this will have on other modes of transport. But most significantly the loss of green space not appropriate especially with an island which will have limited if any usage for public. There has been a failure to explore real options. What is required is a public plaza outside the cathedral, to make the area safe and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists with access to public transport not a traffic management system. Where does this lie with the World Heritage Centre Edinburgh is?</p> | Green space is required not more commercial, however the size and location of the island is not appropriate or sufficient for safe usage with travel highways that are being created. | ANON-8G9D-FC8W-M | 2017-12-11 14:21:30 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>This proposed street layout will have devastating effects on the workings of St Mary's Cathedral. In particular, disabled or infirm members of our parish will have no disabled parking drop-off space should the proposed bus stop be put in place. Moreover, there would also be no designated space for Wedding and Funeral corteges to stop outside the cathedral, clearly a significant issue that affects the many Edinburgh citizens who attend this church.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCU9-K | 2017-12-11 16:18:39 |
| <p>As a parishioner at St Mary's Cathedral the area outside the cathedral should not be used as a bus stop for the new St James Centre - 'A Cathedral to Mammon'. What does this say about Edinburgh's position as a World Heritage Site?</p> <p>Access/Egress for Weddings/Funerals/Disabled will be seriously compromised.</p> <p>The piazza outside the cathedral is an important public space and include several Palozzi Sculptures.</p> <p>Piccardy Place should remain a pleasant green area in which to relax and not to inhale more exhaust fumes.</p> <p>As a resident of the New Town let's promote the area of Broughton St and all it's interesting shops and bars and not pollute them with more traffic.</p> <p>Let's be a bit more imaginative and take time to create something really interesting for the 21st Century.</p> | PLANT TREES | ANON-8G9D-FC8A-X | 2017-12-11 16:20:43 |
| <p>I would like to express my opposition as a Edinburgh Taxpayer to the Council's ill judged present plans for the removal of a safe public parking space in front of St. Mary's Cathedral which at present can be used as a safe drop of area for disabled people attending church services and social events. I have over the years been to many celebratory occasions such as marriages, christenings and funerals and it makes no sense at all for there to be absolutely no provision made in front of this busy and well attended Cathedral for the parking of vehicles used on these varied occasions. A re-think should be made on this important issue and the present unsatisfactory plans not rushed through without further options being considered and supported by the surrounding community.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely, Carol Giovacchini (Mrs)</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCUX-J | 2017-12-11 16:43:40 |
| <p>1.From the new map I do not understand how a cyclist using the new York Place cycleway would be able to safely continue their journey down Leith Walk. The cycleway appear to end at Picardy Place.</p> <p>2. What has happened to the pedestrian crossing between to Playhouse and Union Place. How do I safely cross Leith Walk at this point?</p> <p>3. Once again you are prioritising the motor vehicle over active transport with there being 3 lanes dedicated to motor vehicles in each direction. This will continue to encourage motor vehicles into the city with the resulting problems of congestion and poor air quality.</p> | <p>I would like to see a pleasant green space with trees and places for people to sit and enjoy the city.</p> <p>Perhaps there could be a somewhere to purchase refreshments.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCU8-J | 2017-12-11 17:10:54 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>The Paolozzi work should be correctly seen and it's location changed to reflect that it is not a trio of sculptures. It is in fact a singular piece of Sculpture and the relationship between the sculptural elements is integral to the meaning of the work. It's current planned new "locations" at best dilute its meaning and at worst negatively affect its artistic reading as envisaged by the artist. This requires more thought and consideration to safe the guard the integrity of such an important piece of Art by one of Edinburgh's and Leith's Finest and most respected artists.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCUP-A | 2017-12-11 17:24:37 |
| <p>I use the area often as I live in Abercromby Place and am a member of the gym at the Omni Centre. I walk around the city a lot. I prefer to walk than drive. I support the tram extension from what I've heard so far. The area around Picardly Place is not as pleasant as it could be. I appreciate the points about linking transport and also with the new St James' Centre. However, it is already a difficult/time consuming place to cross and it looks like the plans edral will make it worse. It also seems to increase potential traffic, rather than reduce it. The area outside the Cathedral should be more spacious, rather than less. Also, in the time I've lived here (17 years) Broughton Street has improved with better shops and restaurants. The proposal seems to see it just as a traffic route. I'm not convinced that a central island would be safe.</p> | <p>I maybe misunderstanding the plan, but I can't envisage there being enough space to make it really attractive and how access would work.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCUE-Y | 2017-12-11 18:02:45 |
| <p>The Cathedral while not a "business" will need to remain open during these developments. More than 2500 people visit St. Mary's Cathedral every Sunday, so the effects of these renovations should not go overlooked. As an active member at St. Mary's Cathedral I, I am very concerned this current layout does not allow for disabled parking in front of the cathedral. It is very important that disabled members of our community are able to access church and this current layout looks quite discriminatory towards them. In addition, the Cathedral needs to be able to more caskets in and out of the front doors. Restricting the space much further will make this intensely difficult. It is important to us Catholics to be able to properly honor the dead and I hope you will respect our rights to worship.</p> <p>This gyrating pattern seems a bit old fashioned and not innovative enough to represent this great city. I am sure the Counsel can arrive at a very innovative solution to allow traffic and pedestrian flow while also respecting the needs of the church. I hope you will take these concerns into your consideration.</p> | <p>I suggest making the island smaller and using it as a public green space or even a nice fountain (something that Edinburgh has very few of compared to other cities).</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCUZ-M | 2017-12-11 18:10:33 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>There is a complete failure to recognise the needs of pedestrians particularly the disabled. The plan should start with their needs. Currently people wait ages at traffic light crossings which results in extreme risk taking, Why should pedestrians have to wait in the middle of the road in the pouring rain waiting for the lights to change.</p> <p>Secondly the needs of the residents of the area should be given priority I object to 3 lane carriage ways when there will be a good bus and tram service</p> | <p>This part of the city needs more open spaces not less, The area is becoming less office based and more residential-open spaces should be cherished and preserved not sold off and developed</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC81-E</p> | <p>2017-12-11 18:33:23</p> |
| <p>Intersections are for traffic to enter-traverse and exit efficiently and speedily Putting a TRAM STOP in here will cause a bottle neck.</p> <p>also any proposed BUS/TRAM interchange will make this WORSE</p> <p>18 yes 18 bus routes totalling 100 bus movements an hour would be using this interchange position which will obviously not cope</p> <p>The TRAM STOP should Not BE here but at ELM ROW</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUG-1</p> | <p>2017-12-11 18:34:33</p> |
| <p>I can't any improvement from a pedestrian's point of view - are we supposed to be able to access the island site easily?</p> | <p>Just make it green space - trees, wildflower meadow, etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUQ-B</p> | <p>2017-12-11 18:56:57</p> |
| <p>Too traffic centric. Without properly thought out cycle infrastructure, private cars will always be the preferred option for people.</p> <p>'How do I get from York place to Leith walk on my bike? Looks pretty dangerous...I'll just take the car'</p> | <p>Make it a green space in an increasingly dirty city. Some nice seating areas and a cafe.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUV-G</p> | <p>2017-12-11 19:01:32</p> |
| <p>The proposals for Picardy Place favour traffic over people, outmoded design over future planning and are completely out of step with the Council's declared policies. It is difficult to see how this traffic gyratory helps to reduce traffic, makes the area safe for pedestrians and other non-private car users or looks to a future which will not and cannot be dominated by the private car.</p> <p>I ask that the whole design and its raison d'etre be reconsidered and the views of the inhabitants of this area be taken into account.</p> | <p>I can't comment on the central site when in my view the whole design is deeply flawed</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUK-5</p> | <p>2017-12-11 19:25:16</p> |
| <p>I think more weight should be given to the needs of pedestrians and the environment in the new layout.</p> <p>It is also not clear how the space in the triangle part of the gyratory will be laid out to maximise its appeal to pedestrians - how many trees will be planted here?</p> <p>How will the space be laid out?</p> <p>Could the traffic lanes be made narrower to limit the flow through the new road layout?</p> | <p>The island should remain as a pedestrian area and should provide more art and trees and greenery to this part of the City. Cultural ideas would be fine</p> <p>It should not be used for development at all. The surrounding areas have lots of shops, housing etc.</p> <p>This site is close to a Heritage site and should reflect this attractive location.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUJ-4</p> | <p>2017-12-11 20:05:42</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>This layout looks terrible from a pedestrian point of view. To get from Leith Walk to Leith Street will involve several road crossings. Personal experience shows that the traffic management in Edinburgh ALWAYS favours cars over pedestrians, and I can fully imagine having lengthy waits for green lights at each of the several crossings. It looks like the main crossing outside the Playhouse has been removed which is enormously inconvenient, particularly before and after shows at the theatre when hundreds of people are trying to cross busy roads.</p> <p>Making it difficult for pedestrians to cross roads in this way is dangerous - people get sick of waiting at crossings as single occupant cars take priority.</p> <p>From a cycling point of view, I cannot see any lead in lanes to the Advanced Stop Boxes which renders them practically useless. It is not clear for the map if advanced cycle green lights will be used, this would be a good idea.</p> <p>The layout in general makes the middle of Picardy Place and the area outside the Cathedral particularly unattractive as public spaces. These areas should be developed to encourage people, and the major way to do that is reduce traffic. I can't even begin to imagine the noise, smell and pollution in the middle of this gyratory.</p> <p>The Council needs to thin about this area on a longer term basis and not on the basis of the owners of Harvey Nicols wanting easier parking for their customers. Edinburgh is a walkable city and everything possible should be done to encourage that, and public transport. The Council seems to be gong back in time with it's love of "traffic flow" and easing car transport through the city.</p> | <p>As per previous comments, this island will be horrible if it is surrounded by traffic noise and fumes. None is going to want to spend time there. It would be better if the design could somehow "attach" the island to the space outside the cathedral, i.e. by moving that road. In this way, the public space would be one area, not a separate space that requires negotiating traffic to get to.</p> <p>As a larger space, it should include as much greenery as possible, and some sort of cafe as per St Andrews Square. Personally, I would not go there, unless the traffic surrounding the area is reduced from the current proposal.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCP1-6</p> | <p>2017-12-11 21:15:27</p> |
| | <p>An area of green space which also features some modern art sculptures.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCU4-E</p> | <p>2017-12-12 09:22:16</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>and congestion, is entirely inadequately focused. Town planners need to change their focus from "cycling provision" to "cycling priority". This would serve the dual aim of creating an area/junction where the main users are defined as cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>In many other major metropolitan areas (London as an example although many more exist) it has been proven that placing cyclists and pedestrians at the centre of the decision making process is key to unlocking the true potential of our city centres and ensuring that traffic flows in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>By fundamentally altering the design to place cyclists and pedestrians at the forefront of the decision making process we would cause traffic to increase in the short term, but this is about making appropriate long term decisions as to how we want our city centres and traffic to function. With the limited space in Edinburgh we need to make some very hard decisions as to the number of cars we permit to use them. They should be for local access only and not act as major thoroughfares from one side of the city to another.</p> <p>By altering our long term focus when designing city centres to focus on cyclists, pedestrians and public transport (I am firmly for increasing the trams well beyond the current network) we will finally be able to achieve the design principles set out for this such as ensuring appropriate traffic flow, improving air quality, and building spaces that work for all - not just those who drive. By making these hard, somewhat politically unpalatable, long term decisions we will dissuade people from choosing cars as their main form of transport to cross the city. As other cities have proven when you do this at the same time as providing segregated cycle ways and well run public transport the users will shift to different modes of transport.</p> <p>Yes these decisions are hard, but they must be made if we are to deal with the inevitable increase in traffic expected over the next 20 years as the Local</p> | | | |
| <p>There is no drop off space for the Cathedral.</p> <p>Paolozzi sculptures poorly located - why not on the 'island'?</p> <p>Conflict between cyclists and pedestrians at crossing points. These are very busy areas and this will not work.</p> <p>Too much priority given to vehicles, you should be looking to discourage vehicle use in the city.</p> <p>Inadequate cycling provision. I still wouldn't let my daughter cycle to school from Leith with this proposed arrangement.</p> | <p>As per my previous comments I firmly believe this is the wrong focus to put on this junction. By asking what use this island should be put to you are entrenching the thought that this is the only way forward for this junction.</p> <p>Only once we get away from the "Car is king" model will be really be able to decide what this junction should look like and what it is should subsequently be used for</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCUB-V | 2017-12-12 09:38:40 |
| | <p>Definitely NOT development. This should be a public space (a bit like St Andrew's Square?). The Paulozzi statues should be homed here.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCU7-H | 2017-12-12 10:21:02 |
| <p>The planned gyratory is not people centric, there is no future proofing, and if it ends up anything like the gyratory at Abbeyhill will massively increase congestion.</p> | <p>Some sort of plaza or PEOPLE FOCUSED area.</p> <p>Not another ugly 'modern' building. And definitely not more student housing.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCUD-X | 2017-12-12 10:23:48 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>"Useable space in the form of an island site" - usable space for what? by whom? Why would any pedestrian / office worker / tourist want to pass the time on a concrete island surrounded on all sides by traffic? This wasteland will become a place to avoid at night. I live just off Broughton Street. I'm delighted with plans to extend the tram service to Leith / Ocean Terminal, but not with the seeming plan to turn the Picardy Place area into a major traffic bottleneck / corridor. Broughton Street has developed over recent years into a first class dining / entertainment destination. This plan risks turning it into a major thoroughfare and rat run into the New Town. I'm afraid I don't have an alternative suggestion - I'm not a Town Planner - but whilst traffic flow is a necessary consideration, this proposal seems to make it the only one. More USABLE public space - in front of the Cathedral for example - would be welcome, with more consideration given to ease of pedestrian access rather than private vehicles.</p> | <p>This will never be a success. No-one will want to 'relax' in the area during the day time, being surrounded on all sides by traffic. And at night it will be populated by the homeless, and youths seeking privacy from prying eyes. A wasteland waiting to be avoided.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUS-D</p> | <p>2017-12-12 11:38:29</p> |
| <p>I'm not keen on the way the road is moved West into what is now a pedestrian area, in front of the cathedral.</p> | <p>Whether the island needs to be an island as such, or can be a promontory from in front of the cathedral, I think it's important that any development is low rise, so as not to spoil the view down the walk or the view of the cathedral or of Calton Hill behind Omni. However, given the amount of traffic in the area and the heavy footfall, it would be best if this area was greened -trees and plants to mop up some of the pollution.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUC-W</p> | <p>2017-12-12 11:56:57</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The design brief appears to have been "maintain current traffic flows" and then attempt to fit in public realm, active travel and public transport improvements.</p> <p>This is opposition to the Council's Street Design Guidelines.</p> <p>"We will follow a design process that starts by considering the street as a place for people and recognising that streets have an important non-transport role."</p> <p>The "balanced design" is based on maintaining current motorised traffic volumes, then balancing the other requirements in the design space left by this overarching requirement.</p> <p>Talk of a tram-bus interchange will be hampered by having the tram stop accessible only by crossing three lanes of traffic (in any direction).</p> <p>Pedestrians and cyclists are left fighting over the space left over from motorised traffic.</p> <p>There are no bus lanes, so public transport will be not be prioritised beyond private cars.</p> <p>Yet the design guidelines have a commitment to "always prioritise improving conditions for pedestrians, especially for those with mobility impairments or other disabilities, for cyclists and for public transport users."</p> <p>All the consultations have produced the same objections, yet these have always been set aside and the blinkered, driven-by-traffic-modelling approach has been maintained.</p> | <p>The island site will be isolated by three lanes of traffic, so generally inaccessible to people, or deliveries. Drivers will be loathe to "block traffic", so will not stop for loading or passenger drop off in the outer lane, instead they will mount the pavement and load/park on the foot/cycleways.</p> <p>Even a two-storey building will create an unpleasant traffic canyon, reinforcing the "place" as being for the movement of motorised traffic.</p> <p>The island site would be better as a peninsular site, with motorised traffic only travelling on two sides, the third being contiguous with the Omni Centre or Cathedral precinct.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUN-8</p> | <p>2017-12-12 12:48:06</p> |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>First, I do not understand why "Does not resemble historical layout" is a negative in all of your assessments. Why be bound by that? Why not take the opportunity to rethink this completely? Why not consider elevating the more vulnerable users as in Copenhagen: https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2014/jul/14/bike-lanes-bridge-copenhagen-new-cycle-snake-cykelslangen A joint cyclist/pedestrian elevated lane would not be intrusive in this area..</p> <p>Also, you can't be serious when you write above that the pedestrian are is underused. I pass by on a daily basis, to and from work, and can confirm that it is very busy.</p> <p>You want less pollution, which is already at a record high, and congestion. Therefore do not invite more cars to pass through by making more space for cars. Dis-encourage the use of cars in the city centre, thereby relinquishing space for cyclists and pedestrians. Learn from other cities, e.g. Barcelona where some areas have been made more pedestrian friendly, thereby increasing the turnover for shops and restaurants.</p> <p>You MUST ensure that cyclists and pedestrians are separated. On a daily basis cyclists race along pavements, often to avoid being run over by cars, which only means that pedestrians have to jump for their life. Unlike in other European cities, people in Edinburgh are not bought up to be cyclists so tend to behave as if they are in cars, showing little or no regard for other people.</p> | <p>You can't use it for anything sensible the way you have designed everything else. People cannot access this area. But if you were to use elevated lanes for cyclists then you could anchor that on this island and widen the pavements everywhere else.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCU1-B</p> | <p>2017-12-12 12:54:17</p> |
| <p>I am concerned that new layout may damage access to the Cathedral and use of space in front of it. I am in favour of more pedestrian space but please preserve access for disabled people and special vehicle, e.g. in case of funeral or wedding. Moreover, I do also think that the bus stop will reduce view and access, bearing in mind that the Cathedral is an historic landmark, very important to a large portion of the community of Edinburgh. Therefore, I would suggest that the bus stop is moved to the end of Leith street. Moreover, I propose that new road in front will be named "Cathedral Road" or "Metropolitan Cathedral Road".</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUA-U</p> | <p>2017-12-12 12:57:35</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I anticipate an insurmountable problem arising as a result of introducing the bus/tram interchange at Picardy Place. I have been advised (by NTBCC) that the one stop will be used by 18 buses at a frequency of approximately 100 buses per hour. Counting the mount/dismount time, and passengers and pedestrians needing to cross one or two lanes of traffic to reach the tram platform, there must surely be created an impossible bottleneck of public/private transport. I strongly suggest that the existing Picardy Place scheme be re-examined to resolve this fundamental problem. But why does the tram-stop have to be placed within the giratory scheme at all? Surely the better solution (which would alleviate congestion in what is likely to be the slowest-flowing leg of the triangle) by moving the tram-stop out altogether. Why can the existing stop in York Place not be retained as is? Which would be augmented by a stop in Elm Row when the extension to Leith is completed (as it surely will be eventually).</p> <p>In short I do not think that the existing plans resolve the greater traffic management issues for the surrounding area, and should be reconsidered.</p> | <p>This island site looks pretty inaccessible to me. Whichever way it turns out, however, it should remain a dedicated public-realm, green space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCU5-F</p> | <p>2017-12-12 13:15:50</p> |
| <p>Like many in Edinburgh, I deplore that the new plans for Picardy Place prioritise traffic over active travel and public transportation.</p> <p>I join with Living Streets and Spokes in opposing a gyratory system. I am a member of Spokes.</p> <p>The Living Streets statement is here: http://www.livingstreetsedinburgh.org.uk/2017/11/04/picardy-place-position-statement-november-2017/</p> <p>The Spokes statement is here: http://www.spokes.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/1711-PicPl-Spokes-response-v3-FINAL.pdf</p> <p>Spokes member Chris Paton has made a detailed submission here: http://www.spokes.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/1711-ChrisP-response-Improving-cycling-in-the-proposals-for-Picardy-Place.pdf</p> <p>Please look carefully at the red lines in Figure 9 (pedestrians) and Figures 1 and 4 (cycles) of Paton's submission. The indirect and wobbly routes show how poorly the current design serves pedestrians and cyclists. I can only wonder at who on earth thought it might be sensible to propose such routes.</p> <p>If the gyratory goes ahead, it is important to take into account the detailed suggestions in the statements by Spokes and Paton listed above. This should not, of course, be taken as any kind of endorsement of the gyratory.</p> | <p>I oppose the gyratory design. For detailed comments, see answer to 4; in particular, I support the suggestions of Spokes and Chris Paton.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCK9-9</p> | <p>2017-12-12 13:31:22</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>I have raised concerns in my earlier submission about</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. potential unresolved conflicts between cyclists and vehicles at the junctions of the cycle ways and Cathedral Lane and Little King Street; and 2. potential queuing vehicles trying to travel east from York Place to Leith Walk along a single lane. <p>My other concern, to which I wish to draw attention now, is that this plan is too focused on catering for the private car, to the detriment of pedestrians, cyclists and users of public transport. I would see potential in the banning of private cars from Leith Street to make this route open only to pedestrians, cyclists, taxis and buses. I would also suggest removing the vehicular link from Leith Walk to Leith Street forcing all traffic to pass through from York Place to/from Leith Walk and buses, taxis and cycles to come through Leith Street in front of the cathedral. This could simplify Picardy Place for the better. Have you evaluated these options? They would enhance the public realm around the new St James Centre, the Cathedral, the Omni Centre and the Playhouse, allowing more open useable space for pedestrians and making these venues more attractive.</p> | It should be landscaped and include seating to enhance the public realm | ANON-8G9D-FCK8-8 | 2017-12-12 14:20:09 |
| <p>There will be a reduction of usable public space. It will be inconvenient for pedestrians and cyclists. Traffic flows are likely to be increased with an adverse effect on air quality.</p> <p>Loss of usable space for the public - a traffic island cannot be deemed usable by those with disabilities, parents with pushchairs.</p> <p>Lack of integration to city-wide proposals on traffic reduction and air quality</p> | Hopelessly unrealistic to have a public space surrounded by fast moving traffic. It will become a litter-strewn wasteland | ANON-8G9D-FCKP-Z | 2017-12-12 14:41:40 |
| | How is the island site useable? I can't imagine anyone wanting to use it when it will be surrounded on all sides by traffic (noise and pollution will be overbearing). I'd suggest the best plan for this site would be to green it as much as possible - not necessarily for public access - but to provide a small green 'lung' and a beautiful centre-point in a sea of mostly ugly buildings and roads. A dense planting of trees and shrubs would provide a small haven for birds too. Given the councils record on allowing green urban space to be continually abused (Staff Andrew's Square, Princess Street Gardens) for much of the year, this would present an opportunity to improve it. | ANON-8G9D-FCKV-6 | 2017-12-12 15:06:46 |
| <p>I think there is some improvement on the existing infrastructure but much more needs done to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists. Wider pavements and more direct crossing points are needed and I query whether the gyratory is good 21st century design. I much prefer the sustrans proposal.</p> | <p>The island site just looks weird and I can't imagine a site of that shape and context delivering a high quality place or good development. The use of this site must be considered as integral part of this proposal and not put off for future decision making. Building on this site will also block views. I would suggest alternatively creating a public plaza with kiosks, cafes or moderate sized buildings to frame the space. I support the Sustrans style of approach.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCKQ-1 | 2017-12-12 15:08:38 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>This is in addition to my previous comments.</p> <p>We know (English Heritage research "New Ideas need Old Buildings) that old buildings in established well-peopled streets encourage innovation and productivity more than do new buildings</p> <p>We know that well-peopled streets are good for creating value - commercial, social and environmental. And that fast one-way traffic discourages people.</p> <p>In the absence of the first of those, therefore: it is necessary to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Return to the 2009 Design principles approved by Planning Committee and re-design based on those pedestrian and public space priorities. Re-join the "island" to the "mainland". 2. Create a bus - tram interchange. It is compatible, even improved, in a pedestrian priority area 3. Maintain north-south traffic routes but learn from success in lower Leith Walk. Private vehicle space is reduced, pedestrian, bike and public transport space are increased. It works well for everyone. Traffic is slowed but still efficient. Leith Street and Piccadilly Place can be designed like this. 4. Design all new traffic routes to keep everyone to 20mph maximum (3 lane one-way roads just encourage speed) | | ANON-8G9D-FCKJ-T | 2017-12-12 15:46:27 |
| <p>Clearly the council wish to go with the recent option. It leaves much to be desired concerning a truly future looking greener Edinburgh.</p> <p>But with this in mind can i respectfully suggest three amendments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Place the cycle path in front of St Mary's cathedral be made to run parallel with the road leaving max space for pedestrians and Paolozzi's work to be viewed as they should. 2. Move the tram stop at Piccadilly place down opposite the Playhouse. There is plenty of room and it will mean better access to the Playhouse. 3. The development of the traffic island is made into a carbon sink of trees and plants with 'a wall of shops' facing into the centre, accessed and serviced by bridges and moving stairs, creating a safe and green zone. <p>The street layout seems to focus a lot on car traffic. It seems to be very inconvenient for pedestrians to have to negotiate several crossings get around.</p> <p>The proposed layout also considerably reduces the space in front of St Mary's cathedral .</p> | <p>My suggestion for the island site is a plantation of trees and plants to create a small forest wood and carbon sink a green symbolic beacon of where we must aim to go for the future of this planet. It could be surrounded by shops looking into this 'jungle' and accessed by bridges and moving stairways with the outside walls free for art and advertising...a safe place for tourists and shoppers to rest.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCKK-U | 2017-12-12 15:46:55 |
| | <p>The island site should be left as a green space . The Paolozzi sculptures should all be sited together in this space.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCUY-K | 2017-12-12 15:53:00 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>First, why do we need a tram stop on Picardy Place at all? There is one on York Place - meters away - already.</p> <p>The triangle will not be used for public space. Who wants to sit in the midst of a three-road junction, enjoying the fumes from passing traffic? The focus on a gyratory system is out of date and gives a dominant position to vehicles over pedestrians. Rather than accommodate current traffic flow, seek to reduce it by making it more uncomfortable to drive. This impacts Broughton Street - which should be a hub of creative, charming Edinburgh life - but instead is narrow-walkways, and traffic clogged. You're doing nothing to help this.</p> <p>I cannot see how this design doesn't inconvenience pedestrians and encourage dangerous dashing across multiple roadways, cycle lanes and tramways. Where in the world is the data underlying these decisions? Which councillors are responsible for taking these decisions and how were the decisions made? Who agreed a £20m penalty for changing the design? (I ask as a corporate transactional lawyer, mind.)</p> <p>Finally, who in the world at the council thinks they are better situated than Paolozzi to place his sculptures? Who at World Heritage has been consulted on this? What other bodies have fed into this process? The intentional opacity of process renders any claim to transparency difficult to stomach. I'm deeply troubled by the number of indicative elements, which not coincidentally, one imagines, seem all to relate to quality of life for local residents.</p> | <p>Should this not be part of the development proposal?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKM-W</p> | <p>2017-12-12 18:41:56</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>There are many detailed comments that I could make about aspects of the three-lane gyratory plan, but I don't want to.</p> <p>I want to object wholeheartedly to the whole concept of the road junction in it's current form.</p> <p>The council should apply it's own policies concerning traffic reduction and place making. If it did this, it would not propose a public space that is orphaned in the middle of three lanes of traffic!</p> <p>It would not propose such significant sharing of space between pedestrians and cyclists, which makes travel less pleasant for both classes of road user.</p> <p>It would not propose that the pavements in some places at this busy spot, in the heart of the city, should be as narrow as ~4m at some places.</p> <p>The council needs to look again at these plans and reconsider the high priority given to motor traffic, including public transport. At a time when councils across the UK and cities across Europe are removing motor vehicles from their centres, it would be an incredibly backward step for Edinburgh to make the eastern entrance to its centre and world heritage sight a massive, ugly, three lane urban motorway.</p> <p>I would suggest the council adopt a plan similar to the well-considered Broughton Spurtle plans.</p> <p>The town centre is clearly capable of functioning with limited traffic flow through this junction, because Leith street is currently closed and has been for some time. The world has not ended. Edinburgh is continuing to function. Traffic will adapt.</p> | <p>I don't think that any 'island site' in the middle of three lanes of traffic is going to be attractive a 'high quality public realm'. I think the council needs to significantly reconsider the idea of an island as usable space.</p> <p>Commercial use would also be unattractive... why would I want to cross three lanes of traffic that has priority to reach whatever is on the island? Why would I want to stay in a hotel which has a moat of traffic? Why would I sit outside a bar or cafe... next to a busy three-lane road?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKB-J</p> | <p>2017-12-12 20:41:52</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>centres that are Edinburgh's competitors, would do.</p> <p>Picardy Place is the gateway to Edinburgh's city centre from Leith and the East and should be an inviting space for people to enjoy. However, outside of rush hour a three-lane gyratory will create a wide-open expanse of wasted space and empty tarmac, whilst in rush hour it will be a congestion, noisy, polluted, uninviting and intimidating space for anyone not in a car.</p> <p>This is not appropriate for a square surrounded by a world-famous theatre, cinema complex, cathedral, hotels and major shopping and entertainment development. These facilities cry out for a useful public space to connect them, with plenty of room for pedestrians to circulate and linger. Instead, the plans confine people to the edges of the place, with any means of traversing it either slow or dangerous (I have seen school children cross the current roundabout on foot to take the fastest route to catch up with their friends - human nature says they will do the same with the current design, only now with extra lanes to cross). The design destroys the potential of Picardy Place.</p> <p>Addressing some particular issues with the design:</p> <p>We are told this will be a public transport interchange. However, passengers will have to cross at least three lanes of traffic to get between tram to bus, or more to get from bus to bus. The temptation to run the traffic gauntlet to get to the "island" will be there when passengers see a tram pulling into the stop.</p> <p>The current southbound bus stop on Leith Street is lousy - a heavily used stop positioned on a busy and too narrow pavement. This design does nothing to improve that. It is also a long distance from the tram stop, which undermines the functionality of the public transport interchange.</p> <p>Pedestrians have been disadvantaged by this design. Walking across what could be an impressive public space will instead be delayed by the need to make multiple light-controlled crossings. These crossing spots will become</p> | <p>If the gyratory design is put in place, whatever is put in the island site will suffer. It would be a lousy and grim site for a hotel, for instance - see what an awful environment the gyratory around the London Imax at Waterloo has generated. The backwardness of the design plan is evidenced by TfL's plans to remove a large number of gyratories in the centre of London.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKU-5</p> | <p>2017-12-12 21:01:02</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>As far as I can see, the current Picardy Place scheme is a traffic plan, but it should be a transport and place plan. This is a wonderful part of our city and a sympathetic design that reflects the needs and usage patterns of families that live locally, as well as tourists, and those from other parts of the city shopping, going to movies, church, and so forth.</p> <p>I lived just down Leith walk when I had my first baby, so I walked through this area daily, first pregnant, and then with a baby in a buggy. It always felt hostile. So much could be done to make it a pleasant, usable space that would draw people in.</p> <p>A gyratory is not the solution. We need to focus on the place, not on moving people through. Pedestrians need to feel safe and able to manoeuvre, cyclists should not be treated like mobile speed bumps to slow the cars down.</p> <p>To put it simply: Make crossings single stage, and where the desire lines are. Don't mix cyclists and heavy traffic, nor cyclists and pedestrians. Expecting cyclists to disappear 'somewhere into the St James centre' is a recipe for disaster. Build proper infrastructure that follows the design guidance.</p> <p><u>Build for 2060 not 1960!</u></p> | <p>As long as this island is surrounded by multiple lanes of heavy traffic, any use of the space is pointless. This needs to be looked at not as separate issues of 'traffic' and 'space' but holistically.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKY-9</p> | <p>2017-12-12 21:47:39</p> |
| <p>Since recently I live in Edinburgh and I regularly visit the cathedral next to the questionable road. I am very concerned about the modifications that are mentioned in the new plan since most of the parishioners are older and removing the number of parking places for the disabled is unacceptable. Also, by placing double bus stop directly in front of the cathedral, would create enormous crowds endangering children and the elderly. I am committed to changing the plan.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCK7-7</p> | <p>2017-12-12 23:33:14</p> |
| <p>I am a resident of the area I oppose the plans for a gyratory model as a pedestrian and a cyclist. I agree that alternatives should be considered.</p> <p>Thank you</p> | <p>No comment until more general proposals considered.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKC-K</p> | <p>2017-12-13 08:20:50</p> |
| <p>It is unclear what consideration has been given to disabled people moving through the area. How do the shared pavements work? Where are the dropped kerbs and crossings.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCK2-2</p> | <p>2017-12-13 08:26:30</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I do not favour the creation of an island/gyratory for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Having seen hotels in the middle of a roundabout in both Birmingham and London, I have personal experience of how difficult it is to reach such places as it always requires crossing a road. It is unpleasant. 2. The proposed approach heavily favours vehicles, and diminishes provision for pedestrians and cyclists. In particular, the experience walking in front of the cathedral will be much diminished as traffic would not be passing this quieter spot. This area is also used for street markets. I favour the retention and enhancement of this community space, which I understand may be common good land, and do not favour giving this land up for road/commercial use. 3. The area at Picardy place is primarily a social one - with a cinema, theatre, cathedral and other amenities nearby. With this mind, primary focus should be on the pedestrian use of this land and enhancing the existing public space. 4. With transition to lower carbon futures, vehicular transport should not be given the priority which it is afforded in the proposals. This goes against the emphasis given to low carbon developments recently announced by the Scottish Government. | <p>On the basis that this is understood to be common good land, I favour retaining it for public and community use, connected to the cathedral without opening a road through it. I certainly do not favour the building of a hotel, which could block the view towards Calton Hill. This would also favour commercial use of a public space, which I do not see the case for. I do not believe sufficient consideration has been given to the development of enhanced public space in front of the cathedral using the existing layout.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKN-X</p> | <p>2017-12-13 08:54:38</p> |
| <p>I still feel that even with the concession of disabled parking spaces, we still don't have enough information on how many spaces there will be. This also does not resolve the issue of access to the area in front of the Cathedral being used for weddings and funerals. Big on promises low on detail which is not satisfactory at all.</p> | <p>An alternative plan for the area in front of the Cathedral which has limited impact on its current use.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKA-H</p> | <p>2017-12-13 10:50:27</p> |
| <p>The cycle way on leith walk has not been a success. it creates more issued than it supposedly solves. I live in this area and trying to drive/turn into streets where the path crosses is a hazard to all. Mini give-way junctions - death traps! I'd like to see the stats on the increase in the number of cars rear ending each other when you have to come to a sudden stop for those who think its a pedestrian crossing. It only serves to encourage motorist to park on it and cyclist to cycle on the pavement and into pedestrians. Many cyclists are still using the road anyway. How much money was spent on the 'bumpers' only for them to be removed weeks later ?</p> <p>Why are you making more room for cyclists and narrowing the pavement at the omni (bus stop). Cars and bikes should not have this monopoly in the city centre where we should be encouraging people to use public transport. Got to pay for the trams somehow! A entire review and specialist intergrated travel system (that actually works) is what this city needs. The half baked efforts to put bits here and there DOESNT WORK.</p> <p>Take influence from other european cities where the travel network is non disruptive, integrated and meets the actual needs of the people who live there. Stop killing small businesses with the unnecessary disruptions. Also - where is the clock from the roundabout ?</p> | <p>This island is in the middle of a large traffic junction. What could it possibly be used for ? Not like people could use it - who would want to sit over there or run the risk of the bikes and cars surrounding it. Nothing can be erected that would inhibit visibility at a busy junction full of cars and bikes. Nothing that would distract drivers/cyclists. Doesn't leave many viable options does it - plants ? Just another cost for upkeep to the council.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKW-7</p> | <p>2017-12-13 10:54:58</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>the maximum flexibility for the future as many of the influencing factors on the design are not yet in place, e.g. the tram extension and the ambitions set out in the Transformation Scoping Report. This major traffic development should be taken in context to the rest of Central Edinburgh.</p> <p>The design of the gyratory reflects out of date thinking and raises the question of how we got here? What traffic information has been used to advise on the layout? The emphasis on keeping traffic moving does not take into account the active travel initiatives already adopted and promoted by the Council. Nor do they reflect changing attitudes in respect of atmospheric pollution in our city and the possibility of an LEZ being introduced to the centre.</p> <p>The large influence on the design being imposed by the relocation of the tram stop from York Place into the centre of the gyratory is producing all sorts of difficulties with bus stops, cyclists and pedestrians. There is already a working and suitably located tram stop serving the St James Centre on St Andrews Square so the new relocated stop could be moved to Elm Row which is a much more logical place for a bus/tram transfer if that is a major criteria. The tram stop in Picardy Place will necessitate large movements of people across trafficked streets including for the bus transfer passengers. The provisions for pedestrians are minimal with many conflicts with cyclists. This does not recognise the importance of active travel.</p> <p>A further consideration is that Leith Street should remain a north south route for traffic as there are pinch points at the other crossings at Dundas and Fredrick.</p> <p>The movements of pedestrians around Edinburgh is painful to say the least with obstructions to free flow everywhere. The gyratory follows in that tradition. Pedestrians must be given a priority along with cyclists.</p> <p>The removal of the existing round about at London Road has not been included in the present consultation for Picardy Place or the recent one for Leith Walk. That is an omission. The existing right turn at that junction facilitate east New Town residents access from the east and removal of that will add to the traffic going round the gyratory and into Broughton Street.</p> | <p>It is crucial in terms of maintaining flexibility for the future that the island should not be built on with any large or permanent structures. Picardy Place is an important entrance gateway to central Edinburgh for traffic approaching from the east (A1) and should reflect the highest standard of urban realm design. Small uses for the area could be cafes or bicycle stations and public open space, possibly with some modest planting. The present shape of the gyratory with its street on the south side reduces the space on front of the Cathedral which is a major and imposing building with needs for access and parking. The other suggestions for a different solution utilising a "Y" junction provide a more generous public space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCK5-5</p> | <p>2017-12-13 11:10:47</p> |
| <p>Removal of public space in front of St. Mary's and around Picardy Place, and replacement with triangle area in the middle of traffic which is unlikely to be used very much.</p> <p>The only design is based on a gyratory model that is well known to be out of date, and which gives a dominant position to vehicles over pedestrians, cyclists and for those whom this is their neighbourhood. Please consider other options.</p> <p>To accommodate the new road layout, there will have to be more pedestrian crossings to encounter, while the crossing in front of the Playhouse is to encourage people to cut across a cycle way, 3 traffic lanes and two tram tracks to save time.</p> | <p>This will be very bad for the local residents of Broughton, Forth St, Albany Street, etc. Broughton needs to be a main High Street and not a traffic corridor which will now not be able to be accessed by York Place. It's a terrible idea. This new plan will increase vehicular traffic, reduce parking for residents and shops and make it very difficult to cross the street safely over by the Playhouse. It is known that the council is receiving monies from the St James project and the rushing through of this proposal is based on receiving those monies based on the St James Project's timeline. It is unfair to continue with this proposal without discussing it with local residents and taking the time to see the impact it will have on so many people.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKD-M</p> | <p>2017-12-13 11:22:41</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Gyratory design highly inappropriate. Dominance given to motorists at the expense of pedestrians and cyclists, and more widely, local residents. Pedestrians and cyclists need safe and easy access around and across Picardy Place - including direct access to public transport. This proposal offers multi stage crossings to be shared by pedestrians and cyclists - not appropriate or desirable for either group.</p> <p>Proposal appears to indicate that pedestrians and cyclists share space, which would inevitably lead to conflict of space, and therefore does nothing to encourage active travel. This contravenes CEC's declared policy to develop AT.</p> <p>The proposed island would inevitably be a dead zone, a concrete through-zone, of no value to common good.</p> <p>Proposal does not appear to link to CEC's wider transport policies; nor does it appear that impact of displaced traffic on neighbouring areas has been adequately assessed.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> <p>Keep Leith St closed to private vehicular traffic; local business deliveries at specified times only.</p> <p>Prioritise pedestrians, public transport and cyclists, not private vehicles.</p> <p>Public plaza outside St Marr's cathedral with maximum tree planting.</p> <p>Absolutely no island.</p> <p>Keep Paolozzi sculptures together.</p> <p>Go back to the drawing board: don't tinker with the current design. Take time to consult widely - no more of this current "consultation under pressure".</p> | <p>As stated above - get rid of this terrible island design completely. Problematic for both pedestrians and cyclists at multi crossing points; deeply unpleasant for local residents - a design which caters to private vehicle use, not to public transport users, pedestrians and cyclists. The island itself would inevitably be a concrete dead zone, and of no value to the public realm. Compare with the ideas circulating for a new pedestrian plaza outside the cathedral - safe space, tree planting, Paolozzi sculptures.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVP-B</p> | <p>2017-12-13 13:15:24</p> |
| <p>I support the proposals to reconfigure Picardy Place as part of the St James redevelopment. As a local resident I use the bus and tram in this area, and also walk and drive here. I support the prioritisation of tram / pedestrian routes, but would be keen to ensure that additional congestion does not occur due to the new road layout. This is an already very congested area for buses and cars, and the area would not benefit from further added congestion.</p> <p>I would also expect to see carefully thought out temporary measures during construction which maintain clear pedestrian routes and traffic routes.</p> | <p>A mixed use development delivered as part of the Edinburgh St James / Picardy Place development would be welcomed. This would support the redevelopment of the area, and would sit well alongside the existing retail and leisure offer at the Omni Centre.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCKE-N</p> | <p>2017-12-13 14:25:11</p> |
| <p>I don't like the proposals as stated. They significantly increase road space and traffic and reduce public space around Picardy place. It's also not good for cyclists. The council should be looking to reduce traffic rather than encouraging it. A better option would be to reduce traffic and build a public plaza outside the cathedral.</p> | <p>This site should not be used for building hotels or retail outlets. It should be used as public space and for cultural use.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVX-K</p> | <p>2017-12-13 15:02:48</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I have received a leaflet which states that the new plan eats significantly into the public space around Picardy Place and replaces it with a central island area, and turns what is the 'gateway to the New Town' into a 'motorway in the City'.</p> <p>I am concerned about this. The area around Picardy Place is heavily used by the pedestrian - including me. Please do not take walking areas away from the pedestrian and cyclists to give to cars and buses. Also if you take away the crossing in front of the Playhouse it will encourage people to cut across a cycle-way, three traffic lanes and two tram tracks to save time. This is very dangerous as some people will put their own lives in danger merely to save a few minutes.</p> <p>We need Picardy Place to be safe and convenient for pedestrians and cyclists. and we need easy access to public transport.</p> <p>I get the feeling that there is an assumption that the next phase of the tram will be authorized. I also think that there is too much emphasis on traffic and less on pedestrian.</p> | <p>The Council owns the land - that means the public own it. The The Managers at the Council need to think about the public as well as the Business Community.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVK-6</p> | <p>2017-12-13 15:07:42</p> |
| | <p>The last thing we need is more retail and given the island is surrounded by heavy traffic it is limited for public use due to fumes from said traffic.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVJ-5</p> | <p>2017-12-13 15:54:43</p> |
| <p>This plan ignores the significant footfall on the Omni Centre side of Picardy Place. The closure of Leith Street has accentuated the fact that large numbers of pedestrians use the footway from Leopold Place to Waterloo Place.</p> <p>The creation of an even larger dead space than exists at present within the road system is a definite drawback and makes me think that no real thought has been given to the dynamics of pedestrian use and patterns of footfall. Putting the cycle lane on the pedestrian area outside the Omni Centre is not helpful - it would be very hazardous to cyclists when crowds are leaving or arriving at the theatre.</p> <p>What is meant by "turn back" for buses - and why is the roundabout at Leopold Place not sufficient for this? All the bus routes which enter Picardy Place as they head towards the City centre have to negotiate the Leopold Place roundabout.</p> <p>Nothing in this plan indicates how traffic queuing will be prevented and it seems merely to be enlarging the current roundabout to accommodate a tram stop!</p> <p>I don't understand why the names of these newly-created "streets" is undecided if they are "historic" - this sounds like a bit of PR flimflam to try and justify an unimaginative, traffic-focused scheme.</p> | <p>surrounded by 3-lane roadways! So long as it remains an island, it is doomed.</p> <p>Is "development" a realistic proposal or just wishful thinking? Will there really be demand for more retail or office space in such a site? I can't imagine that anybody is going to want to build a new development of that small size in the middle of a busy traffic island; the constant traffic noise & pollution would preclude residential accommodation - which is the main development taking place in this area at the moment.</p> <p>The trouble with sites that are seeking a purpose is that they become an eyesore - the roundabout has developed an ugly appearance in spite of attempts to liven it up. A bigger space would be worse and this will merely perpetuate the dreariness of the current situation during the time it takes to find a use for it (or a developer!).</p> <p>The Playhouse is the second largest theatre in the UK. Before & after performances there is a huge surge in the number of pedestrians using these areas; during the intervals in performances hundreds of people spill out of the theatre to smoke - or just to stretch their legs.</p> <p>It would be helpful to create a pleasant space where people could gather, before, during & after performances (and, as others have suggested, where events could take place during the festivals), in which case there should be easy pedestrian access to it - people should not have to cross busy lanes of traffic to reach it.</p> <p>It is essential to build easy access to this space at the beginning of any development - think of the access to Bristo Square from Potterrow/Lothian Street. People should not have to wait at traffic lights - and traffic should not have to stop to allow pedestrians to cross.</p> <p>This kind of access, though more expensive to build at the start, would make the whole area so much more useful to everyone, whether on foot, on cycles or in vehicles.</p> <p>The Paolozzi sculptures could then all be kept together, as originally intended, and not separated - as proposed - with the hand & the feet on different sides of a road . By turning this "island" into a park-like space it</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVV-H</p> | <p>2017-12-13 16:09:18</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>The proposed gyratory is quite unacceptable. A relic of transport planning of the 1960s and 1970s which gave primacy to motor vehicles. Edinburgh Council professes to now have a different set of priorities.</p> <p>The gyratory should be scrapped and replaced by a different design which give priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport together with the protection of public space. The Sustrans proposal should be given more serious consideration.</p> <p>The current proposals have some provision for cyclists but this is quite limited and involves many crossings. If the current gyratory designed then there must be a segregated cycle path on the north of the island linking directly to the CCWEL and the Leith Walk cycleway with Tiger crossings. Access for cyclists from Broughton St to the CCWEL and Leith Walk is quite unsatisfactory and needs to be rethought.</p> | <p>The island site should not be developed as this would make it very difficult, in future, to rethink the gyratory concept and/or to use the land for a public transport hub. For the time being, those parts not used for paths or cycleways should be landscaped and considered as public open space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVF-1</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVB-W</p> | <p>2017-12-13 18:01:21</p> <p>2017-12-13 18:19:24</p> |
| <p>The proposed gyratory is a refreshing change from years of bad transport decisions in Edinburgh.</p> <p>This is a critical junction in the city used by cars, buses and taxis as well as cyclists and we cannot afford to inconvenience bus AND car users. Cyclists are given priority in other areas of the city and are already well catered for.</p> <p>There is a complete lack of ambition and commitment in putting people first. Motor vehicles bring noise, toxins and danger into our city centre and the proposed designs only seek to encourage that.</p> <p>"However, the junction has also been designed to accommodate current traffic volumes"</p> <p>It's not possible to have good public space that's surrounded by a 3 lane motor gyratory.</p> <p>"... as more people change to active travel."</p> <p>Induced demand. Allocating large amounts of road space for driving encourages people to take the car. Furthermore, the proposed space allocation looks to negatively impact on active travel road users - opportunity cost.</p> <p>Now is the time to make the changes for Active Travel. By doing so we can induce demand for walking and cycling.</p> | <p>Excellent layout - allows for fast movement by bus and car users. Ultimately, if traffic modelling shows this is the most efficient movement for buses, cars and taxis then this is the route we should choose.</p> <p>George Square in Glasgow is a large motor traffic island. Consequentially it's noisy, polluted and an unpleasant environment. The current plans look to create a similar environment; an island awash with pollution.</p> <p>Staggered crossings - inconveniencing pedestrians for the purpose of improving motor vehicle flow. You can't even directly walk across from St Mary's Cathedral to the "island".</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVY-M</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCV4-F</p> | <p>2017-12-13 19:18:04</p> <p>2017-12-13 20:22:01</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The current layout is clearly poor, a relic from the 1960's. We'll not redo this junction again for at least another 50 years, so please, please, take a step back and plan it for people, and as a place for them to gather and to enjoy our city, not for cars. I live in North Edinburgh, and use this junction very frequently in many of the modes of transport which share it, as a driver, cyclist, pedestrian, and bus passenger at different times, and I am very worried about the proposal under consultation currently.</p> <p>Fundamentally, the plans are flawed by the gyratory design which everything else revolves around. It takes up a huge amount of space both with the lanes of traffic, and the central area which it cuts off from the surrounding area. People will not find it easy or compelling to use this space, even if it is not sold off as a development opportunity and kept as common good land.</p> <p>The wide roads of the gyratory in the current proposal make it difficult for anyone not in a car to get around, even along major desire lines. Many, many more people travel through this junction on foot or by bike than in a car, so please prioritise them in the design - good, quick pedestrian crossings and proper, physically segregated bike lanes which have priority over the roads they cross are critical for this.</p> <p>The current design does not have good crossings. For example, to get between the shops, bars and restaurants on the East side of Broughton Street, and the centre via Leith Street requires four separate crossings of 2 or 3 lanes each, with associated waiting on traffic islands. For those with buggies, small children, or mobility needs, these are even more awkward.</p> <p>The council has stated its goal of reducing car modal share from 42% to 29% between 2014 and 2019. I don't know the current progress on this, but the modal share can only be reduced by making other modes, public transport, walking, and cycling significantly more attractive. I don't see their prioritisation</p> | <p>I strongly feel that this island site is a mistake. A good public space, whether that be open or some sort of public civic building, is crucial here but it should not be cut off by many lanes of traffic, it should be much more easily accessible. Moving or removing one side of the gyratory would allow this space to be easily accessed and well used, as would reducing the numbers of lanes and drastically improving pedestrian priority in the area.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVR-D</p> | <p>2017-12-13 20:47:22</p> |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>junction, this type road layout is from the 1960s and I understand that this does not meet the councils own road design objectives, which should prioritise public transport and walking/cycling over private car use.</p> <p>I think the lack of a clear public consultation on this major project close to the city centre is very poor. The fact that work has started on the proposals before the so called consultation ends shows contempt for this process.</p> <p>That said, and if a gyratory HAS to be built, the revised proposals are a very slight improvement over previous designs, but still have major problems that need to be resolved in the detailed design. My main concerns are as follows:</p> <p>Suggestions are being made about creating a "place" in the centre of this junction, however it will not be a pleasant environment surrounded by 3 lanes of queuing traffic, especially if a building were to be constructed with only narrow footways close to the traffic.</p> <p>The removal of the pedestrian crossing outside the Playhouse is a retrograde step, and I fear it will only be a matter of time before there is a fatality from people trying to follow the desire line across the multiple lanes of traffic/tram/cycles at this location.</p> <p>It is also disappointing to see so many multi-stage pedestrian crossings. If these must be included, they need to be responsive, and not result in wait times of several minutes to cross each leg.</p> <p>While I very much welcome the provision of segregated cycle lanes, they appear very narrow for bi-directional use. Ending in "shared space" at junctions is not acceptable, as this only leads to conflict between those on foot and on bikes. It also does not appear clear how cyclists safely navigate from Broughton Street to Leith Street, which is the main route I take through this junction.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCVT-F | 2017-12-13 20:52:25 |
| <p>It will be a travesty if this gets built. A one in a generation chance to build a significant public space will be wasted to build a triangle that will be hard to access and unpleasant to spend time in as it will be surrounded by traffic.</p> <p>The traffic modelling hasn't taken into account the councils aspiration to reduce car volumes from 42% to 29%. This could be an important step towards that aspiration - but instead it will only encourage more traffic onto our streets to access the St James Centre by car.</p> <p>We can do better than this.</p> | <p>Whilst it is surrounded on all sides by traffic that will be noisy and pollute the air, it's not going to be a space that people will want to spend time in. After waiting for multiple crossings to get there, as a parent, I can't see that I could relax with my children lose and busy roads all around.</p> <p>It could be so much more if you could link it to a wider space (e.g the front of the cathedral) that would allow it to be a useable space for all.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCV7-J | 2017-12-13 22:22:19 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>to Princes Street at the moment. Could that not continue? If not, could it not just be a road used by buses and emergency vehicles? I worry at the moment that it's so congested going past the Omni and up to Princes Street that emergency vehicles may have difficulties getting through.</p> <p>I'm a pedestrian, and not an infirm one or one with mobility issues and even so, in my experience, sharing space with cyclists can be quite frightening because they move so much faster. It's particularly worrying on</p> <p>(a) pavements where the cyclists are rushing downhill and pedestrians are walking both up and down around them. It looks as though that might happen on Little King Street</p> <p>(b) pavements which are quite narrow, as they are opposite the St James Centre and/or crowded (which, again, they almost always are from the Omni Centre all the way up to Princes Street).</p> <p>I'd therefore like you to reconsider the idea of shared space.</p> <p>It looks to me as though there isn't enough space for pedestrians in the plan. It's frightening to be jostled when there are a lot of other pedestrians and not a lot of pavement space and that's made even worse when there are steps down which one could fall (as is the case near the top of the Omni Centre). I therefore think there needs to be a lot more space for pedestrians there.</p> <p>I don't think there should be anything permanent built on the central island: leaving it empty will allow for more flexibility and I hope eventually there will be fewer cars and more space for non-polluting transport options. Leaving the island empty doesn't mean it has to be unused: it might, for example, be a good place for the weekend farmers' market, as it looks as though there might no longer be space for them in their previous location in front of the Cathedral.</p> | <p>As I mentioned in my response to the previous question, I don't think this site should be developed because</p> <p>(a) it will fix this particular road arrangement and ensure there is less room for flexibility and change in the future.</p> <p>(b) I think there will be quite enough traffic already without adding another permanent shopping/entertainment destination.</p> <p>(c) I think it would be better to use a small part of the area for temporary things, like the weekend farmer's market.</p> <p>(d) I think it would make the whole area look nicer, and reduce noise pollution, and help absorb a bit of the air pollution, if there were lots of trees and shrubs planted on the island.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCVC-X | 2017-12-14 03:58:44 |
| <p>The proposed layout is a missed opportunity, it has a 1970s Milton Keynes feel to it with space for people constrained by space for cars.</p> <p>Edinburgh needs to grow if it is to compete as a centre of commerce and culture. This is completely at odds with the proposed road layout. The council must consider the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The summer and winter festival pedestrian areas are severely overcrowded and offer no scope for expansion. 2. Our increasing number of paying tourists arriving by public transport are not given the priority they deserve. The car is king in Edinburgh and we need to identify all sources of revenue. 3. The excessive amount of car parking is a magnet for pollution and congestion. A car parking space is about the same size as a large outdoor cafe table or market stall, yet the car parking space is a net cost to the city in terms of opportunity cost and externalities. 4. Has the council analysed traffic movements in this area to determine the percentage of through traffic that is a net cost to the city? Why should through traffic be given priority over our workers, visitors and residents? | <p>The island site is completely cut off by traffic. As the area will be blighted with traffic noise and pollution the area will be of limited use.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCV2-D | 2017-12-14 08:58:08 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Terrible! outdated urban design which prioritises the car. Awkward crossing points for pedestrians with too many multi-stage crossings, pavements too narrow, conflict points between cyclists and pedestrians, awful setting for the Paolozzi sculpture, poor access for cathedral. | There should be no island site - bin the gyratory. | ANON-8G9D-FCVN-9 | 2017-12-14 09:12:36 |
| <p>The consultation is very limited in the information provided as background to what is happening.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · No one can understand why an out of date gyratory solution has been chosen when other councils are getting rid of theirs. · There has been an inadequate opportunity to look at alternatives to the gyratory, although proposals exist. · Public space in Picardy Place will be diminished because the central island is seen to be unattractive as a public space. · The arrangements for pedestrians and cyclists on balance are worse, with more crossing to be encounter getting around or across Picardy Place. · The Council's threat that, if the gyratory does not go forward, traffic displacement into other streets will happen is based on inadequate wider planning of traffic in the City Centre and into the future, contrary to the Council's own policies. The campaign has been clear traffic displacement should be avoided, but needs properly addressed. · There is no acceptance of the gyratory as second best – the proposals do not work on their own terms. | The design of this space should be totally integrated with the revision of the whole Picardy Place site. | ANON-8G9D-FCV5-G | 2017-12-14 09:16:44 |
| <p>I strongly oppose this Gyratory plan on the basis that the design primarily focused on routing motor vehicles and the island sterilises public use of this space.</p> <p>As a cyclist this layout looks very confusing and thus navigation would be dangerous.</p> <p>As a motorist, what could be a simple T intersection, is instead proposed a three point triangular round about! no thanks.</p> | <p>This shows very little public space? What space is there is fronted by busy roads.</p> <p>Again, why not a simple T intersection?</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCVW-J | 2017-12-14 09:27:33 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>public transport first. Quoting Cllr Lesley Macinnes "Public transport users, people who walk through Picardy Place, people who cycle through Picardy Place, people using the Cathedral, people using the shops and businesses, as well as obviously the residents in this area. We're doing our very best to accommodate everybody's needs."</p> <p>What I see here is putting drivers first, who are mostly passing through and contributing to pollution, noise and danger. Many drivers don't want to drive, but either the public transport doesn't meet their needs, walking is too far or unpleasant and its to dangerous or inconvenient to cycle. Because so much space has been given to motor traffic, it seriously compromises on all other people who use this space and could use it if it wasn't going to be so unpleasant. This junction's motor-centric design will contribute to our nation's thousands of premature deaths from air-pollution and poor health from inactivity.</p> <p>If we can focus on making public transport, walking and cycling great, we don't need to accommodate for large volumes of motor traffic. We should focus on moving people, not cars. Traffic is not an incompressible fluid, it is people making transport choices; build for high motor capacity and more people drive, build for less capacity and less people drive. Either way you will always saturate a city centre road with cars. http://rachelaldred.org/writing/thoughts/disappearing-traffic/ Once people get used to the new junction, either you will have many motor vehicles idling in peak-time traffic or fewer motor vehicles idling in jams.</p> <p>With the current proposal, just stop. We need to take this back to basic principles. We need to put walking, cycling, public transport and public spaces back up the hierarchy in a meaningful way and reduce traffic capacity for private vehicles.</p> <p>Suggestions:</p> | <p>Should this even be an island?</p> <p>If it is physically connected to one of the sides, say to the Omni centre. It could be a valuable space for events, markets, festivals which is easily accessible for all.</p> <p>It could be a garden park, like St Andrews Square.</p> <p>If its going to be a traffic island as proposed, why not a comprehensive pollution and noise monitoring station. Its unlikely to detract from the ugly view of thousands of cars spewing by and there will be data to really see the impact of the proposed design choice.</p> <p>I grew up with Edinburgh and it has a special place in my heart. Having gone to many cities in continental Europe, I can see clearly how Edinburgh has been ruined by excess motor traffic. The likes of Jan Gehl should be taken seriously, Edinburgh has so much potential to be a very pleasant, liveable city and that is especially important in a globalised world where cities compete directly with each other.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCV3-E</p> | <p>2017-12-14 09:45:09</p> |
| <p>No one can understand why an out of date gyratory solution has been chosen when other councils are getting rid of theirs.</p> <p>The arrangements for pedestrians and cyclists on balance are worse, with more crossing to be encounter getting around or across Picardy Place.</p> <p>Need more time for a full proper consideration better solutions, including having an extended space in front of the Cathedral as well as improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> | <p>Public space in Picardy Place will be diminished because the central island is seen to be unattractive as a public space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCVA-V</p> | <p>2017-12-14 09:55:27</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>occasional bus passenger. I am dismayed that the Council has put forward such an unimaginative and retro design which takes me back to the 1970s. I am concerned that this is because the Council is being led by the nose by the developers of the St. James Quarter who would love to allow as many cars as possible into the area to use their car parking facilities. Whatever happened to traffic-reduction? Where is the value of the public realm? Sustainable development?</p> <p>I would encourage planners to actively consider the suggestions put forward by Sustrans and the Picardy Group. I am referring to the Leith Street bus-gate Sustrans proposal, not the one illustrated in this consultation, which is clearly unworkable. The Picardy Group proposal sees a crossroads at the York Place-Broughton Street junction freeing up a large public space area in front of the Omni Centre.</p> <p>The Council proposal is unacceptable as it clearly places cars at the top of the pecking order. All other modes of travel have to fit around the need for a big roundabout for cars. As a result, negotiating the area for pedestrians and cyclists becomes complex and tortuous. Additionally, public space including shrubbery, trees and statues will be removed or compromised.</p> <p>I am encouraged by the bus gate proposal for the top of Leith Street, as proposed by Sustrans. Diverting cars via Abbeyhill seems to have worked out reasonably well and will be improved if buses are taken out of the equation. Extra traffic elsewhere is inevitable and I would suggest that this solution spreads the burden, giving the opportunity to enhance the Picardy Place area for all.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Council to remove the gyratory plan from the agenda and look again at alternative proposals that favour public transport, active travel and pedestrians. Please put principles into practice.</p> | <p>The area would be greatly enhanced by leaving this clear as a public space. I realise that financial pressures will force development (another hotel) but I would like to register opposition to this. The city is densely populated with buildings and needs some open spaces as well.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCB9-Z</p> | <p>2017-12-14 11:22:57</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Whilst amendments are welcome, cars still sit at the heart of this proposal. I feel strongly that if the council has concerns about congestion and impact on nearby residential streets (where I live) then it should be sending a strong message that the car is not king. If there are concerns about residential streets, please add traffic calming measures - I would love to see a pedestrian crossing at the west end of both London St and Albany St, and speed humps on both.</p> <p>This development can't be looked at in isolation - the use of cars in general to access the city centre, and in particular to move through the city centre WITHOUT accessing it should be reconsidered. Reduce parking, and increase public transport with incentives to use it, and encourage more active travel. I used to own a car and gave it up years ago, realising that in a city like Edinburgh using one is sheer laziness - walking, public transport, city car club for short journeys I can't do on foot/bus and car hire for longer trips is sufficient. More people need to be made aware of this.</p> <p>I walk through this area daily and the proposed designs do not, from what I see, improve my walk to and from work. I'm still shoulder to shoulder with cars, I'm still having to cross busy roads, and I see no improvements to the pedestrian areas adjoining the area - Broughton St will still have narrow pavements littered with street furniture, Calton Rd will still have such a treacherously narrow pavement that I'm forced to step into the path of traffic on a daily basis as two people cannot pass on the pavement without one stepping into the road.</p> <p>Edinburgh is a beautiful city let down by the emphasis on cars travel. Look at Cambridge - a beautiful city centre which sends a strong message that cars do not take priority, the approach I'd like to see.</p> | <p>I don't feel there should be an island of this size. Whilst I'd live to see an opportunity for more green space, nobody at all would want to enjoy a green space surrounded by honking cars. This is the existing problem with the area in front of the cathedral - the proximity to a busy roundabout makes it thoroughly uninviting.</p> <p>If there must be an island this size, a music venue would be my preference for what would go in the centre. Edinburgh has seen most of it-s mid-capacity venues close and the new concert hall would be well complimented by a more casual, rock venue with great public transport links and dining options nearby.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBX-Y</p> | <p>2017-12-14 12:22:42</p> |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>The current roundabout is a terrible space, a relic from the thankfully never-fully-realised attempt to create a motorway network through the city centre, and the means and opportunity to redesign it is much needed and very welcome.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the proposed layout does little to improve the current situation and in many ways is actually worse (removing the small areas of green public space from the edges of the site, while increasing the space in the centre, which will be an extremely hostile public space, hard to access, and surrounded by multiple lanes of traffic on all sides).</p> <p>The proposed layout prioritises motor traffic at the expense of all else, despite the council's stated goals to reduce car traffic and pollution levels. In what way will the redesigned Picardy Place contribute to this? If anything it will likely increase car usage. I understand the council is also in the process of launching a process to 'transform' the city centre, with the project led by the Central Edinburgh Development Working Group. Obviously, the redesign of Picardy Place should be part of this important process and the PP project delayed so that findings and goals can inform a more sympathetic design.</p> <p>The overwhelming problem with the proposed layout is its gyratory design. Other cities across the world are removing these sorts of junctions from their centres. For Edinburgh to spend millions to create this backward-looking design at the same time is an extremely short-sighted and damaging step, to the city's reputation as well as the health and well-being of its residents.</p> <p>I strongly encourage to please step back, and develop a new design with a T or Y junction, reducing the road capacity, while increasing opportunities for public transport, walking and cycling - all aspects of the council's own transport objectives. A forward-thinking design could create an appropriate 'gateway' to the World Heritage Site centre of the city, a genuine transport</p> <p>I do not believe sufficient account has been taken of the need for pedestrian access to Broughton st. I am concerned as a local business person about the impact on footfall</p> | <p>See previous comments.</p> <p>Proposed island site will be a hostile space, surrounded by multiple busy traffic lanes and hard to access.</p> <p>A redesigned T or Y junction would create a similar sized site which could be far more usable.</p> <p>It is not good to have this as a disconnected roundabout. Traffic flow should not dictate everything. Connect this 'island' to the area in front of St Marys Church</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBP-Q</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCB6-W</p> | <p>2017-12-14 13:30:32</p> <p>2017-12-14 14:02:44</p> |
|---|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Place, for the following reasons: ---</p> <p>A) The proposed gyratory contradicts the Council's own Transport Policy, notably:</p> <p>Outcome 1: 'Be green – reducing the impacts of transport, in particular playing its full part in reducing greenhouse gas emissions'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The modelling assumption driving the chosen design (accommodating current car traffic levels) contradicts Indicator 1.2's aim to reduce motor traffic, along with Objective 11.1 Manage Traffic and Congestion. <p>Outcome 2: 'Be healthy - promoting Active Travel with streets appropriately designed for their functions, with an emphasis on encouraging walking, cycling and public transport use and a high quality public realm; improving local air quality'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed layout significantly impairs the environment for active travellers and public transport users in order to prioritise car users. In particular I support the detailed comments from Living Streets Edinburgh and Spokes, which highlight that the proposed design fails to conform to street design guidelines in a number of respects. <p>Outcome 5: 'Be part of a well planned, physically accessible, sustainable city that reduces dependency on car travel, with a public transport system, walking and cycling conditions to be proud of'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again, the proposed layout with multiple crossing points is not well planned, not accessible and not sustainable. Any bus passengers with mobility needs wishing to change buses or to board a tram face a hostile environment. And such a gyratory would certainly not be a place to be proud of! It's worth noting that London is now looking to remove gyratories from 33 junctions, having recognised how they degrade the urban space and present unacceptable dangers to vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians. | <p>An 'island site' is an accurate description for this site, since it would be largely isolated from the surrounding streets. Given the flawed proposals for the gyratory surrounding the 'island site', it will be of limited value to pedestrians (or indeed, people trying to visit it by car!)</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCV9-M</p> | <p>2017-12-14 14:18:34</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The Cockburn Association does not support the Council's current proposals for the redesign of Picardy Place. This is an outdated scheme which has no place in the future of our great Scottish Capital. We suggest that a radical new approach is required, one firmly based on the principles of good urban design, knitting Picardy Place back into the urban fabric of the city rather than separating it with complex road infrastructure and junctions. There is no compelling urgent need to make a decision now – time is available to put in place the necessary studies and consultation to get a better solution that will work for Edinburgh well into the future.</p> <p>Cockburn Comments</p> <p>1.The Cockburn Association believes that Picardy Place is not a traffic mitigation problem to be solved but rather it is an urban design opportunity to be embraced. The current proposals for Picardy place are clearly, first and foremost, designed to manage current vehicular traffic flows. They are most definitely not, but we firmly believe that they should be, the result of an inter-disciplinary process aimed at shaping the urban design of Picardy Place (and its environs) which fully considers the design of existing or potential buildings, groups of buildings, urban spaces and urban landscapes, the requirements of residents and the establishment of frameworks and processes that will facilitate successful development and sustainable ongoing management of the whole area.</p> <p>2.Picardy Place does not exist in isolation. The St James Quarter development is underway, a major concert hub is proposed behind Dundas House and ambitious new plans are emerging for the re-imagining of George Street and the First New Town. We also understand the Council is to engage in an exercise to establish the future priorities for the future of the city centre. This context is relevant for the future of Picardy Place both in the sense of its relation to adjacent areas of the city centre and in its 'gateway' role. For this</p> | <p>Please see previous comments</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCB8-Y</p> | <p>2017-12-14 14:38:24</p> |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>this myopic old-fashioned traffic-engineering solution isn't it. It contravenes the Council's own Street Design Guidance policy which looks 'towards place making and away from a system focused upon the domination of motor vehicles'. By not encouraging a modal shift away from cars, it contradicts the Council's air pollution policies.</p> <p>While the present space in front of the Cathedral is not brilliant, the proposed space -- a windswept triangle isolated by multi-lane fast-moving roads -- is considerably worse and does not seem to show any understanding of urban design. The sculptures had been carefully positioned (S Holmes marked Conan Doyle's birthplace, and moving him to the end of the triangle is meaningless and ignorant).</p> <p>If this is meant to be a consultation where are the other options which should have been explored? eg moving the tramstop to Elm Row or northwards to run beside the pavement (the Picardy Place buildings are all serviced from the rear); or extending and redesigning the Cathedral precinct? What about exploiting the level changes across the site to put some traffic underground? You claim that this solution reinstates the historic layout but this is a specious argument unless you put a triangle of street buildings in the centre and return the carriageways to three separate two-way roads.</p> <p>Why is such an out-of-date solution being put forward when other authorities are removing their gyratories because they don't work? Look at the chaotic operation of the temporary Abbeyhill gyratory -- almost the exact same scale and configuration as this -- for evidence in our own city that this is a non-starter.</p> <p>However, the biggest single argument against this proposal is that it has been carried out in isolation. Within the central area there are several studies and major redevelopments proposed or under way, and it is essential to avoid future conflicts to take an overview and plan these as a whole for the best</p> <p>Too car focused, Edinburgh needs more pedestrianised areas. I feel the the pedestrians and cyclists facilities are an afterthought.</p> | | | |
| <p>Design is not in line with current government thinking on active transport and air quality.</p> | <p>A triangle of buildings in the centre is clearly one possibility, providing the streets surrounding it are reinstated as normal urban two-way streets and not as a fast-moving gyratory. However, any building on the site would compromise potential future options if circumstances change. A large public space is also possible providing it is properly designed and has a function.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCBQ-R | 2017-12-14 15:16:46 |
| <p>I would favour options that focus on promoting foot/cycle/public transport, even at the detriment of private traffic.</p> <p>It's important to encourage the reduction in car use, rather than just prepare for a future reduction.</p> | <p>How would this be accessed?</p> <p>Would be far more useful a space if not surrounded by traffic.</p> <p>This space is relatively open at the moment. Adding any kind of buildings there will make the new streets more closed in.</p> <p>I would favour keeping it an open space - perhaps a park. There are stalls, some more regular than others, that currently operate outside the cathedral. These could operate in the park.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMG-S | 2017-12-14 15:27:28 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FCBG-E | 2017-12-14 15:36:58 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>prioritises car traffic, when it should be prioritising cycling and pedestrians, and goes against the council's own as well as Scottish government sustainable transport policy.</p> <p>I understand you have agreed to things with the developers (without consultation) that you would now have to pay to get out of, but this seems very short sighted to introduce a design that is not fit for purpose and will actually increase traffic. Your modelling assumes constant traffic volumes, when it is widely evidenced that traffic responds to the infrastructure. Take away car space, fewer cars, more pace, more cars.</p> <p>Those 1000 parking spaces should never have got planning permission as this clearly will encourage people to drive, making the environment worse for everyone, and no better for drivers, because traffic will just increase until its at the same levels of congestion. Pay the fines if you have to, it will make Edinburgh city centre a much better place, which in the long run will save money.</p> <p>Large volumes of cars, no matter how organised, are intimidating and make people feel unsafe and put them off cycling. I am an experienced cyclist so I'm ok with taking my chances but I have had countless conversations with people who are put off from cycling in the city altogether. A good cycle friendly design is an opportunity to win people over to a healthy and sustainable form of transport, which purportedly is the Council's aim. As long as your priority is to make things work for cars over the needs of all sustainable forms of transport, you will attract more cars and stop 'on the fence' people from cycling.</p> <p>I very strongly feel that there should not be three lanes of traffic, and much, much more space needs to be given both cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>From a cyclists perspective (which I mainly am in this area, although I do also</p> | <p>as I say, I cannot imagine anything in the middle of 9 lanes of cars being pleasant in any way, so I would very strongly question that this is actually usable space, and I feel that it should not be factored into decisions on such a basis.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCB3-T</p> | <p>2017-12-14 15:58:46</p> |
| <p>This scheme fits none of the basic aims or principles that you outline at the start of this presentation, namely enhance the public realm; improve pedestrian and cycling provision; and support the existing public transport network. 'Future proof' is a grandiose fantasy. The scheme prioritises motor vehicle traffic, reduces the available public space to be enjoyed by local residents, shoppers, visitors to the cathedral (I'm one) and passers-by, and fails to improve access and ease of movement for both pedestrians and cyclists. It appears to be an out-dated urban vehicle throughway scheme which is totally inappropriate to the needs of the city. You need to think again, and think differently.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBB-9</p> | <p>2017-12-14 17:04:05</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I object to the proposed revisions for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The consultation is very limited in the information provided as background to what is happening. · No one can understand why an out of date gyratory solution has been chosen when other councils are getting rid of theirs. · There has been an inadequate opportunity to look at alternatives to the gyratory, although proposals exist. · Public space in Picardy Place will be diminished because the central island is seen to be unattractive as a public space. · The arrangements for pedestrians and cyclists on balance are worse, with more crossing to be encounter getting around or across Picardy Place. · The Council's threat that, if the gyratory does not go forward, traffic displacement into other streets will happen is based on inadequate wider planning of traffic in the City Centre and into the future, contrary to the Council's own policies. The campaign has been clear traffic displacement should be avoided, but needs properly addressed. · There is no acceptance of the gyratory as second best – the proposals do not work on their own terms. <p>CEC need to allow for a full proper consideration of other options which offer better solutions, including having an extended space in front of the Cathedral as well as improvements for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> | <p>I object to the proposed island site - it offers nothing of value to the pedestrian and will be effectively marooned in a race track road network.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBY-Z</p> | <p>2017-12-14 17:08:48</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>pavements outside the Omni centre and the pedestrian corridor outside the Cathedral.</p> <p>This is a chance to again, maximise the public space in Picardy Place and create an area that is even more impressive in its use of place making and greenspace with pedestrian transit as the main priority as the greenest mode of travel. I do not see the proposed design for a gyratory doing this at all. It is out of date in terms of sustainability, alarmingly minimises the pedestrian space to an absolute minimum and prioritises and promotes travel by car which is not ethical.</p> <p>I do not think it is entirely realistic to design something new for Picardy Place which suits cyclists staying on the roads safely. As a cyclist I would normally get off and walk at this point or avoid this route altogether. Perhaps cycle paths could be incorporated within the pavements as they have been in Leith Walk.</p> <p>The Paolozzi bronzes must be returned to the space outside the Cathedral along with the other stone features to ensure as many people as possible can enjoy them.</p> <p>The existing trees should be maintained while the work is underway and many more should be planted to screen off the traffic as much as possible. The middle roundabout should be planted with trees and other vegetation.</p> | <p>layout as shown in the map above. I do not think it should be returned to the historical design shape as this area will be far too noisy to be in as a pedestrian or any building and trying to make it like St Andrews Square is not viable here. The traffic would be too heavy and close. I would prefer it if this space were kept to the current circular design and planted with trees and other vegetation and not accessible. I prefer the exiting pedestrian areas to be retained and expanded upon with increased screening from the traffic by trees. This means that pedestrian transit is alongside the outside pavement by the buildings on one side and screened from traffic on the other, until they cross the road.</p> <p>I think the Council should realise that when the venues in this area have performances or films the need for a piazza approach is clear. People fill up these pavements at peak times and there is just enough space at the moment. These gatherings are part of the event making them visibly popular. The visible expanse of people walking, with a comfortable amount of personal space around them, to work or shop in these existing areas also promote walking as an activity in the city in general. Narrower noisier pavements as planned in this new island design would not do this as effectively.</p> <p>I appreciate the opportunity to submit my views at this stage. I have been very concerned that I might not be given the opportunity. I really hope that the plan that goes forward clearly prioritises people and not cars.</p> <p>Please also consider the evidence in these reports and create a more ethical sustainable and environmentally sensitive design. If more trees are included in particular this area will only look better as they grow and mature within the 100 years this design is supposed to last: https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/every-breath-we-take-lifelong-impact-air-pollution http://projectevergreen.org/resources/environmental-benefits-of-green-space/</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCMQ-3 | 2017-12-14 17:12:22 |
| <p>Don't see any easy access for pedestrians crossing into central area between new streets.</p> | <p>It is likely to be too noisy to use for recreation unless you are able to buffer it with greenery. I don't see any mention of pedestrian access on the map.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCBR-S | 2017-12-14 17:21:05 |
| <p>I welcome the dedicated cycle ways on Leith Street and outside St Mary's Cathedral, however I think the council could still do better in improving this space for active travel. It looks like more road surface and less buffer space for pedestrians than the current layout. I also question the value to pedestrians of a central island between three busy roads, compared to a smaller junction with more green buffer space around the outside of the junction adjacent to residential and commercial premises. As a cyclist using this route every day, the off road routes have too many controlled crossings and pedestrian conflict zones. In particular, the route from Broughton Street to Leith Street involves the choice of three controlled crossings and an area of 'pedestrian space', or a road route which is not an improvement on the current design (longer and still necessitating crossing lanes of traffic).</p> | <p>I would prefer to reduce the size of the island and have more green usable space around the outside (I don't fancy spending time in a space that size, sandwiched between three three lane roads!)</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCB4-U | 2017-12-14 17:24:01 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>My comments are related to being a parishioner of St Mary's Cathedral. The space immediately adjacent to the steps leading up to the Cathedral has always been a place where people can congregate on important dates in the liturgical calendar.</p> <p>Due to the screening with trees and shrubs from the main thoroughfare, it is a safe and vital space for funeral cortèges and wedding parties to arrive and depart. It is also used by disabled parishioners.</p> <p>St Mary's Cathedral occupies an important position at the top of The Walk and as such, it deserves to be viewed by the many thousands of visitors who come every year. It is a busy city centre parish which people come to from all over the city to celebrate mass every Sunday.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that this space must remain for the benefit of the many people who use it and urge all decision makers to come up with a better traffic solution.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCBD-B | 2017-12-14 17:47:04 |
| <p>I would like to object to the proposed street layout on the following grounds;</p> <p>Reduction of usable public space - who will go and use the space in that central triangle area surrounded by traffic - children could not play safely there due to risk of running out onto busy roads. The current area outside the cathedral has trees to shield the traffic noise and is enclosed enough to allow children to play safely around the Palozzi sculptures.</p> <p>Inconvenience for pedestrians - staggered crossings and multiple tram track and road lanes will create large queues of pedestrians trying to cross.</p> <p>Rushed decision making by the council - the impact on the New Town residential streets and other surrounding streets has not been broached with local residents then all of a sudden at the busiest time of the year a public consultation is quietly opened for 1 month. This is not the vision we were led to believe when permission was granted for the replacement complex at the St James Centre - it was supposed to be focussed on the pedestrians?</p> | <p>Please run a proper public consultation that all are aware of and give time for people to come up with some great ideas of how to use and access this island site otherwise it will become a disused area of benefit to no one.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCBJ-H | 2017-12-14 18:05:21 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Taking your features and benefits, for example:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "The junction returns to its historic layout of three distinct streets instead of a roundabout. (The names of these streets are undecided). This creates more useable space in the form of the island site, and allows for better pedestrian movement from one side of Picardy Place to the other. " I see no relevance from the historic street layout. It would be better to have more useable space around the periphery for pedestrians and cyclists. Having 3 roads means that there are 2 roads to cross, using multiple crossings, to get across the area. It would be better if there were only 2 roads, thus allowing traversing the area via a single road crossing. 2. "The junction ensures the tram stop site is properly aligned for any extension, and has good pedestrian access and links to other public transport." There seems to be poor pedestrian access as roads will need to be crossed in order to access the tram stop. 3. "A dedicated cycleway is introduced on the Omni Centre side of the junction. This will link with the dedicated cycle way being developed on Leith Walk and will eventually link through the St James Quarter to provide improved cycling access to and through the city centre. Other segregated / shared cycleways in the junction will make bicycle travel safer and easier between all streets accessing this junction." There appears to be no direct link to the the St.James Quarter from the Omni Centre. It will be necessary to cross a congested 2-stage crossing and then cycle up "shared space" in Little King Street. <p>A) A segregated cycleway should be provided on Little King Street. B) A prime requirement is also to connect the City Centre West East Link cycleway (CCWEL) directly to the Leith Street to Leith Walk cycleway. This would best be achieved by a segregated cycleway on the North side of the central island. C) Broughton Street has great potential for cycling as it is the least steep route up to the CCWEL and to Leith Street. There needs to be a clear, direct</p> | <p>The island site should be reduced in size with the space being re-allocated to the periphery of the area to give more space to pedestrians and cyclists. The smaller island could be incorporated as a bus/tram interchange - negating the need to cross the road between tram and bus stops. Alternatively, the island site should be extended to include the road area in front of the Cathedral as one continuous public space. Traffic reduction measures need to be introduced so that there is less traffic frequenting this area and it becomes a better place for people.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBT-U</p> | <p>2017-12-14 18:25:19</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>city centre – traffic should not be treated as priority.</p> <p>This is the city centre, pedestrians should be treated as the top priority.</p> <p>Pedestrians should be able to cross the road in one crossing, rather than 3 or 4 separate crossings.</p> <p>Other cities are trying to remove traffic from the centre – Edinburgh seems to be wanting to increase the amount of traffic.</p> <p>Given Leith Street has been restricted for a year, then will be closed for 10 months, why does it need to reopen for all traffic?</p> <p>Pavement widths do not meet Edinburgh councils street design guidance of 4 meters.</p> <p>Every effort has been made to make sure cars and pollution can pass the junction without delay. Meanwhile pedestrians will take far longer to transit the junction.</p> <p>The shared narrow space between cyclists and pedestrians will not work.</p> <p>Cycling space should be separate and clearly delineated. Cycling routes should be kept away from pedestrian crossing points and desire lines.</p> <p>Floating bus stops are new in Edinburgh and just aren't working. Further research should be done before any more are rolled out. See objections from RNIB etc.</p> <p>Loss of green space outside St Marys not being replaced.</p> <p>Centre bit in middle of gyratory will be waste land. Noisy and filled with pollution. If a hotel is built, no indication of how it would be serviced.</p> | <p>The island should not be there in the first place. The area will be filled with noisy traffic and pollution.</p> <p>Council should go back to the drawing board and ensure this space is not an island.</p> <p>If a building was built in the space there is no way shown on the plans how it would be serviced. Deliveries, bus stop etc etc.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCB2-S</p> | <p>2017-12-14 19:04:04</p> |
| <p>The proposed gyratory system is far too car-centric and is a missed opportunity to create a truly cyclist/pedestrian friendly junction. It reminds me of the gyratory system at Forrest Road/Bristo Place which is really alarming to navigate as a cyclist because it creates conflict with drivers and cyclists merging into the same lane. I much prefer the Sustrans proposal or any junction that reduces the amount of road space dedicated to cars. Leith Street has been closed to vehicular traffic for months and yet life goes on - if Picardy Place was redesigned with less car capacity Edinburgh drivers would adapt and cope. In the 21st century we should not be designing junctions to increase private motor vehicle traffic! We should give pedestrians and bikes priority to encourage residents to walk or cycle. At the moment the whole Picardy Place area is very hostile to pedestrians and cyclists with heavy car traffic dominating the space and this proposal doesn't seem like an improvement.</p> | <p>I think suggesting this space will ever become a viable development is deeply optimistic/unrealistic. Who wants to cross three lanes of traffic to visit anything?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBN-N</p> | <p>2017-12-14 19:05:13</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Major concerns are provision of vehicular access to front of cathedral especially wedding and funeral cars. Also regular Masses for disabled. Will there be adequate disabled parking? Also do planners realise how much the cathedral is used? There are 3 Masses each weekday and 4 on Sundays. There will be 1000+ people each Sunday.</p> <p>Also special events e.g. Monday 11 Dec, a freezing cold evening, 300+people (and 2 guide dogs) attended a special Mass.</p> <p>There is another worry. If there was an emergency and the church had to be evacuated, where would people go. If it happened at the 12noon Mass on Sunday, 500+ people would have to be moved.</p> | <p>Can we have open space? Does everywhere have to be built on? How about a few nice trees?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCB5-V</p> | <p>2017-12-14 19:05:24</p> |
| <p>The walking route from the Playhouse to the Tesco will be very tortuous. A direct crossing point should be provided. All desire lines should be respected rather than fought against.</p> <p>The cycle route up from Broughton Street to Leith Street is unclear. Continuous cycling infrastructure should be provided.</p> <p>Not enough has been done to reduce the dominance of carriageway space. The two southbound lanes at the top of Broughton St should be reduced to one, with greater pedestrian space at the street corner by The Street.</p> <p>At least one carriageway lane of the gyratory should be reduced on all sides. This would provide space for people in all the right places including where you know this should happen, such as outside the cathedral and retail / pub entrances.</p> <p>Pedestrian crossings should be as wide as possible to create wide safe spaces for people to cross.</p> <p>A distinctive art feature should be added to the central island, such as the Bean in Chicago.</p> | <p>A distinctive art feature should be added to the central island, such as the Bean in Chicago.</p> <p>An alternative would be a recessed park/seating area.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBW-X</p> | <p>2017-12-14 19:42:43</p> |
| <p>I fully support the proposal from Spokes and Living streets to keep Leith Street closed to general traffic, as is the case now and throughout the 10 month period of construction, reopening it only to bicycles, buses and possibly taxis.</p> <p>This will allow not only dramatic improvements to the public realm designs for Picardy Place, but also significantly reduce traffic through the Waterloo Place junction and on other key streets such as North Bridge and Leith Walk.</p> <p>The Picardy Place designs should adopt the Sustrans Proposal of a crossroads at the top of Broughton St and connecting the open space with the front of the omni.</p> <p>A reasonable alternative would be to adopt the Living Streets proposal of a Y junction and connecting the public space with the Cathedral frontage.</p> <p>In addition, in all the designs, the Council should consider stopping up, or restricting access/egress to Broughton Street.</p> | <p>This space should be connected to either the frontage of the Omni, or the frontage of the Cathedral. It should be designed and developed as a high quality public space - not a commercial development.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCB1-R</p> | <p>2017-12-14 19:54:06</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| | <p>Removal of left turn into Broughton road will result in displacement of traffic to surrounding streets. For example under previous temporary diversion for trams along Albany/Abercromby place. Little consideration has been given to residents and pedestrians using these streets. There have been a number of accidents in the time since the tram diversion (perhaps in part due to higher traffic volumes from encouraged use of the route) and a lack of policing of the new 20 mph limit.</p> <p>Full assessment and modelling of potential impact required of such a change to Abercromby Place, Dublin Street and surrounding streets.</p> <p>I would encourage some form of traffic control to prevent further increase of use of Abercromby/Dublin/Albany Street. Ie Encourage use of great king street heading east (which is the status quo primary arterial route through the centre of the new town) provides wide and clear access to Broughton Street and east London street.</p> <p>Island site not ideal - much better accessible space (ie less pedestrian crossings required) under current layout.</p> <p>Consideration for alternative layout with smaller (or no) island.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCBA-8 | 2017-12-14 20:03:15 |
| <p>This is a disaster.</p> <p>The proposed gyratory roundabout is completely inappropriate in a modern city centre. "Keeping traffic moving" is wholly the wrong priority. This type of infrastructure is discredited and to build one in Edinburgh would be a backward step for the city.</p> <p>There has been no proper consultation on this. Compared to the consultation on George Street or the East West City Centre Cycle Route, the consultation has been derisory.</p> <p>It doesn't appear to comply with the Council's and the Scottish governments current thinking and policies about making quality of place more important than giving space to motor vehicles.</p> <p>It is very poor for pedestrians and for cyclists, doesn't allow desire lines to be followed and with multiple waits – many more so than for cars!</p> <p>In many modern cities that would be a civic square/piazza, not a roundabout - valuable public realm.</p> <p>It's nonsense to call it a bus/tram interchange when the routes between them are so convoluted.</p> <p>It is a throwback to the past, when it should be looking to the future.</p> | <p>Nothing permanent should be build here that would prevent its future use as quality public realm space.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCT9-J | 2017-12-14 20:29:57 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The proposed ban on LH turns from York Place to Broughton St is likely to displace traffic into residential streets and should not be progressed without traffic modelling of the likely displacement and exploration of alleviating measures. The design is to a great extent dictated by the plan to have a Picardy Place tramstop and bus interchange- although little information is provided about how that is to work. This creates the large triangular island which is markedly less easy to utilise as civic space (as boarded on all sides by main roads) than the current public realm at the Cathedral and Picardy Place, and provides little better connectivity than the roundabout. As we don't know if the tram stop is required it is premature to go ahead until a decision on the tramline extension is taken, and studies undertaken to see if it could be relocated to York Place/ Elm Row. The new cycle lane up Leith Walk to Leith St is welcome but it could be provided in conjunction with maintaining the current roundabout until the position on the tram becomes clearer. This November design is better than the September design, but that suggests that with proper consultation and a more holistic approach (as is happening in the George St and Frist New Town project) something much better could be achieved.</p> | <p>The Island should be landscaped and no buildings should be erected on it which could not be removed should it turn out that traffic reduces sufficiently over time to allow the junction to be altered to create a more unified public space in front of the Cathedral. If the tram stop does end up in Picardy Place then a temporary café and travel information centre would be possibilities, but nothing beyond one storey should be built in the Island as otherwise the pleasant vistas of Picardy Place as seen from Leith St and the Cathedral seen from Leith Walk would be lost. Also any structure should require minimal servicing so not to disrupt the flow of traffic. The Paolozzi sculptures should remain in a leafy public setting in front of the Cathedral (ideally their present setting) as the Island is too surrounded by traffic to be a safe place for children to play on them as Paolozzi intended.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBC-A</p> | <p>2017-12-14 20:54:28</p> |
| <p>I think that it will be a missed opportunity to improve the quality of the area. The principles outlined by Living Streets and the design suggested by Sustrans would be a far safer, more attractive design. It is a big mistake to have shared pedestrian and cycle space. It doesn't work in busy areas. The area has big potential for enabling high quality urban spaces given the retail area at the newly developed St James Centre and the Omni Centre. Making these spaces more attractive and usable is important if the businesses are to be successful. The fact that large numbers of people need to be accommodated when they leave the cinemas and the theatre doesn't seem to have been taken into consideration, What's also striking is the lack of trees compared with the current situation.</p> | <p>This should be landscaped to enable better walking and cycle routes and to create high quality urban space. I was told at the exhibition that the council was considering selling the space to enable commercial development to be built on the space. This would be a mistake and means that the space for cycle, walking and public transport connectivity would be damaged. Far better would be to enable sufficient dedicated space outside the Omni Centre to accommodate the late number of people who regularly use the centre as well as travelling on this key north/south route as pedestrians, cyclists and bus users. Decent landscaping would make the area more attractive to residents and tourists and make the most of the tram/bus interchange. The current plans will not accommodate the increased capacity for sustainable transport that the city needs. It looks like a very old fashioned proposal.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTX-H</p> | <p>2017-12-14 21:15:38</p> |
| <p>I think the central area is too big, it won't be usable space stuck in the middle of all that traffic and means we lose public realm space that we currently have outside cathedral and along Picardy place. I think this decision is being rushed when there is so much change happening in the area but as a local resident who regularly uses this area mainly as a pedestrian I don't think it is a good move forward.</p> | <p>I think it's ludicrous to think an island stuck between all that traffic would be useful for anything worthwhile. If it ends up been built on we lose the (already curtailed) views up to Carlton hill</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTP-9</p> | <p>2017-12-14 21:28:52</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I object to the proposals to turn Picardy Place into a traffic orientated gyratory, a layout that will last for a considerable period of time.</p> <p>It does not prioritise pedestrians or cyclists, doesn't provide an appropriate entry point to the city centre, and encourages traffic. New traffic layouts should be designed to optimise desired traffic and not to deal with existing.</p> <p>The island, which could be a valuable use of space and a suitable entry to the world heritage site, becomes nothing more than the middle of the roundabout.</p> <p>The proposals should be considered as part of the wider city centre transformation strategy.</p> <p>Finally, I suggest that your 'alternative proposal discussed with Sustrans' to be completely misleading and not representative of the latest proposals.</p> | <p>The island site should be joined connected by pavement to one side of Picardy Place and used as a public park and events space.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTZ-K</p> | <p>2017-12-14 21:45:17</p> |
| <p>little used.</p> <p>The removal of the pedestrian area in front of the cathedral is sacrilege. The cathedral is a place where a community comes together for prayer, contemplation and celebration. At present there is ample space for the congregation to arrive and depart, and a quiet place for the general public to sit or to stroll, surrounded by trees and the Paolozzi sculptures. The plans propose to remove most of this area, including the healthy trees, plus a bank of neat grass and flower beds which has been tended carefully over the years, and replace it with ... a major bus stop. Charming. No more will the peaceful cathedral space be shielded from the traffic and general hubbub. There is no need to move the bus stop from present position in York Place if the very wide pavement is made narrower. There is also a bus stop outside John Lewis which, I presume, is to remain. Why does there need to be one outside the Cathedral?</p> <p>The relocation of the Paolozzi sculptures doesn't make sense, with the hand the other side of the road outside John Lewis.</p> <p>The same appears to go for the area in front of the shops/bank/hotel on the north side. More removal of innocent trees and shrubs, plus poor old Sherlock Holmes. Loss of parking spaces there will inevitably create yet more problems for residents of the streets off Broughton Street, where parking is difficult at the best of times. The proposals appear to show some sort of single lane which has the potential to become jammed with delivery vans, rental cars and cabs and coaches dropping off hotel guests.</p> <p>I would also argue a health-and-safety issue in that the public will be much more vulnerable (exposed to motor traffic) with the removal of both these "green" pedestrian places.</p> <p>I hate to think what the plans are for the enormous triangle which, it is</p> | <p>For a start it is too large. If made smaller, it would leave more room for traffic lanes. Secondly, it's an island, requiring crossings to reach it. Crossings will require traffic lights, presumably controlled, at least to a certain extent, by pedestrians, thus creating potential congestion, which the proposals seek to address. However, if there is to be an island triangle, then at least make it a community space, where perhaps the trees and shrubs in front of Tesco and the Cathedral can be re-planted and continue to grow. The community does not want more development in the shape of buildings. Isn't there enough development going on at the new St James's Centre? Picardy Place still retains a little of its historical past; a green space will still allow visitors to see and enjoy those buildings (some of which are reflected in the glass front of the Omni Centre) and at least compensate the community a little for the potential loss of its public spaces in front of the Cathedral and Tesco.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTE-X</p> | <p>2017-12-14 22:00:38</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Please replant areas with semi mature trees and gardens</p> <p>gyratory layout, it is little better in the historic context than the current arrangement (and previous layout attempts since the demolition of Union Place) in that there is a large empty, dead space in the centre of extremely busy roads. Changing from a circle to a triangle road layout gives the central portion no improvement.</p> <p>By my estimates (taken from available bus timetables), there are ~110 buses per hour (each way) through Picardy Place, with only the number 8 using the Broughton Street - Leith Street axis, the rest go from Leith Street or York Place towards Leith Walk and London Road. This junction layout offers little in the way to priority of buses.</p> <p>The massive concentration of roads in this area concentrates pollution, kills the central space, and provides a serious obstacle to crossing from one side to the other by foot or bike without going through a diversionary series of crossings, with far too many stages to make a simple A to B crossing.</p> <p>From household statistics, commuting occupancy of cars in Edinburgh dropped from a 1.12 persons/car in 2001 to 1.08 by 2011. Cars are a hugely inefficient way of moving people through Edinburgh, most have only a single person in the. For every person who goes to work as a car passenger, there are 1.3 on a bike and 4.4 on foot. Even to meet existing patterns, pedestrians and cyclists need prioritised, never mind actually increasing provision for motor traffic through this junction. In the last 10 years, commuting by car has decreased 5% points in Edinburgh, DfT counts at survey points around #PicardyPlace are down 21% in 16yrs.</p> <p>So we have a long term and significant decrease in motor vehicle use in general in Edinburgh and specifically around this junction, so never mind building for "existing capacity", the junction being built is over capacity, and it should not be built to be able to be changed "if" traffic levels decrease, they already have!</p> | <p>Mini street plaza with planting, art and views down Leith Walk</p> <p>Let's be serious, what is proposed is simply a triangular roundabout surrounded by multiple lanes of traffic, it will not and can not be a destination of anything but unavoidable necessity.</p> <p>Why is this the only roundabout in Edinburgh where we are fooling ourselves into thinking it can be some sort of a public space? Edinburgh has plenty of dead, corporate "public" areas like Festival Square / Exchange Square / Conference Square and they aren't surrounded by traffic. This will only be worse.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTK-4</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTQ-A</p> | <p>2017-12-14 22:14:07</p> <p>2017-12-14 22:16:39</p> |
|---|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Public space is being reduced. Especially outside St Mary's Cathedral. Even though the space here with the sculptures dates from 1992 it has been successful in getting people to sit outside, enjoy the trees, art and the regular markets. Its proper 'placemaking' which will be reduced and destroyed by this plan. Firstly the space will be reduced. But there will be more space for cars. The trees are being ripped out and any replacements will be twigs in comparison. The Paolozzi sculptures which were conceived as a group are going to be split with a road between them. One of their uses was the Paolozzi wanted them to be played on by children - by a road this won't be safe. They were made SPECIFICALLY for this exact site by him as it commemorates the older site of the Scots Italian Club which was in Picardy in the 1930's. By splitting them and resisting them the council is destroying in intrinsic part of their aesthetic power.</p> <p>How are pedestrians going to access bus stops and trams stops with 3 lane roads to traverse? How long will the traffic be stopped or will it be stopped at all? Will we have to play chicken on zebra crossings?</p> <p>WHY are we planning for trams when they haven't been agreed yet? Why can't the bus exchanges be lower down on Elm Row or York Place?</p> <p>As a pedestrian I do not want to share crossing points with cyclists or have them cycling over pavements.</p> <p>I do not want the greenery beside the Sherlock Homes Statue turned into more roads. I thought the council was committed to reducing traffic?</p> <p>Just how are pedestrians going to get to the Playhouse?</p> <p>All in all the Picardy Place Giratory is about giving more lanes and room to cars, taking away amenity and allowing pedestrians to risk their lives crossing. The space is a glorified traffic island. Create a more pleasant space for pedestrians by discouraging traffic and creating a pedestrianized space such as in the Grassmarket. It would assist if at least one or two sides of the triangle were pedestrian access only.</p> <p>I'm amazed that your proposals seem to include very little awareness of the daily pedestrian traffic along this route. I walk past this way once a day on my way from town and down Broughton Street, and there are already many, many pedestrians who use the route. These proposals, seem to prioritise motor traffic over pedestrians and bicycles, going against the Council's and Scottish Government's plans for active transport and reduction in car use & carbon emissions. Similarly, moving trees and considering replacing them, rather than committing to maintain some greenspace in a busy & polluted spot, it not acceptable.</p> | | | |
| | <p>Even if there was a bridge over the road or a tunnel getting to the 'island' - the Council cannot seriously contemplate this with the amount of traffic travelling around it the air pollution will make being on it a health hazzard. The idea of it being filled with retail, cultural, commercial and hospitality is utterly ridiculous.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCT8-H | 2017-12-14 22:18:40 |
| | <p>A park! We need more green spaces and trees in the city centre and less traffic.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCTU-E | 2017-12-14 22:25:51 |
| | <p>Why not use it as a green space - or else follow Sustrans' suggestion of creating a pedestrian plaza and not having a 3-way gyratory but instead making it a two-way jnction, with more space for pedestrians & the public. If it's an island in the middle of a 3-lane gyratory, why would anyone want to do anything with that? It's going to be impossible to access safely.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FCT4-D | 2017-12-14 22:41:41 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Leith Street, or at least the part between Princes Street and Calton Road, should be permanently closed to general traffic (but open to buses). The current temporary arrangements have shown that this solution would be workable.</p> <p>This should take place as part of a concerted effort to reduce private vehicle traffic in and around central Edinburgh, including measures to discourage/prevent summer visitors to the city from using private vehicles in the central areas.</p> <p>Building on this, the proposals for Picardy Place should be remodelled for lower general traffic flow, particularly to and from Leith Street. This should allow narrower roadways and more space for pedestrians and public use.</p> <p>The (long gone) historic triangular street plan is irrelevant. Local people are used to the welcome feeling of open space that Picardy Place currently provides, and the historic street plan should not be used as an excuse for inappropriate overdevelopment of the site.</p> <p>Whatever the final street layout, it should prioritise the movement of pedestrians and the pleasantness of the area for pedestrians and local residents.</p> <p>The road layout should form a simple junction rather than forming a large traffic island in the middle. Either this could be similar to the Y-shape proposed by Sustrans, or the central area should be connected to the Omni Centre side of the triangle (which possibly has the highest level of pedestrian traffic?), with Leith Street curving round in front of the cathedral to meet York Place and Broughton Street in a crossroads.</p> | <p>Any building should be single storey and take up no more than a third of the site - in other words, the site should be a pleasant public open space with perhaps a cafe or similar.</p> <p>As stated earlier, the open nature of the site is an important asset that should not be sacrificed. All that is needed is for it to be made more pleasant and accessible for pedestrians.</p> <p>There should be no question of commercial agreements, which have not been subject to any meaningful public scrutiny, prejudicing the future use of the site.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTM-6</p> | <p>2017-12-14 22:43:39</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>mistakes planners made 50 years ago - worshipping and building altars to the motor car while ignoring the real needs of the majority of inhabitants.</p> <p>This development is being rushed through by the Council based on outdated plans and decisions taken more than 10 years ago. Stop and think again about what type of city you , and more importantly, the majority of the people who live here, really want.</p> <p>Picardy Place is an opportunity to develop a great public space in the heart of the city and breathe new life into the area. Instead we are being given an enormous, dangerous, car clogged roundabout. It is a hideous plan which the council and councillors should be deeply ashamed of.</p> <p>I have searched in vain on the council website to find the council evidence behind the proposed solution. Where is the council evidence that a gyratory roundabout of this design will enhance user experience? It will do nothing at all to promote the local area - it will merely allow private vehicular motor traffic to flow faster through the city centre - that is not what the council should be looking to achieve. Where are the all day bus lanes that would allow buses to avoid being delayed? Why do pedestrians have to cross so many lanes of traffic? Why are there so many lanes of traffic in the first place? The idea that a road system must be designed to avoid long queues of traffic is both laughable and outdated. All the evidence suggests that increasing road capacity simply generates traffic. This gyratory system will inevitably produce the same result - right in the middle of one of the most beautiful and historic cities in Europe</p> <p>There is no reason why the redesign of this junction must work for everyone who currently uses it - the point is to decide how the city want it to be used in the future and design it accordingly. As Adam McVey rightly said in a public speech recently:</p> | <p>What a total waste of space. This should be an accessible public space not a giant island in the middle of multiple traffic lanes.</p> <p>This land belongs to the people of Edinburgh. It should be given over to the creation of a public pedestrian space linked to and not cut off from the land in front of the Cathedral. A park, play areas, seating,</p> <p>Whatever design is ultimately adopted, this space should not be given up to yet more retail/commercial/hospitality development- there is simply no need for it. Who wants to shop, work or sleep in an island in the middle of a sea of cars? Is that the best that Edinburgh can offer?</p> <p>Change the design to</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCT3-C</p> | <p>2017-12-14 22:44:17</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I regularly cycle from Broughton St to the Bridges via Leith Street. This layout offers no improvement over the current one.</p> <p>Apparently no access from Broughton St to the cycleway in front of the cathedral? Looks like the options are to go round the (now longer) roundabout / gyratory (implying going downhill to go uphill). Or to cross Queen St with pedestrians (the existing crossing is always busy just with people). Then the route onward to Leith St seems to just end outside John Lewis.</p> <p>On the Omni Centre side, where will the segregated cycle route fit? The pavement has several choke points (e.g. near the bus stops and crossing to John Lewis) caused by poor design of the office buildings (i.e. the steps down to them). It's a challenge getting a pushchair or wheelchair along there. I don't think that the space exists for the cycleway, it will be encroached on unless a commitment is made to widen the pavement / narrow the roadway.</p> <p>If cycling round the gyratory we're being invited to cross tram tracks. The potential for being forced into a dangerous approach angle on such a busy section of road is too high.</p> <p>The "middle lane" problem still exists -- only confident cyclists can get into / remain in the correct lane for entering the gyratory. Again, no improvement over the existing roundabout.</p> | <p>In general I think that these plans have been too rushed (at least in public). So making them effectively permanent by building in the middle of the road would be really foolish.</p> <p>A concert hall has been proposed here -- it would need serious soundproofing to not be full of traffic noise. And there can't be much call for relaxing drinks in the middle of a busy roundabout either.</p> <p>Aesthetically, why block more of the view up to Calton Hill.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTF-Y</p> | <p>2017-12-14 22:55:27</p> |
| <p>An absolute waste of an opportunity to maximise pedestrian, cycle use. This area should be a space to be admired by tourists and enjoyed by locals. This is the chance to show positive movement towards sustainable transport that is required now in Edinburgh. To create a dead spaced roundabout is an embarrassment. This along with other drivel such as adding 70cm to path outside Balgreen Primary school for pedestrian and bikes to share sums up the actual minimal commitment given to transforming this city. Embarrassing when the transformations being done across Europe and Canada can be easily seen by a google search. So fast forward 20 years to gridlock and COPD for a generation of kids attending school on the councils "strategic route" Balgreen Road. More consultations then... maybe too little too late. Fix this now.</p> | <p>Useable island site?! Who is going to spend time in the middle of a multi laned round about? Is this an actual joke?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCT7-G</p> | <p>2017-12-14 23:25:29</p> |
| <p>Mixed cycle pedestrian zones do not seem a good idea for cycle commuting.</p> <p>If the space between the island and cathedral is to be used for buses to turn and stop then this should be a mixed use pedestrian / bus zone with traffic calmed and the priority use / style of paving for pedestrians. No private vehicle access to be allowed.</p> <p>Alternatively, there could be a tunnel arrangement or green bridge to allow continuity of access between sculpture area and island. This need only be as high as single decker buses.</p> <p>Priority should be given to pedestrian flow on all sides over the needs of bikes, cars, trams etc.</p> | <p>A range of small scale rather than large chain outlets would be welcome but a substantial proportion should be put over to green space, especially trees, to aid water infiltration, muffle noise and improve air quality.</p> <p>Considering how much residential property has been developed out of this area, a block of social housing should be built; introducing a community with a vested interest in protecting the area into the future.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTT-D</p> | <p>2017-12-14 23:32:17</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I much prefer the Y option, what is going to be suitably done in the middle of the junction? There was talk of some not for profit centre in the middle of that polluted junction? Is this what is happening? Would there be car parking spots on the centre area? What about blocking the fine view down Leith Walk?</p> <p>How come so many more cars are now to be allowed to park on the shopping development? How come footpath space is lost, traversing around the junction is now more complicated and safe bike space is not guaranteed on all routes around there?</p> <p>Why is the motor car and the developers desires being prioritised? The major train and bus stations of the city are all around here we do not need to be prioritising more cars!</p> | <p>Park if anything, greenery, trees, to somewhat combat the pollution of motor vehicles. Install public artworks on a rotating basis, a Sherlock Holmes dedicated grove, tourist attraction, public 'speakers corner' platform, buskers and street performers, nothing involving more cars or commercial activity! And why not think about the Y layout and not this island!</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTD-W</p> | <p>2017-12-14 23:42:00</p> |
| <p>spaces which bring both vehicular and cycle traffic closer to pedestrians. The area outside the Omni Centre, the Playhouse and the various bars and eating places around them is already one of the busiest sections of this part of town - where are all these people to go, when the space they have to move in has been cut back?</p> <p>The central island looks marooned in a sea of circulating traffic. If this is where the tram will drop people, as seems to be represented in the PDF diagram, where are they to go once they are left on the island? How are they to get across three lanes of traffic, plus a further dedicated cycle lane on one side?</p> <p>This central area is marked 'Future Development Area', which immediately rings alarm bells. This implies that additional development here is a foregone conclusion - it WILL happen - and no indication is given about what kind of development is envisaged.. Can we rely on this being an area for people to meet, to rest and to mingle, or - as I suspect - is this being earmarked for further commercial 'development'? If so, then people will effectively be sandwiched between heavy traffic flows and retail outlets. I cannot see this being a pleasant space to spend time in - it will just add to the increasingly frenetic pace of the city, and it will be surrounded by noise and traffic fumes.</p> <p>I think what the Council should be doing is preserving, and ideally adding to, green spaces wherever possible. Defined and separate cycling lanes, where bikes and people can move parallel to one another but each within their own defined areas, are a good idea but not when sandwiched in this way between busy traffic and heavily used pedestrian areas. This proposal seems to me to be prioritising faster traffic flows at the expense of people.</p> | <p>As indicated in my previous response, this 'island' appears to maroon people in the middle of traffic.</p> <p>Obvious issues present themselves. If the 'island' is filled with such mixed-use developments, how will they be supplied and serviced? How will pedestrian flows to/from the various outlets across the traffic flows on each of the three sides be handled? The previous diagram showed a number of trees, which seem to have vanished from this representation - how much green space will be left once you pack in some retail, some commercial, some cultural and some hospitality spaces?</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTB-U</p> | <p>2017-12-14 23:46:11</p> |
| <p>Cycling provision is disjointed and having two way segregated paths means extra crossing requirements. Ensure that any two way segregated paths at 3m or more wide.</p> | <p>Soft landscaping with public art or similar. Bike share/hire location</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTS-C</p> | <p>2017-12-15 00:35:23</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>pedestrians and cyclists? - YES it does.</p> <p>I totally endorse the view of Spokes and Sustrans and Living Streets as well as The Cockburn Association - I am not sure if you'd like me to reiterate them here. but in principle Picardy Place as it links to Leith Street, York Place and maybe Broughton Street, needs to prioritise people, bicycles and public transport, in that order.</p> <p>The aim of the Transformation, as in the originating Council motion, which is to:</p> <p>"... to improve the public realm in the city centre with the aim of making it more pleasant, reducing motor traffic substantially, and improving conditions for, and prioritising access for, pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users ..."</p> <p>Traffic and tram</p> <p>In a nutshell: The Picardy Place redesign as proposed by City of Edinburgh Council does not meet my expectations.</p> <p>I live in North Leith and every week walk and/or at this time of year take the bus (buses) into the City Centre and the Old Town (I used Leith Walk's new cycle way last week and aside from four vehicles parked on the track uphill, it was very good indeed - on my way down to Kirkgate a couple of bike lane parkers, but overall a massive 7/10 - an A-grade were you being examined - i.e. a whole new cycling experience that encourages me to use this route all year round, rather than just spring to autumn).</p> <p>On the back of this, in summer I cycle 75%+ more than I do now in winter...the new Leith Walk cycle lane may make a difference now that I have</p> | <p>The island site as far as I understand comprises inalienable common good land. You obviously think otherwise. Please can you confirm if and/or not which parts of this central triangle is common good land that I believe to be inalienable?</p> <p>Were you to sell it off and/or develop it presumably it would be a matter for a Court of Session to expedite as well as for public consultation - i.e. in advance vs in retrospect as with the current 'public consultation'?</p> <p>The worry here is that not only will the triangle be built upon above ground, but that deep ground excavation will be proposed for a subterranean development opportunity in order to monetise what is otherwise a no-man's-land?</p> <p>The alternative, is to incorporate it into a pedestrianised plaza with cycle-friendly space projecting from St Mary's Metropolitan Cathedral.</p> <p>Otherwise, realistically it is 'dead' space i.e. only attractive to marginalised developers that'll try anything there and sell their idea/if not the real estate with planning permission to the hilt?</p> <p>I.e. forget the triangle gyratory and go for something new like the T/Y-junction that allows a public realm in front of St Mary's Metropolitan Cathedral - seriously, it is worth trialling.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTH-1</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FCT2-B</p> | <p>2017-12-15 02:59:40</p> <p>2017-12-15 06:18:32</p> |
| <p>There would be nowhere for funeral hearses, family wedding cars or disabled drivers to stop or to park when they require to attend mass services at the foremost Catholic church in Scotland.</p> <p>This can't be right? There must be some mistake?</p> <p>The church is at the heart of our christian country, this church provides a huge service to the community. It serves the whole of Edinburgh and outlying districts. It also serves the whole of Scotland.</p> <p>This amenity of parking for these extremely important purposes cannot be lost, the church and its community will struggle to function without the amenity of the area of land it has used for these purposes, openly and peaceably for well over 40 years...</p> <p>It may well hold title to this land</p> | <p>The Island site requires to be much smaller, in order that the area outside St Mary's Catholic cathedral can be retained for use by the church for services to the community such as for funeral hearses, family wedding cars, a place to park for disabled drivers attending mass services and church events, stopping and parking for visiting dignitaries, foreign dignitaries and representatives, any royal visitors, tour buses bringing pilgrims or visitors to the main catholic church in the country of Scotland, and/or to Scotland's national shrine to it's patron saint, St Andrew, etc....</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCT5-E</p> | <p>2017-12-15 07:03:29</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>This layout prioritises the movement of motor vehicles over all other movements (tram, bus, pedestrian, etc.) This is simply the wrong prioritisation in a 21st century city; around the world cities are recognising that they can never build enough space for cars, and they people need to be encouraged to use alternative modes of transport, for the benefit of their health, the health of others, and the environment. The design should be completely re-thought in order to prioritise the movements of pedestrians and cyclists, busses and trams and their passengers.</p> | <p>The island site should not exist in this form. Who is going to do battle with 3 lanes of traffic to get to it? It will just be a dead and empty piece of tarmac.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCTA-T</p> | <p>2017-12-15 08:38:35</p> |
| <p>- I'm really happy to see good dedicated cycle lanes! But I want to stress that it is not clear how these will interact with bus stops. I would also like to make the point that good cycle lock-up facilities are important to make this a desirable destination for cyclists.</p> <p>- I'm not convinced about the shared cycle/pedestrian space. In my experience, this doesn't work well, ends in pedestrians milling everywhere making it unsafe and stressful for both groups. However, something would have to ensure good and safe cycle connectivity from Leith walk to Broughton St and York Place, as currently it is not clear how this would be done without merging with traffic or pedestrians. In addition, if you are planning to ask cyclists to dismount, it is not a viable solution, cyclists don't dismount and it's incredibly frustrating and results in bottlenecks.</p> <p>- I'm concerned about the amount of private traffic that this will prioritise. It doesn't seem to be in line with modern views that private traffic should be the lowest priority when designing cities. I appreciate the need to keep traffic flowing however and certainly am concerned with air quality so don't wish to increase that. However, I feel that we are not making the city more liveable and will mostly be replicating what we have today in terms of how the space is used. I live just around the corner and mostly just find it a nightmare to move through on foot or bike currently, and cannot see how this new plan would contribute significantly to making this a more liveable part of the city.</p> | <p>It would be lovely to have a park area here with benches and a space for a proper farmers market! There is a wee food truck bit at the cathedral but it's mainly just selling snacks. It would be so nice if there was a proper market to get actual produce there. It would contribute to local food culture and the good food nation bill and being part of a sustainable city.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCT1-A</p> | <p>2017-12-15 08:46:04</p> |
| <p>Too much provision for cars. Council policy is to improve experience for pedestrians and cyclists and this plan does not support these aims. "Streets are places for people" and have important non-transport role" Awkward crossings for pedestrians. This is a major route for pedestrians getting across town - why make it so miserable. Consider closing Leith Street to traffic except buses. Access has been restricted for a year and now closed completely and world has not come to an end.</p> <p>This scheme is old fashioned and backward looking. City deal has deliniqued for bypass etc so concentrate on getting cars around outside of Edinburgh and not through it.</p> | <p>Development on island equals traffic. Redesign plan and have island accessible to pedestrians.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWX-4</p> | <p>2017-12-15 09:02:35</p> |
| <p>There is no easy and clear way to cycle from Broughton Street to Leith Street. Also, the proposed cycle routes involve areas of shared space with pedestrians at shared crossings and the West East route that will come along York Place, then has to go down in front of the Cathedral to join the cycleway from Leith Street (that will eventually continue down the East side of the area to join the Leith Walk cycleways at Montgomery/Annandale) rather than the more direct route across the top of the central island.</p> | | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWP-V</p> | <p>2017-12-15 09:10:08</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| Important points to consider: (1) Trees will be lost during this development. These must all be replaced to ensure that wildlife connectivity networks are maintained. (2) Pedestrian access across the streets must be as quick, simple, and efficient as possible. At the moment it's a terrible area to cross the road. We need a step change in the ease of access for pedestrians, not an increment. | How about an urban wildlife biodiversity area? Plant wildflowers, which will encourage pollinators. A selection of native shrubs and trees will provide nest sites for birds. This will help us tackle decline in our native wildlife, and provide connectivity networks, linking up greenspace in the city | ANON-8G9D-FSWG-K | 2017-12-15 09:42:24 |
| Creating what is in essence an urban motorway in this area is a disastrous idea that seems to belong in the Sixties and will in no way encourage active travel - in fact, induced demand will likely lead to worsen congestion and pollution. Please do not do this. High quality alternative suggestions have been made to you by groups such as Sustrans, Living Streets Edinburgh and others - please listen to them and build something that will attract people to this area and make it a showcase for a 21st Century approach to Place. | Don't create an island - a space surrounded by 3 lanes of traffic on every side is not going to be a pleasant place to be and will not see the footfall that could be possible here. Make sure this space connects to the rest of the site on at least one side so that there is continuous pedestrian and cycling access (in part, at least). | ANON-8G9D-FSWQ-W | 2017-12-15 09:48:00 |
| <p>I write on behalf of the G1 Group Plc, owners of a building at Picardy Place, adjacent to the subject area. To date the G1 Group, despite being adjoining owners have not been invited to attend the stakeholder workshops. I have raised this issue with Councillor Miller.</p> <p>Had we been invited to attend the stakeholder workshop we would have raised a number of issues set out below. We have however visited both the Vin Caffé display and the City Art centre consultation display and are fully conversant with the proposals. I respond succinctly in my capacity as a chartered Planner and Urban Designer.</p> <p>The G1 Group PLC does not support the Council's current proposals for the redesign of Picardy Place. The design appears to have little merit in public realm terms in a city that exhibits world heritage status. Picardy Place/ Cathedral is a gateway into the World Heritage Site – not a traffic flow gyratory. The focus of this proposal on traffic management and not heritage and urban design is therefore a concern.</p> <p>The spirit of the scheme is essentially dominated by traffic flow rather than by people and the public realm which they inhabit. We would like to see a well thought out scheme founded in recognised urban design principles; one which knits old and new city fabric together and provides spaces between buildings that are dominated by people, not cars, buses or trams. There are many better solutions that could be investigated and we should look to the experts in world heritage for their input. At each of the display events we attended there was no urban designer present to discuss this issue with.</p> <p>The current scheme separates city fabric rather than drawing it together. We would welcome a scheme which provides opportunities to improve the setting of the cathedral and Picardy Place's historic buildings. Opportunities for a civic, breathing space between these key buildings would also be a desire. We would therefore implore the council to re-examine the proposal and look at it from an urban design opportunity perspective rather than a traffic management one.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FSWU-1 | 2017-12-15 10:13:21 |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Removing the trees and bringing traffic closer to the Cathedral will have a detrimental effect on the appearance and functionality of this vibrant pedestrian area without conferring any benefits for amenity. The proposed plan, if implemented, would significantly mar the appearance of area. Traffic will no longer be screened from view (at present screening is provided by the 2 attractive curved lines of trees at the Cathedral and on Picardy Place). Moreover, the Cathedral will lose its drop off points and therefore be less accessible for people attending events such as weddings, and more generally, for people who are disabled and attend services on a regular basis. The traffic flow in the area is likely to be increased by the gyratory design. This is not consistent with nation-wide calls to reduce traffic in order to reduce air pollution and the health problems it causes - a health and safety problem that would be amplified by the proposed enlarged central island with traffic circulating around it. The space should be returned to the Cathedral frontage as it is with the Paolozzi sculptures in their former position rather than diminished by the proposal to have them divided by a road, close to traffic and, also no longer an accessible attraction for children as it was in previous months. As a local resident, I am concerned about the many negative consequences that would ensue if the proposal is implemented; it is far from clear what the benefits are that would outweigh the reduction in usable public space, the increase in volume of traffic, the inconvenience to pedestrians and the impaired appearance of the area overall.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FCTC-V | 2017-12-15 10:17:22 |
| <p>In a word, this is awful. You should be prioritising sustainable and active travel not private vehicles. Multi lane roundabouts are hideous places for pedestrians, public transport users trying to cross traffic and cyclists.</p> | <p>What an attractive place that will be, surrounded by three lanes of traffic and associated pollution. It will be about as popular as the middle of Picardy Place is right now.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSWB-E | 2017-12-15 10:18:57 |
| <p>priority should be to 1. pedestrians, including traffic light sequencing to using modern system with timer indication, no situation where everyone is at red, nothing moving. pleasant landscaping for pedestrians with shrubs kept low for visibility. 2. key tourist areas should have public art, seating and bins 3.layout cannot be viewed in isolation as best access for cars/cyclists or trams 4. Cathedral needs protection from future bids to build in front of it 5. small informal markets we have had are to be welcomed, seating to enjoy coffee etc, some rain cover .6 avoid creating new wind tunnels</p> | <p>where is the long ago last seen art installation that changed colours/ future of the Paolozzi ones should be returned, Gayfield clock also and some pigeon sculptures and Sherlock Holmes.... Look at NYC redevelopment of Columbus Circle for inspiration, new pedestrian area, many crossings, landscaping etc etc</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSW3-Y | 2017-12-15 10:19:39 |
| <p>The roundabout provides good traffic flow. It's slightly unclear where the pedestrian crossings would be and therefore whether these would impede traffic flow. As well as putting the current sculptures back are there any plans for commissioning any new public art? It's important that you do replant trees for those that you are cutting down so that there is an element of green public space. It is also unclear what exactly you are proposing to put on the newly created central island (ie: terrible coffee shop or some kind of green public space?)</p> | <p>No to more unnecessary coffee shops, bars or hotels - there are plenty in the Omni Centre and neighbourhood. Let's have some good and visually arresting public art to counteract the St James Golden Turd and a green space to replace all the trees and shrubs that you are taking away to make the Picardy Place Tram stop.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSWF-J | 2017-12-15 10:26:12 |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>For all of the below reasons I strongly object to the city of Edinburgh Council's proposals for the area of land in front of St Mary's Catholic Cathedral, Edinburgh, Scotland.</p> <p>There is Established Use of area of Land in front of St Mary's Catholic Cathedral:</p> <p>* Funeral hearses and wedding cars: The area of land immediately in front of St Mary's Catholic cathedral provides access and parking for funeral hearses, which require to drop off and pick up coffins at any time, and for wedding cars to drop off and collect brides and grooms at any time.</p> <p>* Disabled Drivers: The area of land immediately in front of St Mary's Catholic cathedral provides access and parking for disabled drivers and parishioners who otherwise would be unable to access and park there in order to attend mass, religious services and events.</p> <p>* Visiting Dignitaries and Important Guests: St Mary's Catholic Cathedral is the foremost Catholic Church in Scotland, since it is the roman Catholic Cathedral serving Edinburgh as Scotland's capital city. The area of land immediately in front of St Mary's Catholic cathedral is often required to provide access and parking for visiting dignitaries and other extremely important guests.</p> <p>* City of Edinburgh Council's Town Planning: Edinburgh is one of the foremost capital cities of the world and attracts many, many visitors from all over the world. It encompasses the National Shrine to St Andrew, Scotland's national saint. It would therefore be shameful to alter the area of land immediately in front of Scotland's foremost Catholic Cathedral in this way. This area should therefore reflect the importance and uses of this church. The area of land should also provide all of the functions and amenities required of such an area.</p> | | | |
| <p>This lay out appears to prioritise private car travel through this particular junction over all other users, which is in conflict with stated objectives of both the Scottish Government and City of Edinburgh Council.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FSWY-5 | 2017-12-15 10:42:59 |
| <p>The proposal for a public space, in the middle of a small, fast moving gyratory with heavy traffic on all sides is ludicrous.</p> | <p>Any use of this island site will be unpleasant, impractical (involving multi stage crossings) and unpopular</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSW7-3 | 2017-12-15 10:48:57 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Street, runs through Picardy Place. It must be direct and of high quality – but in the current plans it is seriously indirect, and its quality is compromised by diversion through a small and constricted pedestrian/cycle traffic island at the John Lewis corner.</p> <p>2.) Maximum flexibility must be retained, to allow future adaptability in conjunction with the above City Centre Transformation. In particular, this means landscaping the big island inside the gyratory, not building on it</p> <p>3.) Broughton Street to/from Leith Street are important cyclist route connections – they must be direct and convenient</p> <p>4.) Shared pedestrian/cycle space has been reduced, but should be replaced altogether with separate facilities, including side-by-side road crossings rather than shared 'toucans.'</p> <p>It was clear that the current proposals were inadequate when their failure to support pedestrians and cyclists was highlighted by Sustrans who said they could no longer engage with the council whilst the plans still included a gyratory. They state, 'The gyratory concept does not adequately balance the pressure of traffic, with the opportunity to create a successful, quality public space and transport interchange.'</p> <p>'Currently, and under the proposed designs, Picardy Place would be a weak link between these projects, and cycle infrastructure along Leith Street. Given the context of the GAM, Sustrans thinks that any potential development for the junction-centre should not be delivered until the gyratory is removed, either leading to, or in response to a reduction in through traffic.'</p> <p>I understand that the City of Edinburgh Council is bound by the Growth Accelerator Model and that a significant amount of funding is dependent on creating a gyratory junction but it is imperative that this is reconsidered. I have recently submitted a response to the Low Emissions Zone consultation and if the Council wants to reduce air pollution it needs to ensure modal shift from cars to active travel and public transport. We have to start linking policy with the appropriate action. Please don't constrain all those living in and</p> | <p>As stated earlier the whole design needs a rethink, so I don't want to comment on what should be done with these inadequate facilities.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWK-Q</p> | <p>2017-12-15 10:50:22</p> |
| <p>The design is very poor prioritising cars over all other forms of traffic. Priority needs to be given to buses with dedicated and policed bus lanes. Segregated cycle lanes should also be added. The design should aim to reduce car use in this area, particularly considering the very low car ownership rates in Leith.</p> | <p>The Island site, surrounded by 3 lanes off traffic would be a very unpleasant place. The area would benefit from a public area, physically connected to the Cathedral or Omnicentre. No development should take place on this site.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWR-X</p> | <p>2017-12-15 10:50:34</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>Don't build a three lane gyratory.</p> <p>Seriously, don't build a three lane gyratory.</p> <p>An island in the middle of a three lane gyratory is not a "usable space". Nobody wants to sit in the middle of a muckle great roundabout, surrounded on all sides by three lanes of cars. Usable space has to be *connected* to the edges of the street, as they've done in Trafalgar Square.</p> <p>The tram link can be done without building a gyratory. Indeed, with a Y-junction, the bus stops could be much closer to the tram stop.</p> <p>Pedestrian and cyclist access would be far better with a Y-junction, which would have the space to incorporate segregated facilities along all the desire lines, instead of forcing people to cross multiple staggered pedestrian crossings just to get from one side of the square to the other.</p> <p>Stop worrying about traffic congestion. If you make it walking and cycling easier than driving, people will do it. That means that building high quality cycling infrastructure has to go along with *reducing* possible flow rates of motor traffic. You don't do that by building a three lane gyratory. Traffic evaporation will take place anyway, so you shouldn't be trying to accommodate current levels of traffic. You have a golden opportunity here to design a place in the city centre which people want to walk or cycle through, instead of driving - seize it.</p> <p>I'll say it one more time - don't you dare build a gyratory.</p> | <p>This is not a "usable space". Usable space is easy to get to (i.e., doesn't require one to cross three lanes of traffic!) . Usable space is pleasant to sit in. Nobody sat or stood around in the old Picardy Place roundabout. I can't see why this will be different when there's even more traffic around it.</p> <p>Usable space is not plonked in the middle of a three lane gyratory.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSW4-Z</p> | <p>2017-12-15 10:58:24</p> |
| <p>I feel there is far too much space given over to traffic lanes in this proposal, and that the island space in the middle of the proposal will be a wasted area of public space that will be little used and potentially become a litter strewn, desolate space. Far better to improve areas in front of the church to create a space that is connected to existing pedestrian routes and cycleways. Providing a massive roundabout seems contradictory to the future of this city and the current proposal seems massively disappointing and lacking in imagination.</p> | <p>Given that the whole proposal gives over too much space to traffic, developing the island site would mean that even more public space is lost to development and would, I feel, make the area seem too cramped. If a public plaza was placed in front of St Mary's with small scale café and restaurant uses, this would be far more in keeping with the leisure uses and complement the current attractions in the area than a difficult to access hotel on a roundabout.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWH-M</p> | <p>2017-12-15 11:03:04</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>can see there are numerous respected bodies who are completely against it, informed members of the public think it's a terrible idea, numerous politicians say that it's unsuitable, and the word on the street is that many council officers think it's the wrong solution. It seems that what is driving this plan is a deeply traditional transport planning outlook.</p> <p>As I understand it the agreed vision is: "By 2030, to make Edinburgh's transport system one of the most environmentally friendly, healthiest and most accessible in northern Europe."</p> <p>Are these just fancy words designed to placate a demanding public or to gain votes for someone?</p> <p>This could have been lifted from the long-dead plans for inner city motorways and ring roads for Edinburgh... which themselves offer testament to the designs that result from handing important decisions to those whose job it is to maximise traffic throughput at the expense of all else.</p> <p>Traffic modelling is beside the point. This is the middle of Scotland's capital city. If we're comparing ourselves to Europe (as in the statement above) look to Utrecht where they replaced waterway with motorway based on this kind of thinking... and recently tore out the motorway to put the waterway back. This is a 40-50 year mistake... from the point when a decision is taken to turn back... and Edinburgh's not taken that decision yet. Even Birmingham is ahead of us, having torn up significant parts of its inner ring road in the 1990s or so... pedestrianising its key city centre streets around the same time. That's about 25 years ahead of us...</p> <p>If we plan to make Edinburgh "one of the most environmentally friendly, healthiest and most accessible in northern Europe" then we will need to take decisions which DO reduce the ability of the city centre to carry through</p> | <p>Development of this site will fail under the current plan - becoming at best a hotel with no character. There are few uses for such a space once it is cut off from city life in the way envisaged. I've stayed in such a hotel in another UK city. It had no soul - and no place in the city landscape except for those arriving by car. If anything the development of the site in this way cast the surrounding area into a more gloomy space. This is a disastrous outcome for this prime city centre site.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWT-Z</p> | <p>2017-12-15 11:14:45</p> |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>including Living Streets Scotland and Sustrans.</p> <p>This is an important site for the City and there is an opportunity to create a quality public space while balancing the needs of active travel, public transport and other traffic. Picardy Place should be a place where people want to be rather than just a through route.</p> <p>Edinburgh is making huge progress in promoting active travel and public transport – it would be a shame if the opportunity to create something inspiring is missed.</p> <p>We have concerns about the proposals as they stand, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •The three lane gyratory proposal puts people travelling on foot and by bicycle at a disadvantage as it forces them to share inadequate space at the side of a very wide road built for the benefit of people in vehicles •The desire lines of people travelling on foot and by bicycle are compromised to encourage free flowing traffic resulting in circuitous routes for all active travellers •The three-lane gyratory and associated increase in car parking at the St. James's centre from 500 spaces to 1650 spaces contradicts many local and national policies, strategies and visions to encourage active travel and put private cars at the bottom of any transport hierarchy •The three-lane gyratory has been justified with reference to traffic modelling that does not consider the increase in people choosing to travel actively rather than drive and the result, due to induced demand, will be more vehicles dominating a potentially pleasant public space reducing the amenity of Picardy Place for all residents of and visitors to Edinburgh. <p>In our opinion proposals should be revisited and there should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Less space given to motorised traffic | | ANON-8G9D-FCV8-K | 2017-12-15 11:20:03 |
| <p>As both resident and parishioner, I'm very concerned about the pace of this process and certainly don't think enough time is being provided at the consultation stage for these plans.</p> <p>It was brought to the attention of all the parishioners, that the proposal will have a dramatic effect on all cathedral activities, and will have a drastic impact on funerals, weddings, the elderly and anyone disabled in particular. These designs seem to be all about traffic flow, rather than a focus on people, cyclists and pedestrians - and overall it feels like instead of looking into the future and putting plans in place with a design that will satisfy the majority, you are looking into the past, and not taking advantage of expertise available.</p> <p>Please take on board the concerns of everyone who has seen the proposed plans and take time to consider what will work best for the future of the East End of Edinburgh.</p> <p>As a resident of Leith and parishioner, motorist and pedestrian, I fervently disagree with this proposal as it stands at the moment.</p> | | ANON-8G9D-FSWS-Y | 2017-12-15 11:43:42 |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>While almost anything is better than the current layout, this proposal fails miserably as a key city centre location. The Developers' huge gyratory proposal is a disaster and should be dumped, the Sustrans T-layout should be further developed.</p> <p>Instead of an attractive place, the developers' car-centric gyratory is an example of failed 1960s ideas, with sub-standard provision for public transport, walking and cycling; these seem to be tagged on afterwards instead of being planned .</p> <p>For example,</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. people who walk or cycle in any direction generally have to cross multiple lanes. As you emphasise "traffic flow" (=private cars) it is to be expected that the traffic light timings will be as bad as they are in Princes Street, with long waits where huge crowds of people will build up in the small spaces allocated to them. 2. This could be a good public transport interchange, but instead the bus stops are dotted around all over the place on a large area, so that users who want to change buses or trams will have to walk quite far and cross multiple lanes of motor traffic. 3. The cycle provision includes too much "shared space" which is hated by cyclists and pedestrians alike. This will lead to a lot of conflict. It will discourage less confident cyclists, whereas more confident cyclists will use the carriageway with obvious risks. <p>It is also unacceptable that this design was drawn up by the developers over many years without any public consultation, and even now much of the "consultation" is a joke and just a box-ticking exercise.</p> | <p>The triangle in the centre will decay into a dead space as it is locked in by the motor traffic with all the dangers, noise and pollution. Similar places in other cities lead to constant problems of criminal and antisocial behaviour. An example that I know well is Ebertplatz in Cologne, which has a similar layout and been in national news recently. Despite huge efforts and investments, Cologne city is unable to convert it into a living urban space - even though the area around Ebertplatz is very busy and lively and a key public transport interchange, the centre of the gyratory is dead and people avoid it. Another similar failed example is Plaerrer in Nuremberg.</p> <p>At Picardy place, the risk is that developers are keen to create such a dead space so that the city is forced to accept another profitable hotel development soon.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSW5-1</p> | <p>2017-12-15 11:57:20</p> |
| <p>There mostly seems to be three lanes of traffic. The noise and pollution that this causes is going to put people off using this area as a public space.</p> <p>Much of the current pedestrian space has been moved to the 'roundabout' which is surrounded on all sides by traffic, again this is likely to put people off using it as a public space.</p> <p>The mixed pedestrian and cyclist area seems hazardous.</p> <p>To reduce carbon emissions, we need to be cutting down the amount of space that traffic has rather than accommodating it, as this is one of the best ways of reducing it.</p> | <p>I don't think that this is an appropriate public space - I would remove it from the design</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSW1-W</p> | <p>2017-12-15 12:13:05</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The biggest issue with the current layout is the amount of vehicle traffic and noise and this plan looks like it won't be any better for those factors. Personally, I'd see a plan that gives less emphasise on car traffic, whether by reducing the traffic lanes or restricting the access times for cars.</p> <p>The plan looks like it requires better/easier pedestrian access to the "island site" to encourage its use. The cycling lanes should also have better integration into Broughton St.</p> <p>I would also like to see more green space and parkland areas on the plan to encourage people to stop and relax in this area.</p> | <p>Make it a park/green space with suitable noise protection from the traffic surrounding it.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYP-X</p> | <p>2017-12-15 12:16:34</p> |
| <p>I think this layout is to traffic focussed & not pedestrian friendly. The cycle provision is not practical or safe for cyclists. This design will only cause more congestion in my opinion.</p> | <p>Accessing the island would be difficult and crossings would only cause more congestion by stopping traffic. A bad idea.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYP-K</p> | <p>2017-12-15 12:18:26</p> |
| <p>appears to favour vehicles over pedestrians and cyclists , and have at its core the wish to facilitate the, as yet un approved, tram extension.</p> <p>I am not sure why it is considered an improvement to take away space from in front of the cathedral and along Picardy Place . And in doing so removing trees that have attained a reasonable maturity. It appears that council planners underestimate how much trees and greenery contribute to a liveable city.</p> <p>Creating a more "useable" space in the centre of the traffic flow seems lunacy. How can that become a space where people would want to go ,with traffic and their fumes surrounding them ? A building on this site would be even worse as it would take away the open aspect of Leith Walk with the Cathedral at the top.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this proposal will create access problems for the Cathedral. I understood that there have been plans to create drop off places , but access to such an important building should not have to be tucked away round corners.</p> <p>From a pedestrian's point of view the plan creates some awkward crossing situations, especially around the Playhouse - with a temptation to take dangerous short cuts across many lanes of traffic.</p> <p>From a cyclist's point of view the plan creates some very clumsy junctions, in particular with the connections from Broughton Street.</p> <p>I am also unhappy about the proposals for the removal of the Paolozzi sculptures. It is good that they will remain on public display in the meantime, but their location on completion completely ignores the fact that they are a triptych. So to place them with one piece separated by a road makes no sense. I would rather see some kind of "plaza" area in front of the Cathedral</p> | <p>I am completely opposed to any kind of building project on this site.</p> <p>As I stated previously ,the Cathedral should visibly sit at the top of Leith Walk and not be hidden away by a development on this island. Further more, the air quality and sound from traffic is likely to make this an unappealing place to spend time. At least if the public space is located in front of the Cathedral or on Picardy Place the traffic is only from one side, as opposed to on three sides.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWN-T</p> | <p>2017-12-15 12:19:39</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>have changed my mind, and I do not think that they should be a factor in this decision. Picardy Place was not laid out in the same way as St Andrew Sq or Charlotte Sq. Had the tenements in the island survived, they would have been of interest and worth saving, but now they are gone there is nothing special about the original triangular road layout.</p> <p>The factors that should be driving the layout of Picardy Place are to make it a safe and pleasant place for pedestrians, a safe and convenient route for cyclists especially along the Leith Walk-Leith St and Broughton St-Leith St axes.</p> <p>The current proposal is hidebound by the need, which I believe is enshrined in the GAM, to increase the traffic flow around Picardy Place, in part because of the ~1000 extra parking spaces planned in the New St James Centre.</p> <p>Form follows function. The function of the new St James Centre is to bring in shoppers and their money. The form should therefore make the environs of the centre as attractive to shoppers as possible. I would have thought that the USP of the new St James is not just the centre itself, but the fact that it is embedded in a vibrant, pleasant city.</p> <p>Therefore, before a new proposal for Picardy Place is drawn up, there needs to be a radical rethink about reducing traffic volumes in the city centre. As well as extending the tram, this might include: thinking about extra park-and-ride schemes, a congestion charging scheme, improving bus transport by reinstating centre doors to make loading and unloading faster.</p> <p>Active travel will not just happen, especially if the streetscape is</p> | <p>As put forward in the Cockburn Association's submission, I feel that deeper thought is needed about the area and how it relates to other parts of the New Town. I do think that the space should provide an enhanced environment in which to appreciate the Paolozzi sculptures and the Conan Doyle statue. I quite like the idea of a really nice, tree-lined playpark, where children & parents can unwind after a hard afternoon's shopping. It would be nice if the equipment could have some sort of Paolozzi or Conan-Doyle theme.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSW2-X</p> | <p>2017-12-15 12:20:25</p> |
| <p>Broadly I think that this is essentially re-creating the roundabout currently there. Ideally I would prefer an open public square or landmark (but not too big) building and some form of T-junction. However I understand potential traffic limitations and if Princes St & George St are to be restricted in some way under upcoming design proposals then this junction and free-flow access to Queen St are essential for E-W travel.</p> <p>However, this is not an easy transport interchange as suggested. Crossing from bus to tram looks difficult, and pedestrian movement across the junction looks tedious. Is it feasible to have the buses stopping adjacent to the central island (like the tram), even if this requires the buses doing a circuit of the roundabout to then go where they need to (ie. stop on R of road rather than L)? This would facilitate easy interchange between modes of transport, simple access to the central space and only one road to be crossed for whatever direction you then wish to travel (Omni, St James, Leith Walk etc).</p> | <p>There's probably enough retail/commercial at the new St James and the Omni.</p> <p>Option 1. An open public square with a landmark Andy Scott-type sculpture. The Kelpies draw people in - something similar at the top of Leith Walk could do similar? A small cafe (eg. St Andrew Sq), some trees and a reflecting pool would help with the aesthetics/place making.</p> <p>Option 2. A new cultural venue to further create a cultural quarter (Playhouse, Cinemas, new Concert Hall behind Dundas House, Portrait Gallery)? Glass, well lit to be a beacon at the top of Leith Walk, semi-subterranean so as not to be too large. Think along lines of the glass pyramid at the Louvre in Paris. If subterranean, then this would facilitate movement across Picardy Place as tunnels beneath the roads could be created through the new venue.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSY9-7</p> | <p>2017-12-15 12:35:44</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Although its welcoming to see the reinstatement of the area's historic block structure and the increased provision for cyclists i can't help its also retaining a roundabout in all but shape, maybe a triangabout!</p> <p>Why this fascination in one-way systems when the new town along Queen Street has shown two-way junctions / streets function perfectly fine, we need to move away from creating places that give traffic-engineers a wet dream!?! </p> <p>For instance why not consider the northern street in Picardy Place as an extension to York Place, providing a junction at the top of Broughton Street akin to those along Queen Street. I realise Broughton Street is dimensionally different but this approach would greatly simplify things and set an aspiration for how we want people to shift their modal choices within the city.</p> <p>This would also free up space in front of the Omni by removing the road extending from Leith Walk to Leith Street and retain the opportunity to develop a block in the centre of Picardy Place to provide a nod to history. Leith Walk would simply link onto a new Queen Street / York Place / Picardy Place East-West Corridor with routes onto Leith Street via a crossroad at the top of Broughton Street.</p> <p>I understand this all takes a level of courage and foresight but these projects are about setting out a vision, massaging people into making better, more sustainable modal choices rather than being reactive to how people currently move about.</p> | <p>Although its welcoming to see the reinstatement of the area's historic block structure and the increased provision for cyclists i can't help its also retaining a roundabout in all but shape, maybe a triangabout!</p> <p>Why this fascination in one-way systems when the new town along Queen Street has shown two-way junctions / streets function perfectly fine, we need to move away from creating places that give traffic-engineers a wet dream!?! </p> <p>For instance why not consider the northern street in Picardy Place as an extension to York Place, providing a junction at the top of Broughton Street akin to those along Queen Street. I realise Broughton Street is dimensionally different but this approach would greatly simplify things and set an aspiration for how we want people to shift their modal choices within the city.</p> <p>This would also free up space in front of the Omni by removing the road extending from Leith Walk to Leith Street and retain the opportunity to develop a block in the centre of Picardy Place to provide a nod to history. Leith Walk would simply link onto a new Queen Street / York Place / Picardy Place East-West Corridor with routes onto Leith Street via a crossroad at the top of Broughton Street.</p> <p>I understand this all takes a level of courage and foresight but these projects are about setting out a vision, massaging people into making better, more sustainable modal choices rather than being reactive to how people currently move about.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSYX-6 | 2017-12-15 12:45:58 |
| <p>The cycle paths look too narrow, and indirect. The crossings look very inconvenient, even for walking.</p> <p>It doesn't look very easy to change from the tram stop to the bus stop, if there were side platforms, buses could share. Most tram cities in Europe do this for good reason.</p> <p>I don't like that it'll be easy for many cars to travel around Picardy Place easily, it makes it worse for everyone else. And there's more pollution.</p> <p>Leith St has already been closed to traffic for a few months, it shows Edinburgh doesn't grind to a stand-still. Lets keep it closed for normal traffic, but let buses through and have a wide bike path all the way up to Princes St.</p> | <p>If the island is surrounded by busy roads, its not going to be a popular place to get to and be around. Whatever gets put there is less relevant as a result.</p> <p>It could be a open place for markets, but it'll be much nicer with less traffic.</p> <p>If it could somehow be made smaller on the edges to make better infrastructure for cyclists that would be nice.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSYM-U | 2017-12-15 12:54:41 |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am highly concerned about the lack of accessibility to St Mary's Cathedral within this proposed layout. St Mary's is a vibrant community within this part of the city; offering many activities that build social cohesion and reduce the isolation of older, and mobility impaired people. There is a great lack of disabled parking spaces within this proposal around the Cathedral site. You have thought about access for cyclists but removed access for disabled users. This must be in opposition to many of your stated transport/disability/equalities policies and strategies and I will be contacting our Councillors on this issue. I have many older friends who use the Cathedral and during this current time of upheaval due to the development of the site, they are finding it increasingly difficult to access the site as it is, as there is now no parking in the adjacent street. They are worried and stressed about these proposals and what it means for them in the future. The Cathedral offers a real lifeline in providing a safe and welcoming space both in terms of disability and for people seeking a spiritual life. These proposals impact greatly on the ability of people to worship, to take part in community activities, to mark milestones in lives. Many local people choose to have weddings, baptisms and funerals in the Cathedral; this is an integral part of the community. There is no access in your plans for wedding parties, funeral corteges and access for other celebratory events that add to the vibrancy of this part of Edinburgh. I really urge you to re-think as this proposal is counter to the development of the Cathedral as a community hub.</p> | <p>Whatever is put on it, it should have a low aspect so that it doesn't feel closed in and block the views of the other amenities in the area. I would like to see it developed as green space with great sculptures and a park like feel.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCBF-D</p> | <p>2017-12-15 12:55:59</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>proposals</p> <p>I am writing in response to the Council's revised proposals for Picardy Place. I also express my views on the future options for Leith Street, which are of course closely linked with the eventual layout that is adopted for Picardy Place and the redevelopment of the entire former St James Centre area. I also take this opportunity to make some comments on the wider policy and planning questions which arise as a result.</p> <p>Picardy Place</p> <p>The Council's revised proposals for Picardy Place are a minor improvement on the original proposals. They remain, however, fundamentally flawed. The retention of a "gyratory" system, means that the opportunity to use the redevelopment of Picardy Place to transform that area into one which puts people and community first, and at the same time forms a fitting gateway into the city, will be lost.</p> <p>The new proposals will lead to a loss in the space currently used as "public realm" east of St Mary's RC Cathedral, and will create what will in effect be a giant "traffic island" surrounded by traffic on three sides which is likely to be unusable for public realm, because of difficulties of access across busy streets and also because of the poor air quality likely to result from being surrounded by traffic. The new proposals will also make it less convenient for pedestrians to cross, and offer no improvements to cycle routes across the site.</p> <p>Instead, any revised scheme should extend the current "public realm" area, and make better use of that area. It should ensure that both pedestrians should be able to cross both York Place and Broughton Street in a direct manner. It should also provide segregated cycle routes to allow direct access up from York Place towards Leith Street, and from York Place towards Leith</p> | <p>See my answer to question 4</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSY3-1</p> | <p>2017-12-15 13:03:11</p> |
|--|------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>and public transport over other motor traffic. Yet:</p> <p>1) There are no bus lanes on the proposed design, nor any on Leith Street. What kind of prioritisation is that?</p> <p>Furthermore, passengers wishing to join the tram at Picardy Place will first have to play live-action Frogger across 3 lanes of traffic. Then hang about in the middle of a roundabout breathing in fumes from traffic in the 9 lanes surrounding them. This, frankly, is awful.</p> <p>2) The number of general traffic lanes is designed to cater for current levels of traffic, rather than being set to cater for the desired level of traffic (which, for a city centre location with excellent public transport links should be minimal). Further thought should be given to actively discouraging excessive freight and private motor vehicle use of city centre roads rather than passively waiting for this to happen. Because it won't. Build it and they *will* come, so consider who you are building for.</p> <p>3) Leith Street has not been limited to public transport only. This by itself would go a long way to making the area more pleasant by discouraging through-traffic. Due to the St James redevelopment, you are testing the effects of closing Leith Street upon general traffic now. The world does not appear to have ended, even with public transport too following the diversion.</p> <p>4) If further proof is needed that the hierarchy of users has been reversed by the proposed design: consider that only *motor vehicles* have the continuous uninterrupted travel surface (3 lanes no less) through the junction whilst active travel modes do not.</p> <p>5) You've removed nearly all the usable public space in front of the cathedral. Lots of events take place there. I somehow doubt the participants in those will want to carry on in the middle of the island, any more than they would want to</p> | <p>Is it usable? The space is marooned in the middle of 9 lanes of traffic, bathing in fumes!</p> <p>Regardless of how tempting what you put on it, I wouldn't want to spend any time there, any more than I would want to stand in the middle of the existing roundabout.</p> <p>For an example see the Morrison Street - Torphichen "island". It's dreadful spending any time around there.</p> <p>Furthermore, if you build on the island, there will be much less public realm than currently available in front of the cathedral.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYG-N</p> <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYY-7</p> | <p>2017-12-15 13:07:37</p> <p>2017-12-15 13:38:05</p> |
| <p>The streetscape presented is poor quality and motor traffic focused. It fails to properly consider air quality in the area, Picardy Place as a destination for outdoor activities, the desire lines of pedestrians, and the desire lines of cyclists.</p> <p>It will lock in for another generation a junction that is unfit for a modern city.</p> | <p>The island site should not be an island. This fundamental assumption has poisoned every decision making process and this hasty consultation. No development should take place here.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYB-G</p> | <p>2017-12-15 13:39:53</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>- proposal creates an isolated island in the middle of heavy traffic. Gyrotory systems are outmoded as ineffective uses of space and traffic control.</p> <p>- loss of public space in front of cathedral. It's an important civic space, and often very busy. The proposal means this space will now be even busier - with the addition of a cycle path, and a bus stop - but in a much reduced space, and will also have to front onto a major busy road.</p> <p>- turns Broughton Street into a thoroughfare - its livelihood and character come from its individuality as a meeting/shopping/working/living place for locals</p> <p>It seems clear more time is needed for a proper consultation between locals and planners.</p> | <p>Would be good to have clarity on process and schedule by which imaginative proposals for the site are developed.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYZ-8</p> | <p>2017-12-15 13:39:58</p> |
| <p>I much prefer the Y option, what is going to be suitably done in the middle of the junction?</p> <p>There was talk of some not for profit centre in the middle of that polluted junction? Is this is what is happening? Would there be car parking spots on the centre area? What about blocking the fine view down Leith Walk?</p> <p>How come so many more cars are now to be allowed to park ion the shopping development? How come footpath space is lost, traversing around the junction is now more complicated and safe bike space is not guaranteed on all routes around there?</p> <p>Why is the motor car and the developers desires being prioritised? The major train and bus stations of the city are all around here we do not need to be prioritising more cars!</p> | <p>Park if anything, greenery, trees, to somewhat combat the pollution of motor vehicles.</p> <p>Install public artworks on a rotating basis, a Sherlock Holmes dedicated grove, tourist attraction, public 'speakers corner' platform, buskers and street performers, nothing involving more cars or commercial activity! And why not think about the Y layout and not this island!</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSWD-G</p> | <p>2017-12-15 13:47:42</p> |
| <p>The priority must be on quality of public realm for street users, rather than transport (as per existing plans) . The city's economy will be defined by the attractiveness to linger, shop and spend leisure time. This is a unique opportunity to create one of Europe's great public spaces at the entrance to the new town. A traffic junction does not do that.</p> <p>They key will be making the public space adjacent to the cathedral and an extension of the new streetscape at St James Quarter. It must be used and must not be stranded in an island.</p> <p>The Sustrans proposal goes some way to doing this, but there is still some significant work to do.</p> <p>We also need to think about that the purpose of Leith St is - it can be a place to dwell, shop, not simply a transit route.</p> <p>Please let's see the city centre can be a destination, not a corridor.</p> | <p>There is no example anywhere in the world of where an island is truly usable. It becomes isolated and forlorn.</p> <p>Please refer to to the changes in London at Trafalgar Square where the changes over the past decade have brought that public space into full use - simply by connecting that space to the National Gallery.</p> <p>Edinburgh can do at least as well.</p> <p>I am also very worried about the time it will take to fully consider the options for that island space, finance and develop. We would likely have 10-20 years of vacancy. Let's instead have the confidence to feature our public realm.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYR-Z</p> | <p>2017-12-15 13:54:19</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The segregated section of cycleway on the cathedral side seems a little redundant - and it isn't clear how cyclist would access this having come down Leith Street. At either end cyclists would have to get off and on their bike. Most would surely stay on the road. It is cyclist travelling down Leith Street in tending to go down Leith Walk where it feels a bit unsafe. Buses will be moving across into the right-hand lane. I'd prefer the central and right lane to enable the right turn onto Picardy Place - so cyclist could keep in the central lane having come down Leith Street. It would be very good if two stage lights were installed as part of this development to give cyclists a safer route across the junction.</p> <p>Also, how easy will it be for cyclists coming up Leith Walk to get to Broughton Street/York Place. Would be nice to see the cycle lane merge with the advanced stopping zone at start of Leith Street - so cyclists could pause there until the lights are red, then join the traffic on the road (again a two-stage light sequence would be really helpful here).</p> <p>For those who don't routinely cycle - this doesn't look like it would help encourage them - I'd really like to see something that took cycling, buses and pedestrian as the priority - which this design doesn't. The Sustrans solution wasn't too bad in my view - and didn't think that issues with congestion would be a factor. Keep strict bus lanes where cars (or any other vehicle except emergency ones can't use them). That will keep the buses flowing. Building more roads just encourages more cars.</p> | <p>I would be extremely angry with the council if they decided to use this space to build on. This should absolutely be kept as a green, shared public space. The proposal already will create a substantial circle of traffic which is not great for our health. Having open, green spaces in cities is of huge benefit to our health and well-being. A brand new commercial, retail and housing development is being built right nearby - we don't need more.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYU-3</p> | <p>2017-12-15 14:01:31</p> |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I am totally opposed to the proposals in their entirety. For the avoidance of doubt, this does not mean that it is not my preferred preference. I have no preference at all for the proposal. The proposal has been developed as a piece of transport planning, with absolutely no consideration for urban design that means that the proposal is both a planning abomination in terms of aesthetics and seriously detrimental to those who live and work in the area in terms of robbing everyone of usable public space, noticeably that in front of St Mary's Cathedral which should be a priority.</p> <p>Even on its own terms, the proposal for the joint tram-bus stop will create a major traffic blockage. For pedestrians and cyclists it adds further crossings to the area, and is not an improvement as claimed.</p> <p>The proposal is clearly and extensively in conflict with current Government and Council policies, for which no adequate reason is given.</p> <p>More broadly the Council has failed to present a proper case for their proposals and the claims made for the proposal are contentious and not properly validated.</p> <p>The Council cannot proceed with the proposal. Further consideration needs to be given to other options backed by proper and independently validated data and analysis in a genuine exercise in public engagement. Given the very limited current exercise in public consultation, that falls below even basic standards, the Council cannot draw a mandate from this consultation, and needs to go back out to the public on an entirely different basis. There are no grounds for ruining another part of the City and the gateway to the New Town.</p> | <p>I do not support an island development. No one thinks that a piece of land in the middle of a busy three lane gyratory traffic system will constitute an attractive public space, whatever is put on it. It is very likely to be a dead space that will further detract from the local amenity through lack of use. Any suggestion that placing a building on the island will restore the area to its historic layout of three distinct streets instead of a roundabout ignores the other seriously detrimental affects on the area of modern building design.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSW9-5</p> | <p>2017-12-15 14:09:54</p> |
| <p>The design as proposed is awful.</p> <p>The initial 2009 design shown was fatally flawed and its evolution to the one above is reminiscent of a cancerous growth or demon spawn, just getting worse with the progression of time.</p> <p>It obviously prioritises personal cars over everything else. With pedestrians treated worse than cattle, expected to mindlessly follow the dregs of pathways left once everything else is fitted in.</p> | <p>The space should be integrated into the public space in front of the cathedral by removing the motorway that is proposed for cathedral lane.</p> <p>It could have nice paving so could be used as a marketplace. Or more specifically used instead of St Andrews Square. As there events there destroy the grass and trees.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYH-P</p> | <p>2017-12-15 14:13:29</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>A T-junction (eg, removing the Cathedral arm of the gyratory), would still allow the tram to pass, would not impede buses and would much improve the experience for pedestrians and cyclists. It would also ensure a useable public space, where the various existing statues and sculptures (and those lost from the area) could be sensitively relocated. This would also compensate for the loss of greenery from Picardy Place. The number of trees removed should be replanted and then some.</p> <p>The design of a key space in favour of entirely motor vehicles is ridiculous in this day and age, particularly in line of council and Scottish Government priorities for public and active travel. The proposed gyratory makes the car king, and makes all other users face compromises. It is setting in place for a significant number of years to come, a space that had it been built in the 1960's, in an area with reasonable governance it would now be being replaced with something that supports public and active travel.</p> <p>I understand that the main reason for the gyratory is to allow thousands of cars access a new car park at the St James development. Regardless of when this was proposed, the fact that the council is being held to ransom by private property developers is all that is wrong with development, planning and place-making in Edinburgh today.</p> <p>If the layout is indicative, and is designed to be 'flexible for the future' then why not just be sensible now and reduce the amount of space given over the cars (increasing road space only ever increases the number of cars using it - it never improves traffic flow). It also seems unlikely that having three sets of traffic lights to manoeuvre, rather than one roundabout would reduce traffic flow.</p> <p>'The junction returns to its historic layout' - except the junction was never designed for such volume of motor traffic.</p> | <p>Centre space: The site in the centre of the gyratory if developed would cause horrible a 'canyon' effect - exacerbating the impacts of poor air quality that will result from such a car dominated environment. With the enormous development at St James - do we really need more retail, commercial, and hospitality development?</p> <p>The centre site if undeveloped will become as much of a waste land as the current roundabout, or the London Road roundabout - who would want to spend any time surrounded by three lanes of traffic on all sides. The air quality, noise and sense of place would all be atrocious.</p> <p>I also understand that part (most?) of the land in the centre of the proposed gyratory is common good land - therefore shouldn't it serve a common good (which I argue would be pleasant / green space) rather than a private development or empty space in the middle of traffic chaos.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSY4-2 | 2017-12-15 14:15:33 |
| <p>The cycle ways are poor throughout, but especially the one across the front of the cathedral as they stop at an incredibly awkward angle to rejoin the car lane - with no flow whatsoever. I think this cycle way Will just end up like the new ones that have been put in on Leith walk - with no-one using them and staying on the road instead to everyone's detriment.</p> | <p>The island site should be used for landscaping only!!! Clear lines of sight are absolutely necessary for traffic safety at this area, especially for cyclists and any kind of development will be extremely detrimental, impractical and dangerous.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSYN-V | 2017-12-15 15:02:01 |
| <p>Needs to incorporate more green space, a greater prioritisation of pedestrian traffic, and further consideration to the use of public space.</p> | <p>The island should be green space, perhaps incorporating a coffee shop, a la Russel Square in London</p> | ANON-8G9D-FSYW-5 | 2017-12-15 15:02:12 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>'GAM' agreements, are elected city leaders and who will be responsible in perpetuity for the functioning of the space will be embarrassed by the fact that the outcome, if what is proposed is built, is not urban design; it is transport engineering. The design proposal is for a 20th Century city, not one that is aiming for being at the leading edge of sustainable cities in the 21st Century.</p> <p>2. Have the designers visited and actually spent time there and passed through the junction in all directions on foot and on bike? I doubt it.</p> <p>3. Picardy Place is very important for the city so should primarily be a real PLACE for people to enjoy being in and those who pass through should do so safely and pleasantly. Not many people can do this by sitting in private cars or vans so these numbers must decline (in line with CEC's stated policy). Far more people can enjoy using a vibrant public space, or passing through the place, if they are on foot, bike, bus or tram. This is not only proven in international research but is also apparent to the casual onlooker as they see queues of cars, generally with one person in, snaking slowly around the present junction where the inefficiency to movement of people and goods, and to local businesses is staggering. It really is clear, traffic jams with low-occupancy private vehicles are economically poor. People on the street, enjoying the urban space, means an active local economy. My appeal is PLEASE COULD CEC REPRIORITIZE THE DESIGN PARAMETERS TO ENABLE PICARDY PLACE TO BECOME A CONVIVIAL ECONOMICALLY THRIVING PART OF THE CITY CENTRE THAT IS NOT DOMINATED BY CARS AND VANS.</p> <p>Other specific points:</p> <p>4. CEC policy is to reduce car use, but the official who I met at the consultation event clearly said that this doesn't apply here. Why? When is the city going to begin following its own policy? What about induced traffic demand that will be created with a 3-lane gyratory? The modelling seems to</p> | <p>It should be usable, open space for people to enjoy.</p> <p>But why'll anyone want to go to middle of a gyratory? People need reasons to go! Public finances can't justify prime city real estate sitting noisily empty. It needs to be calmer, quieter to allow a programme of events all year round</p> <p>With a 'middle' or not (I'd prefer not) a well-landscaped new Edinburgh Trams stop, with kiosks, might actually help make a space vibrant as long as it is not too congested and surrounded by polluting noisy vehicles. And it could help make trams more popular.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSY5-3</p> | <p>2017-12-15 15:04:55</p> |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I agree with Sustrans' recent statement on Picardy Place that the current plans do not respect the commonly adopted hierarchy of transport use, which makes pedestrians the top priority, then cycling, public transport and finally in last place private motor vehicles. It also contravenes Scottish government guidance on street design, and Edinburgh's own Street Design Guidance, adopted in August 2015, which states:</p> <p>"For too long we have put car based movement ahead of the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users when designing streets. While most streets will require to accommodate car use, we need to achieve a much better balance, where the street environment positively influences driver behaviour and where other street uses, sense of place and other forms of travel are put before speed of movement by car."</p> <p>Can I urge the City of Edinburgh Council to take heed of its own guidance?</p> <p>Furthermore, I would add that the the designs do not even fulfil the Council's own design brief. Please note the following extracts from 'St James Quarter Development Brief', approved by the Planning Committee 19 April 2007 .</p> <p>Development Principles:</p> <p>B To enhance movement and access to and within the St James Quarter</p> <p>Proposals for the St James Quarter should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recognise its pivotal city centre location by maximising access by foot, bicycle and public transport; - Consider the removal of the Leith Street Bridge and examine alternative means of pedestrian access across Leith Street and into the St James Quarter, if justified as part of an overall Transport study; | <p>There should be no "island" as there should be no gyratory!</p> <p>A Y-shaped or T-shaped junction would allow this area to connect to the cathedral and create proper public space, retaining the existing trees and sculptures.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSY1-Y</p> | <p>2017-12-15 15:06:42</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>My preference would undoubtedly be for a 'Y' or 'T' shaped junction, so that there is direct access to the central space from the area in front of the cathedral, without having to cross any roads. I'm thinking of a comparison with the transformation that occurred in Trafalgar Square, London, when the road in front of the National Gallery was blocked off, and the whole square became an easily accessible public space. Without a similar change here, I think the central island area will remain an unpleasant, polluted, little used and wasted space.</p> <p>If this cannot be achieved, then the current design should be improved to give more priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport. The needs of cars and lorries should be a lower priority, and I think that any extra congestion caused by making their passage more difficult will be short-lived 'especially as car drivers realise that the city centre is to be avoided, and switch to other modes of transport.</p> <p>I'm concerned that there is too much shared space for cyclist and pedestrians, and that this will cause potential for accidents. Cyclists, especially the many who now commute in the city, need segregated spaces. It is also essential that there are direct cycle routes from York place to Leith Walk, and Leith Street to Broughton place.</p> <p>Finally, I'm concerned that the predominance given to vehicles in these plans, even as improved, contradicts the city council's own transport strategy for prioritising pedestrians and cyclists. There seems to have been a worrying lack of public consultation, and an expensive and possibly irrevocable commitment to an undesirable gyratory scheme, which is not in the best interests of the city and the need to improve public transport, and encourage walking and cycling.</p> | <p>see my answer to 4. I also believe the site should not be used for built development, in order to preserve opportunities for improved pedestrian , cycling and recreational use in the future .</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSY2-Z</p> | <p>2017-12-15 15:09:49</p> |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I don't think the City of Edinburgh Council has put enough thought into these proposals and appear to be rushing them to coincide with the work being done on the St James Quarter. They should be looked at in the context of the bigger picture of the centre of our beautiful city and more time given developing proposals which would be acceptable to the majority of city residents.</p> <p>However, my thoughts on the current proposals are:</p> <p>If the priority for these plans is for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport:</p> <p>Why are there no bus lanes approaching Picardy Place from Leith Walk? Why would pedestrians have to use three crossings to get from e.g. St Mary's Cathedral to the north side of Broughton Street where currently there are only two?</p> <p>Why are there so many spaces to be shared by pedestrians and cyclists? This can only lead to issues between the two groups on such busy areas.</p> <p>Why is there only one lane for traffic from York Place to Leith Walk? If this is to be shared between public transport and other vehicles, it can only lead to delays, despite what the trialling shows! Living near the Abbeyhill Gyratory, I know that what happened when it was first introduced was not what was expected following the trialling and amendments had to be made - and are still being made!</p> | <p>In accordance with my initial comment about the lack of time that has been given to these proposals and the rushed nature of them, I have grave reservations about having an island such as this in the middle of flowing traffic. Who would want to be doing anything here and breathing in polluted air? I think consideration should be given first of all to the bigger picture, including whether there should even be such an island, before deciding on the future of the whole area and how it fits with the surrounding areas.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FC8P-D</p> | <p>2017-12-15 15:10:57</p> |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>In addition to the detail of the proposal, the process of public engagement and consultation to this point has been completely inadequate. This in terms of the very short timeframes (the December deadline for responses takes no account of the time of year - winter and the Xmas season - given the short turnaround required)and the fact that no alternative options were presented for public consideration. The public "consultation" meetings were not a serious attempt to engage local and other public taken as a whole but "drop ins" designed to divide and rule by focussing on individuals and their responses - this would not be allowed anywhere else in the public sector e.g. change in the NHS.</p> <p>In addition, this proposal has been presented as a traffic management solution and not, as I believe critical, an integrated urban design proposal encompassing traffic management. This point has been raised at "consultation" meetings but has not been picked up by the Council's officials.</p> <p>I also believe that the decisions about Picardy Place need to be part of, and integrated with, wider city planning processes including the future planning for George Street and the tram extension decision. No one can understand how this Picardy Place proposal, even as a traffic management plan, can be judged and implemented in isolation.</p> <p>In terms of the proposal itself, the public has not seen the validated modelling data to support this proposal and the justification for the supporting assumptions. I understand the data was collected in 2014 - so is outdated - and was restricted to motor traffic. The modelling and analysis needs to be shared with the public and there should, in addition, be data and modelling to support the assumptions made about pedestrians and cyclists. These assumptions should support wider Government and Council policy not work against them as this proposal appears to.</p> | <p>I completely oppose the retention of this island site as it is currently designed - I don't want an island at all and no development in the middle of Picardy Place. Mention is made of "Design Guidance Principles" above but these are dated 2009 - nearly 10 years ago and require to be reviewed.</p> <p>I don't accept that the island site of the proposal will restore the historic position.</p> <p>I don't accept an alternative proposal that this island site could compensate for the loss of usable public space at St Mary's Cathedral and Picardy Place. Given its position an "island" marooned in traffic will not be an attractive public amenity space, particularly given the additional pedestrian crossings required. I would like to understand how the island site can be removed to allow for the expansion of the piazza outside St Mary's and more public space elsewhere on Picardy Place.</p> <p>In addition, I think that there needs to be much more of a future focus, exploring other urban design and traffic management solutions which will require the removal of the island site.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FSYC-H</p> | <p>2017-12-15 15:11:36</p> |
|---|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>truly awful - prioritising a minority transport method i.e cars at the expense and health of all others.</p> <p>This is no way provides even prioritisation of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Where are the protected cycle lanes ? This is not fit for purpose - how can any non-confident / assertive cyclist fully navigate this gyratory ?</p> <p>Why must pedestrians have to wait at so many crossings to get from one side to the other.</p> <p>Why are cars given priority at every decision point.</p> <p>How does this design sit alongside the Scottish Government's stated aim to increase active travel participation ? It does not, it is entirely at odds with it.</p> | | | |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FSYA-F | 2017-12-15 15:16:09 |
| <p>Not bold enough for world-class city. We don't get many opportunities to design a space for people, and to make it attractive to visit. This is a major entertainment, social and shopping area ,and should be largely pedestrianised. Leith Street should be closed to through traffic except for a single lane for buses, thus removing the need to have a triangular traffic island at all. Once that is done, it truly opens up the area for a proper re-design, enhances the councils' and governments' desires for increasing public and active travel.</p> | <p>Nonsensical. Who in their right mind would want to visit a site completely surrounded by motorised traffic.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS29-Z | 2017-12-15 15:35:17 |

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>traffic than for retaining / increasing pedestrian spaces and cycle ways .</p> <p>Increased traffic would increase fumes which are detrimental to people using city centre amenities.</p> <p>Increasing traffic flow in this small area around Picady Place is a no-brainer as vehicles will then be funneled into the exisiting road network and form bottlenecks. The roads simply cannot accommodate an excess of traffic in this part of town.</p> <p>The council plans drastically reduce the useable pedestrian spaces that currently exist - these are already at capacity and should be enlarged not reduced. By that I mean enlarged alongside the current retail and leisure facilities not within an area coralled by traffic as proposed.</p> <p>The council appears to be focusing on expanding retail opportunities rather than local amenity - which would benefit the council through revenue but not the users of the areas.</p> <p>Trees and green spaces will be lost.</p> <p>The area outside the Cathedral will be drastically diminished. It currently serves as a space to walk, gather and occaisionally hosts a local market that brings character and local cohesivness to the area.</p> <p>Where have the Paolozzi sculptures gone? They have already been removed. Relocating the sculptures to more than 1 location is not how the works were designed. Following the recent removal of the Paolozzi arches mosaics from Tottenham Court Road tube station to great public outcry (national and international) - the developers thinking that it was acceptable to divide up an artwork that was conceived as one - should ring alarm bells within the council. Particularly given that Paolozzi was / is a celebrated local</p> | See above. | ANON-8G9D-FS2X-Y | 2017-12-15 15:57:28 |
| <p>Safe cycling and pedestrian access must be prioritised, as well as public transport.</p> | <p>Performance, retail and leisure space that.</p> <p>Edinburgh has a real shortage of market spaces too, and it would be amazing to see provision for a weekly fruit and veg market.</p> <p>It could a be a really vibrant, exciting area in which to spend leisure time!</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS28-Y | 2017-12-15 16:02:50 |
| <p>I am opposed to the proposal. I think Edinburgh Council should prioritise cyclists and pedestrians. The idea that people will use an island for recreation whilst cars whizz around them is a joke. Many European countries are pedestrianising many spaces and certainly not building gigantic gyratory systems. We do not want to 'accomodate' levels of current traffic or increase it. We want to dissuade people to continue using cars unnecessarily and encourage people to walk, cycle and use public transport. This solution is ugly, it lowers the quality of life for everyone in Edinburgh and will threaten the status of Edinburgh as a World Heritage Site. Edinburgh Council needs to think about long term environmental and social sustainability and pollution levels and not about short term profits with property developers. The city should not prioritise traffic over the people who have a right to enjoy moving around within that city.</p> | <p>It is ridiculous to think that people will want to spend anytime in the middle of a giant gyratory system breathing in exhaust fumes, barely hearing themselves talk or think in the roar of traffic, worrying that their kids will get run over or waiting for the notoriously slow and soul destroying wait for the lights to change at the pedestrian crossing. The best thing you can put in the centre is an enormous gravestone engraved with the date he gyratory was erected which says ' another civic space murdered by Edinburgh Council in the name of profit'</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS2E-C | 2017-12-15 16:30:33 |

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>This plan appears to favour car use over allotter considerations and form three mini-urban motorways. I cannot see how the island formed in the middle three busy streets will have much utility as it will be stranded. I believe the Sustrans proposal or something very like it offers a better balance of public transport, foot and car access for residents and visitors to the area.</p> | <p>If this island is formed it should definitely NOT be built on</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2Z-1</p> | <p>2017-12-15 16:32:11</p> |
| <p>The new design focuses too much on motor cars and other vehicles and not enough on pedestrians and cyclists. For example, it makes my daily crossing from Broughton Street to the Omni Centre more awkward, take longer and gives me more roads to cross.</p> | <p>The island site (if one is needed) should be used to improve the pedestrian and cycling experience, and provide a green space</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2Q-R</p> | <p>2017-12-15 16:49:58</p> |
| <p>The proposed 3-street junction design fails to meet the Council's transport and travel policies on a number of levels. The advantages claimed by the Council are also disingenuous.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 'Returns to historical layout.' So what? Irrelevant. We should be designing this junction as a place for people and with a shift away from private cars towards active travel and public transport. 2. 'Safer for pedestrians and cyclists.' This is demonstrably untrue. 3. 'Better manages traffic and lower vehicle speeds.' The 3-street design creates so much unnecessary road space in the east end that it will induce traffic - precisely the opposite of what Council policy is looking to achieve. Indeed, the Council's traffic assumptions do not plan for altered behaviour and modal shift, they simply assume existing (worse, historic) traffic levels. This is not what policy is aiming to achieve. 4. 'Creates central island site.' It does. But it'll be an island that will take a long time to cross into, have a hostile, motor vehicle dominated perimeter and will not be a pleasant place to spend time or meet. Even London closed one side of Trafalgar Sq in a bid to place make - to great effect. 5. 'Creates space for tram stop.' It does, but not as much as Y. And it dumps tram users in the middle of the junction, that they will then have to wait at crossing to escape from. 6. 'Promotes flexible design.' Why the need to be flexible rather than going for the correct solution in the first place. Is this an acknowledgement that the design is old-fashioned, flawed and contrary to Council policy? 7. 'Supports journeys 'to not through' city centre.' It does the exact opposite. Is this final point a bad joke? Creating a 3 lane gyratory does not encourage travel to, it clearly encourages traffic through. Why is this desirable? Where will these vehicles go? The soon to be announced LEZ? Surely not. The soon to be transformed city centre? Surely we're not wanting to increase traffic on the already car dominated city centre. | <p>No development. Should be preserved for y design and public realm/plaza.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2G-E</p> | <p>2017-12-15 16:56:11</p> |
| <p>All good. Keep maximising pedestrian and cycleway space while accommodating pedestrian desire lines for travel.</p> | <p>site is probably too small for any decent development. site development would require a layout (shown above) which seems worse than the proposed, in particular removing space in front of the Cathedral. developing the site would remove line of sight towards Cathedral (and Omni centre), which I think should remain visible.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2K-J</p> | <p>2017-12-15 17:08:33</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Given the expected reduction in traffic in the city centre and Edinburgh in general I am surprised that the proposed design appears to prioritise traffic instead of bicycles, pedestrians and creating a nice place which people would be happy to spend more time. Although the total amount of public space may not have decreased I do not consider what is effectively a large roundabout surrounded by a three lane road to be a particularly desirable alternative.</p> <p>Instead I am broadly in favour of the alternative designs which do away with the three sided roundabout - replacing this with either a cross or T-junction and giving much greater priority to pedestrians.</p> <p>I appreciate the effort to make the junction more cycling friendly but am concerned how the shared spaces will actually function particularly the area around the Conan Doyle pub and near the proposed site of the "hand sculpture" . It is not clear to me that this will improve cycling from Broughton St to Leith St at all.</p> <p>Equally I do not see that the public transport interchange is greatly improved since to get from bus stops to the tram stop involves crossing busy roads and possibly cycle tracks.</p> <p>In conclusion, although this new design represents an improvement over the first proposal, I am not impressed with it and am concerned that it misses a great opportunity to create a high quality, people friendly, gateway to the city centre and St James centre. I would therefore recommend an alternative design with less emphasis placed on traffic flow.</p> | | | |
| <p>The giratory system is bad for pedestrians and cyclists. Please think again about the use of a T or Y junction here.</p> | <p>Given the location of this site in the middle of a roundabout and near to an already high density of shops and restaurants I would suggest creating a high quality public garden so it at least looked attractive perhaps with a cafe in the centre.</p> <p>In addition a cycle station where bikes could be rented could also be included as part of a city wide cycle scheme. As well as public-transport information.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS2J-H | 2017-12-15 17:29:55 |
| <p>This layout gives too much priority to vehicular traffic at the expense of people on foot and on bikes. Any area close to three lanes of traffic will be hostile and unpleasant to people not in cars.</p> <p>This design is twenty years out of date. The great cities of the world have moved on from the car being king. Edinburgh must too.</p> | <p>Hmm. An island site surrounded on all sides by three lanes of traffic. How appealing. This proposal for an island site should be abandoned and replaced with a large public space worthy of the eastern approach to the city, where people on foot and the public realm genuinely takes priority rather than being an afterthought.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS2M-M | 2017-12-15 18:23:49 |
| | | ANON-8G9D-FS24-U | 2017-12-15 19:58:48 |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---------------------|
| <p>Looking at the proposed layout, it is mentioned that this will allow greater public access but I feel that the inclusion of the large gyratory will effectively cut off all of that area from public use therefore there will be less access for the public.</p> <p>The area in front of the Cathedral currently has good access for people going to services and for cars associated with weddings and funerals. The proposed layout removes this access and as such those with limited mobility will be unable to access the Cathedral.</p> <p>With the current layout there are clearly defined pedestrian crossing areas which allow safe and easy access from one side to the other. The proposed layout seems to indicate that there will be more complex crossings, particularly towards the top of Leith Walk, which will be more problematic for older residents.</p> <p>One of your proposals is to reduce traffic by encouraging greater use of alternative transport means, I feel that the revised layout will encourage more traffic thus reducing feelings of safety while trying to cross the roads.</p> | <p>Any development in the island site will destroy the wonderful view of the new St James development and the Cathedral that is currently available as you come to the top of Leith Walk. Additionally, development in this area will cause access issues for pedestrians as, currently shown above, there are no safe crossing points into the area. Even with suitable safe crossing points the nature of any development may induce unsafe crossings to take place potentially resulting in casualties.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS2T-U | 2017-12-15 20:31:12 |
| <p>The idea that the 'island', surrounded by a sea of cars is a usable urban space is a planner's fantasy. It is still a large roundabout designed primarily for the throughput of cars.</p> <p>The noise, smell and sheer unpleasantness of that 'island' doesn't take too much imagination to realise: just stand next to any road with 25,000 cars a day and eat a sandwich, strum a guitar or even sit down and read a book. No doubt someone in the planning dept. has already prepared a glossy photoshopped impression of this space filled with smiling, hapless tourists gazing at jugglers, mime artists and third rate skateboarders.</p> <p>This delusional urban planning seems to have died out in most of Europe but still lingers on in Edinburgh like a dose of herpes that can't be cured.</p> | <p>Not a place for children, asthmatics, cyclists, those with sensitive hearing, or indeed any one who values their health.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS2Y-Z | 2017-12-15 20:41:41 |
| <p>I am against the proposed gyratory design. This design concept is out of date, as it gives a dominant position to vehicles over pedestrians and cyclists within the city. It is also damaging for the neighbourhood and the sense of cohesion and community required to build strong communities in the city.</p> <p>In addition, human nature means that pedestrians will seek short cuts to crossing the road to the Playhouse and the current design encourages pedestrians (of which there can be a large number during the start and end of a show) to cut across three lanes of traffic and tram tracks.</p> <p>Other options must be considered that are more friendly towards residents and pedestrians.</p> | <p>Based on knowledge of a similar island site in Dundee that had the McManus in the middle, I would not offer any suggestions for development of the island site, as it will not be used. In Dundee, the gyratory was altered in 2011 to close traffic off on one side so that pedestrians had free access to the museum. This got rid of the island and created a piazza, which provided a community space for use by the residents and museum, to great success. The museum also saw a massive increase in footfall. The re-design of the road was a large part of the success for the redevelopment and, by focusing on people instead of cars, showed a true understanding of what visitors and residents needed.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS2R-S | 2017-12-15 21:05:54 |
| <p>A round about is an evolution of transport, going back to several sets of lights makes no sense. Destroying cathedral access to support a tram no one wants seems like an anti catholic move, a move I am certain would not be put upon a mosque or synagogue.</p> | <p>Put your multi bus stop in it.</p> | ANON-8G9D-FS2D-B | 2017-12-15 21:29:20 |

| | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>I oppose the proposed gyratory design. I dislike the preference the proposed design gives to vehicles over pedestrians, as this means pedestrians will be forced to walk further (sometimes in icy conditions) to cross the junction. I object to the removal of the public space in front of St Mary's Cathedral, which is accessible, with a proposed island space that will mean crossing three lanes of traffic - I simply wouldn't use it. On a final note, the proposed design is very disruptive to the neighbourhood and residents. There is barely any improvement on the current junction, which already divides the area and is very unfriendly for pedestrians and shoppers. There must be other options that create a more pedestrian and community focused space and these must be considered, even if it means a delay.</p> | <p>I would not want to cross three lanes of traffic or sit in the middle of all that noise and pollution.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS27-X</p> | <p>2017-12-15 21:43:05</p> |
| <p>I am concerned that due attention be given to the linking of bus/tram routes with shared stops so that, for example, travellers using the no. 8 service can change directly into a bus/tram serving Princes St, West End and Lothian Road.</p> <p>A reasonable sized dropping off space in front of the Cathedral is necessary.</p> <p>It's not easy to see from the plan where pedestrian crossings are planned. The one linking the Playhouse with the North side of Picardy Pl. should be retained to allow reasonable access to disabled parking.</p> <p>Pedestrians with limited mobility (of whom there are many locally) should not be faced with long walks between the sides of the Place.</p> <p>The Paolozzi pieces should be returned to Picardy Place and kept together as intended by the sculptor.</p> | <p>Given the likely traffic and noise pollution it's hard to see how this could be safely and usefully used for anything other than gardens/trees and sculpture/artworks.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2H-F</p> | <p>2017-12-15 22:16:10</p> |
| <p>The new layout looks like it will be an improvement on the current situation. I think the route for pedestrians crossing from the Playhouse to the other side of the road (i.e. to Tesco) looks like it will be awkward. This will be inefficient, and may mean people risk ignoring the crossings and running across other parts of the road. If you could introduce a direct crossing route here, crossing Greenside Place and Union Place, that would be much better.</p> | <p>I think the island site would be best used as a green area, with trees, flowers or other plants, as otherwise the area will look very industrial. These will likely improve the wellbeing of residents and tourists more than any shops, commercial buildings or hotels.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2S-T</p> | <p>2017-12-15 22:44:42</p> |
| <p>I'm sorry, I haven't looked at this in great detail as I only knew about the consultation this week, but there are a few considerations which I would find really important - the scheme should be as conducive as possible to 'active travel', making the environment as friendly as possible to pedestrians and cyclists. I also think that the closure of Leith Street to cars is a great improvement: better make this permanent, making it just for pedestrians and cyclists in future. It is a great shame that the developers have been allowed such a large number of parking spaces. I think 3 separate streets would be better than a roundabout, no matter what it's called. I don't really see the need for a tram stop here on the extension when there's one already on York Place so close by. Trees and statues are good - the more trees the better.</p> | <p>I think it would be good if the space was used to divert cars underground into the car parking area of the development since that has I believe been contractually promised. The hotel development, the one that's been given the unflattering nickname, might also be better built here rather than at the top of Leith Street, where it will apparently be all too visible from locations all around the city. Alternatively, if it is really necessary for Edinburgh to have more hotels (which I personally don't see, and by the way we should really have a tourist tax anyway), then have one here and preserve the old Royal High School on Calton Hill to look like it does now.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FCUM-7</p> | <p>2017-12-15 22:46:31</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|-------------------------|----------------------------|
| <p>The proposed street layout and the concept of an "island" in Picardy Place is a completely inappropriate design for 21st century Edinburgh. This design is likely to be in place for at least 30 years, and therefore it will lock in a prioritisation of vehicular traffic that will dominate not only Picardy Place, but also the surrounding streets, and even further from this locus to the streets of the New Town (as far as the West End) and North and South Bridge, for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Contrary to CEC's policies It is a well-known phenomenon that if roads are built and expanded, then traffic will come and fill it up (it's called Induced Demand). This is exactly the opposite of CEC's stated policy of reducing the volume of private car usage and encouraging more active and sustainable transport options.</p> <p>The stated features and benefits are spurious and inaccurate. Some of the features listed in this consultation are of no relevance to a design for the 21st century. Most notable is "returning Picardy Place to its historical layout". Notwithstanding that it all depends at what period you define the history (it was once fields), the 1970 layout was not necessarily satisfactory at the time (access to the island tenements in Picardy Place was not very good) and photographs show that traffic levels were very low compared with what will be expected if the 2017 proposal is implemented. It will become a traffic dominated desert that neither serves the travelling public nor will it help the public to access the retail outlets in St James' Quarter. Another spurious feature is the ability of buses to turn around. This is really stretching the justification; if that is genuinely a requirement, there are many other options available to allow buses to turn around in that vicinity without building a 3-lane gyratory. Other stated benefits are just plain wrong. A notable claim is easy tram/bus interchange and easy access to the St James' Quarter. The fact that the design is for (effectively) a giant triangular roundabout, any bus stop will be on the opposite side of the road from the proposed island, so anyone</p> | <p>I do not agree with the premise of the question. There should not be an "island" but a "peninsular" connected at the cathedral side. This will allow many more options for the site, rather than closing them all off as a traffic dominated island would. What is principally needed is a green welcoming space for people. Pedestrians and passengers could linger (weather permitting) and enjoy the space rather than being surrounded by noisy traffic and finding it difficult to get off the island. Some well-designed low level development could be undertaken but it should be a place where people can relax. There are already some well known statues in the area; the peninsular could become a focus for sculpture and other artwork; there could be a fountain; a place for children to play; a café; a quiet place for visitors to the cathedral. There are many options but most of them will not be possible with the island as proposed. It would be a catastrophe for several decades.</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2B-9</p> | <p>2017-12-15 22:57:45</p> |
| <p>The disabled and elderly , the sick and visually impaired need help and are becoming more " disabled! this is scandalous ! People are distressed and are having difficulty continuing the spiritual practices City infrastructures have taken precedence over people</p> | <p>An area open and suitable for reflection and With clear safe access to St Marys Cathedral and St Paul's and St George's churches vital to the Spiritual heritage of Scotland</p> | <p>ANON-8G9D-FS2C-A</p> | <p>2017-12-15 23:26:15</p> |

My primary concerns is the cycle lane in front of the Omni Centre. Due to how busy that area normally is with pedestrians and waiting cars, I can imagine people running across that lane to get in stopped cars. There doesn't seem to be a provision for people or taxis to wait near the Omni & Playhouse. It has to be close or people won't use it. Three streets away in a car park is too far for the elderly, young & lazy. Second concern is turning right coming down Leith Street to Leith Walk. That can be a quick road and I am concerned about turning right on a bike to make use of that road.

Seems the brief is focused on motor traffic movement first with pedestrian, cycle and public roads as an after thought. If this is a design based on traffic modeling then The Council should look at how to decrease motor traffic in The City and design for lower volumes. The future of our city has to be less traffic not existing or more. Agree with systems statement on design. Prefer zone architects proposal with new public square. Please go back to the drawing board and tackle the modeling, dont design to traffic modules otherwise we'll end up with car dominated cities.

I am concerned about the lack of disabled parking beside the Cathedral. Some people are too infirm and disabled to walk, they need to be dropped off in front of the Cathedral, there is not enough space. There has been no consideration of funeral corteges and wedding cars, the fundamental functions of the church havent been thought about. I see there is a loading bay in the revised plan. I hope this isnt for coffins. The space for parking needs to accomodate hearses and several funeral cars and be located in a space where it will be treated with respect. I am appalled that a taxi rank is being considered for Little King Street. This will take up more space and I would not feel safe waiting for a taxi there compaired to other, more open spaces in town.

The plan has been formulated without any consultation from citizens, disabled people and parishioners of St Mary's Cathedral. The Plan would be improved by moving the island site forward , attach it to the front of the Cathedral to make a space where people can relax. linger and enjoy a place of peace. It could become like a Piazza in front of significant buildings in Europe. The significance of the building of St Marys has been overlooked. The purpose, weddings, funerals & masses have been ignored because a lack of understanding of religion in society.

Current proposal is too influenced by traffic model which could also be inaccurate and against current transport policy. Remove most arm of gyratory and extend church plaza, creating a smaller T junction. Priorities trams and buses with one lane for traffic in each direction, bus lanes and cycles on both sides of street.

Overall Brilliant! Please try to include view to sea down Leith Walk, and Calton Hill etc. Good for overall well being. Open space very important. About Leith Street for buses only - Please Don't - Cars etc will all come down Calton Road. Being Selfish!

The increase in shared space is not a good idea. Pedestrians (some frail and elderly) will not use shared space - feeling inhibited by sharing space with cyclists. There should be clearly segregated areas, make it safe and welcoming for everyone. We are trying to promote active travel and elderly will be dissuaded from these areas

Leith Street to Broughton Street requires 4 signal crossings for folks walking or using cycle provision. This does not align with government policy to prioritise these modes.

There is no East-West connection for cyclists, i.e. if you want to go to York Place to Leith Walk, you can't cut through tram stop - must go uphill to Leith Street and back down. Again discouraging this mode (against Government Policy).

Traffic modelling based on current demand, CEC should be aiming to reduce vehicle demand to meet incoming low emission zone targets. Additionally, induced demand makes design a self-fulfilling prophecy. If you build capacity automobiles will fill it up.

Comments from council representatives at consultation event suggest need to tackle traffic volume as part of wider measures. This site is not part of wider traffic reduction strategy.

The current design is being advertised as "flexible" i.e. traffic lane could be removed if needed. Why not start with traffic lane removed, and then add it if needed? Makes much more sense long term.

Central public realm/greenspace idea totally unrealistic - who would want to meet to hand out in centre of an 11 lane traffic island?

Proposed cycle way outside Omni will create conflict between pedestrians and cyclists and people being dropped off on junction (which will happen regardless of enforcement measures). Reducing number of lanes on junction would create more space to avoid this conflict.

I primarily use this junction as a cyclist. My primary concern is the safety of travelling from Leith Street to Broughton Street. I am unlikely to use the right hand segregated cycle lanes due to needing to cross the road multiple times. Therefore I would remain on the road and would have to use the middle lane which is difficult and dangerous to change into. In addition if this is a terminus for buses, cycling in a middle lane would be uncomfortable. Secondly I often cycle from Leith Street to Leith Walk. I would like to use the proposed segregated cycle path, but I am concerned that there is a clear entrance point from the northbound lane. In addition, the pavements where that cycle lane will be added is often very busy. I would be worried that pedestrians would not respect it, limiting its usefulness.

Has been interesting to hear "x might happen" & "this" could be the first of many incremented changes, as this information has not been easy to find otherwise (I say this as a resident and council employee). However, profile among the public of such significant & wide-reaching changes has been woefully low. It does not build confidence in the councils ability to see through these plans. I'm concerned at the lack of consideration given to active travel, despite the councils apparent comitment to increasing this. The proposed plans look no less favourable for pedestrians & cyclists than the current layout which opten feels no less than dangerous. The central "triangle" ought to be given over to green space or community-use but will require better encouragement for the puclic to think of it as theirs than a few - not enough pedestrian crossings. A more ambitious plan to favour active & public transport would be my preference - Edinburgh is at breaking point with the continual use of public transport - why not be bold and reduce private cars, not maintain the status quo? Here's to Edinburgh for the public! (I did not catch his name but the man I spoke to was representing the council & development spoke clearly & was very helpful in understanding the proposals - Thank you)!

Pavement space for pedestrians is already limited. It seems to have reduced here?

Is this the first step towards a greater plan for Edinburgh City Centre? If so, it has not been communicated.

Fundamentally, I believe city centre car traffic should be banned.

Busses/trams already blocked at the bottom of The Mound at peak time. Princes Street and Old Town are unwelcoming to pedestrians and cyclists - not suitable for a tourism reliant city. City centre should not be a private vehicle through route.

Will this step provide a temporary solution to traffic flow only? If so, what's the point?

Island should be free of buildings, but not necessarily clear green spac.

Market of cafe would be ideal.

A 3 lane highway will attract more traffic adding to city centre congestion. Is that the aim?

There needs to be a dedicated bus lane to make public transport easier and more attractive.

Far too little attention seems to have been given to pedestrians and road crossings. The whole design should be approached with priority given to those on foot. Wider pavements needed! Friendlier road crosssings needed? I'm fed up as pedestrian having to share space with cyclists. It means being confronted with speed and at this time of year excessively bright flashing lights (illegal under rule 114 of the highway code). Keep cyclists and walkers apart! Protect pedestrians from inconsiderate cyclists!

Roundabout design no improvement on the present.

I favour a junction design.

There's no way to make a 3 way roundabout people friendly. Make a T junction instead, I support the systems proposal instead. You are prioritising cars over everything else. If you build for 3 lanes of traffic they will fill up. By attempting to make it fast and easy to drive into town, that's what people will do. This is "induced traffic". If you prioritise walking, cycling and public transport, then that's what people will choose instead. Don't be afraid to make it hard to take a private car to the town centre.

Please retain right hand turn into Bleinham Place from Elm Row roundabout.

Please retain right hand turn form London Road into Leith Walk.

Please reinstate the clock which used to stand on roundabout at London Road (Leith Walk junction)

Please bring back artwork, cast - metal pigeons.
Pedestrians/Cyclists crossroads outside Conan Doyle pub a big concern, can't see how that can work at peak times.

Would like to see additional cycle lane, West to East end on the central island

Much improved though.

Better, at least the cycle path doesn't focus the tram stop. But.....still not radical enough though, I love the idea of a sunken centre of the " triangular roundabout" filled with a building. Don't leave it as a void - an ideal place for urban crime. But if this is developer driven then it may just be a ruse.
As a cyclist I would refuse to leave George Stree, go down Noth St Davids street, down York Place, negotiate a junction, go up the first part of Leith on a cycle lane then join 4 lanes of traffic fo waterloo place. If I wanted to go to the Bridges I would (i will) go down to Princes Street then along Princes Street and turn on to the Bridges.

No justification for reducing pedestrian space by the Cathedral and moving the Paoulozzi's, there's plenty of space!

Thank you to all the staff on duty that were very helpful.
The new design is an improvement, efforts should ensure that,
The public space outside the Cathedral remains available to its current users.
No cars should be allowed to park outside the Cathedral.
All possible mature trees should be retained.
As the pollution levels will be high, many more trees should be planted.
The pedestrian access to the Playhouse is dealt with - in favour of pedestrians.

I don't like the idea of a road in front of the Cathedral, I would also like the "triangle" to be retained as an open space & not be built on. I'm further against any extension to the trams. The trams are severley underused and must be losing money every year. This is soley a vanity project for the council.

It seems very very unfortunate that the tram stop is such a conditioning factor. It would be very desirable to reduce the south of the island side to allow the roadway to be moved northwards to allow more pedestrian/public realm space in front of the cathedral and to allow the paolozzo sculptures to sit as a group intended.

As much care and ingenuity should be used to keep pedestrians and cyclists apart and to protect pedestrians from cyclists, and to get cyclists to defer to pedestrians needs. Can by laws be used to regulated cyclists behaviour? e.g if it ways dismount you have to dismount.

No left turn from York Place to Broughton Street makes no sense as its going to drive traffic onto the next left turn which is Union Place and the ever narrowing East Broughton Place, pushing traffic heading north into small residential streets.

Why are we designing to fail rather than desiging a modern city centre. The latest design started with private vehicles and forgot about pedestrians until the end. This should be redone putting people first. If traffic can't get through the junction it will evaporate. The island will remain barren if it is left isolated like this!

I absolutley disagree with the gyratory. At the bare minimum it needs a connected cycle lane past the tram stop to Leith Walk.

Simply no Gyratory, if your answer is gyratory then the question is wrong. To ensure more model shift to cycles it is very important for cycle routes to be complete without "Cyclists Dismount" signs. Signs saying "Please give priority to pedestrians" are reasonable . We want pedestrians to feel safe too. The top of Leith Street from Calton Road to Waterloo Place needs to be protected for pedestrians and cyclists (and buses) If necessary due to limited space, please exclude cars. Cyclists must have designated space on the side of the gyratory island with good links e.g Tiger crossings whenever required.

So to sum up: Think cyclists and ensure all desire lines are fully covered by uninterupted routes. Then you will attract more cyclists with E-trikes, the hills of Edinburgh are no longer a hindrance so you can expect more people to want to cycle. Please be forward thinking and plan for this.

Important to consider the way sherlock statue is facing - visitors must be able to take photos without backing into the road - as with Harry Potter café and Greyfriars Bobby.

Bus users seem to have been neglected in this plan. May have misunderstood plan but crossings to theatre seem to be much less direct and more time consuming.

Will the pedestrian crossing from Gayfield Square to Elm Row remain?

The plans look okay but really feel the trams arent necessary. I think it should be explained to the public exactly why they are necessary. I am prepared to be convinced but have seen no justification so far.

A lot of thought has obviously gone into accomodating the needs of pedestrians and cyclists

Reduce risk of conflict in shared use areas by tiger crossings and guiding cyclists to them.

Continue to keep Leith Street car free, I understand it would be possible to close the top of Leith Street while also giving access to the St James Hotel etc, leaving bikes and buses to use the top of the street.

Preference for cycle paths to follow the edge of the triangle to allow for flow of bikes from York Place to Leith Walk.

Revive idea of congestion charge.

No high buildings on the triangle - should be public space with trees, maybe wildflower beds etc.

Pedestrian crossing across Greenside Place and Union Place?

Too long - four stages! Real issue especially with football to Playhouse and Omni.

No bus lanes, does not bode well for public transport users.

Current two stage crossing for pedestrians at top of Broughton Street replaced by 3 stage - significant disadvantage for pedestrians.

Pedestrian/cycle crossings between Little Leith Street/Leith Street is very narrow. The island is far too narrow to accomodate cycles and people on bikes.

Gyratory layout really problematic, so sad to see this as our Picardy Place. Contradicts all CEC policy on traffic reduction. This layout does not reduce traffic.

Desire line for cyclists coming along York Place should be more direct rather than causing pinch point accross Leith Sreet.

Pedestrian crossing times look to be slow. No priority for them as priority given to traffic.

Good to see more public space outside Cathedral.

Three stage crossing for cyclists coming from Broughton Street too long - not desire line.

Good to see public art given space to live.

I am concered that there is no cycle route from York Place to Antigua Street, for the diversion takes cycles into conflict with pedestrians, plus is longer, uphill and therefore it will be more dangerous as cyclists (judging by temp Montrose Terrace diversion on which is dangerous for cyclists, whether they ignore the 1 way system or not - different dangers but both create dangers) will ignore system that is illogical. A cycle route, solely for cyclists is the best option - not on display now.

This plan should be put aside until there has been a decision on the tram station. When any permanent changes are made they should place the emphasis on reducing car access to the city centre and do something appropriate with the central space.

I am greatly opposed to the Gyratory scheme. I feel that the community have not been adequately involved in coming up with innovative, progressive solutions. The Gyratory scheme is too focussed on managed traffic. Why the rush? Why not postpone decision until the tram extension decision is made. The local community (from everything I have heard) are very opposed to the approach taken today. I remain concerned that too much emphasis remains on traffic by automobile. More foot and cycle needed. The central area being "open to possibilities" is not comforting. It is and will be an ugly, unloved space only useful in relevance to the automobile led gyratory. Car led development like this needs to be relegated to history. Alternatives exist; Employ them!

If we start from the basis that council policy is for model shift from private car to public and active transport then this plan is a failure to make any change to the status quo. Public space is reduced, road space is increased. Life is made no easier and in cases more difficult for pedestrians, although I accept that cycling provision has improved.

Suggestions:

Adopt the T Junction proposed by living streets and zone architects.

Continue cycle segregation up Leith Street.

Reduce width of roads to fewer lanes which have a better change of flowing.

Consider restricting Leith Street to buses & cycles only.

Remove multi stage pedestrian crossings

Give more space to high foot traffic area outside the omni centre

Model shift is only possible by making the unfavoured option (private car) more difficult, while making favoured options (walk, cycle, bus, tram) more convenient.

Need for pedestrian crossing from the row of restaurants in Union Place to a position close to the Playhouse Theatre on the other side of the road (there is one there at present). Otherwise pedestrians face extended walks to cross to the theatre. Which way will the Holmes statue face? For people to view it from on and be photographed/take selfies with it, it must face onto the newly created island, rather than down Leith Walk, where it couldn't be properly photographed except from the road. I also suggest a lower plinth than at present.

Really encourage as must focus as possible on planning for future - that encourages maximum ped/cycle activity/transport. Different public transports mechanisms compared with current nonsense of tram as largely add-on! Really encourage open space for public living compared with current feel of this area as mainly a big traffic junction that non drivers have to navigate somehow.

Would be great if the city could embrace a bolder vision for transformation of Princes Street as part of a fully integrated plan to make more social space rather than a bus route. Edinburgh needs radical vision strong sustainable city living.

Encouraging that questions were fully answered in good and knowledgeable spirit.

Centre ground where Holmes statue will be , make this a green space with trees and eating.

The East West cycle route is coming so the development must with with that. Therefore cyclists should go from York Place to Picardy Place without crossing in front of the Cathedral and likewise going the other way.] If Edinburgh is serious about walking and cycling, this redevelopment must be cycle & walking friendly.

A cycle lane up each side of Leith Street would be useful too.

It is very important from the Cathedrals point of view, to have access to parking directly outside for hearses & wedding cars & disabled parking.

Glad to see some improvement on earlier versions but still prioritising car use over walk/cycle/bus.

Good to hear that some aspects can be improved in the future - e.g reduction of the 1600 parking spaces.

Suggest - keep Leith Street as bus/bike/ped through route with parking access only for cars.

Hope council will lead the way in reducing car use in city active with congestion & emission charges for example.

Too much road space devoted to car users.

Difficult to use crossings for people on bikes and foot.

Very narrow multi stage cycleways

Need to reduce demand by people using cars & return space to people.

Incredibly depressing that system is designed to accommodate car parking agreed so many years ago.

CEC, where is your waking & cycling vision?

This just looks like too much road for the centre of a city like Edinburgh in the 21st Century.

Public space is not public space if its in the middle of a roundabout.

Look out Trafalgar Square!!!!

Central space should be left undeveloped for pop up events, farmers market & exhibit type displays.

The central area opposite the Cathedral is a prime development site.

However there is more and more desire for free spaces in our city and this would with imaginative design become an oasis.

I'm concerned about pedestrian crossings especially opposite the playhouse, no provision?

Pedestrian crossing York Place - proposed 3 stage? (2 stage now)

No Bus lanes in Leith Street

Only single lane planned for traffic from York Place to Leith Walk & London Road.

A chance for an open vista. Please do not build on this space. Walking up Leith Street wonderful open outlook of buildings once hidden. Enjoy view before Edinburgh's next carbuncle!

Very good design for cycle paths, separate and safe. In middle of "roundabout" maybe small floral display to give some colour. Please bring back the old clock, here or at the other nearby location.

A single lane towards Leith is a flow which raises concerns about capacity as well as pedestrian crossing timings.

The single lane to Leith will cause real problems should there be an accident or a bus dropping off at the hotel.

Too many cars.

No consideration for pedestrians at all.

Will only serve to add congestion.

Bizarre 1960's thinking.

Lacks ambition.

Cyclists who wish to go from York Place to Leith Walk should be encouraged to cross via the island in the most direct manner, it would get them away from in front of the Cathedral.

While I understand there is currently a need to cope with existing traffic levels, I would have liked to have seen more emphasis on people, either living, working or visiting the city. With all the building work around Leith Walk, and the drive to attract more tourists, people should be paramount. Look at many continental European Cities - they have put people first in their city centres. I favour traffic proposals which do not have the triangular island. We have an opportunity to have a large plaza in front of the Cathedral - fully pedestrianised - and with easy access to the tram stop. The current proposal has people crossing busy roads to get to/ alight from the tram - not a good idea - an accident waiting to happen. We need immediate measures to reduce traffic flows - not wait until the 2050 vision realisation.

Very concerned about shutting off left hand turn down Broughton Street as I think a detour down Dundas Street is going to harm business on Broughton, more so businesses at the top of Broughton Street. You say not a lot of traffic turns left down Broughton Street at the moment but I see it every day and enough comes down to bring Broughton extra business. If they have to detour to much they won't bother coming back around. When they do detour they are going to be using the residential area anyway so to take pressure of Queen Street/Dundas Street junction. Also to take away volume of traffic on those residential roads. Open up left turn onto Dublin Street but as there is already a disabled ramp it would make more sense to open up York Place Lane thus lets traffic slip down to Albany Street to park or take shortest route to Broughton Street. Thus again elevates volume of traffic on both new proposals for new roundabout also Queen Street/ Dundas Street junction and less traffic going along residential streets around that area.

Huge opportunity wasted. You have loads of space yet are expecting pedestrians & cyclists to cross over, mix, go much further, crammed in. Currently no traffic is allowed to use Leith Street to Princes Street/ Waterloo Place. When you look for a more pleasant future then this should continue - keep as much traffic as possible off this route. Don't make it easy for private cars etc. Do the same as for Princes Street - buses, cyclists & pedestrians. The cars, vans etc have had to find another route. Then you wouldn't need the huge roundabout with traffic lights & so many lanes of traffic. Prioritise public space that builds community, roads don't do this. Don't expect to create a garden in the middle of this traffic dominant roundabout or build a hotel. Discourage traffic & free up more space for trees etc. Shared spaces for cyclists & pedestrians are hated by pedestrians in Edinburgh. I know, I walk & cycle. Pedestrians don't behave as those in Germany etc & aren't expecting cycles on what they see as pavements. Cyclists here tend to go faster than those in shared spaces in Europe.

TOTAL re think needed - Blue skies & open minds.

Stop making the City slow, bad for business & compromised for bike & people. Give us a chance to buy all the places you consider your space & preserve them to parks. Don't give permits for new build right on the footpath then claim back road to give foot space. Large open spaces in Edinburgh are just bleak & unpleasant so a large flat bistro style skate park where the roundabout is are just civil littering. Why not be imaginative, create open light under pass structure for people and trees and cafes inside the roundabout for just plant a visual garden.

Any development in a triangle centre will affect flow.

Trams run x2x2 across a busy junction - timings of traffic halts will have major impact on flow.

Trees gone!

Single lane outflow bus & car to Leith Walk,

Create a proper tram bus interchange in centre of triangle (look at German systems)

Design belongs in the 1950's.

Leith Street will be closed for a year, does it need to re open?

Design doesn't reflect approved active travel policies.

4 stage crossing rather than 1 as per CEC policy

How will hotel in middle be serviced?

Shared space between cyclists and pedestrians not workable

Ignores street design manual

Puts traffic at heart of Edinburgh

Brings more traffic to city centre

Design only benefits developers

Bus lanes removed- why?

No bus priority

I'd like to see bus lanes around the gyratory and if the council are serious about moving people from private cars onto public transport/bikes, it would take a lot more sense for buses to have priority round the gyratory. A cycle path connecting York Place & Leith Walk along the north edge of the gyratory/ Piccardy Place is needed, cyclists are not going to use the gyratory cycle paths to do York Place-Leith Walk, they're going to use the fastest & most direct route. Thanks for running the engagement event - it was really interesting seeing the evolution of the designs.

There is real opportunity to create a destination for visitors and outstanding public realm by prioritising pedestrian space, giving cycles segregated lanes both directions on Leith Walk. This scheme will only have a decent impact on businesses, health, air quality etc, if it is ambitious and realises that public space should not be dominated by private cars. The current updated proposals do not provide a great enough change from the status quo to create the shift in travel methods the council seeks. Leith Street should remain pedestrianised, Leith Walk should be significantly calmed.

The 3 junction layout prioritises movement of private cars over pedestrians, cyclists and public transport, again policy in the app, designing streets & the local development plan.

The revised design with more space outside the Cathedral is better but risks creating conflict between pedestrians and cyclists at the corner with York Place. The shared space proposed here is not a good solution & needs to be resolved.

Given that many households in Edinburgh do not have access to a car, it is important that the proposals work for them. I am concerned that the design will be negative for bus users (reduced priority) pedestrians (reduced pavement width) and cyclists (non connectivity of networks).

This design should be part of an overall reduction in the capacity for the road network for vehicles and an increase in capacity, connectivity and comfort of pedestrians, cyclists & public transport networks.

As this design is about the future, it should be modelled against model shift targets e.g in cycle journeys and not current traffic levels.

The presence of a large off street car park should not be influencing road capacity in this area, there is a clear danger that increasing road space will increase car journeys induced demand.

The detailed navigation of this area is for pedestrians & cyclists is controlled & illegible e.g crossing from Omni centre toward Union Street.

The island site seems to present considerable difficulty for future input except for a public space e.g how would a new building be serviced?

This makes the underlying assumption that this space would be developable questionable.

I don't favour the gyratory triangle approach and suggest an improved T junction would be better. The proposed new tram stop area could be widened to incorporate a bus stop/interchange with both east west bound buses. This would reduce the amount of time on junctions round the triangle and occasions for traffic being stopped.

Central triangular space should be left open, garden, plaza, market..

It should be made clear that the proposed footway in front of the Cathedral steps will permit drop off/pick up & parking for funeral & wedding vehicles. Many disabled drivers drive themselves. The carpark in the new development will be too far away & up/down & steep. There must be disabled parking close to the Cathedral.

I like the latest amended traffic plan, as a definite improvement over the previous proposal. However I do think that the tram tracks & tram infrastructure encroaches too much on the available space for buses and private and commercial vehicles moving along Picardy Place and heading towards Leith Walk. I suggest there needs to be some alleviation of this potential bottleneck in the stretch along Picardy Place.

I walk, drive, cycle and use public transport on a regular basis. Overall I am disappointed with the current plan for Picardy Place. The emphasis is on the cars and not on the active travel. It misses opportunity to meet council and government plans for future travel.

Recent reports was for space in Edinburgh for cycling, walking & public transport and not for cars - reduce air pollution, more attractive town centres. Sustain a greener Leith. Looking forward to the bike hire scheme.

Pedestrians completely de-prioritised, huge volumes of pedestrians pass through here yet they will get nothing but multisection staggered crossings, roundabout detours, squashed footways and a gyratory even more unpleasant than the existing roundabout.

Cyclists not considered. You do know that hundreds of cyclists have fallen off and been injured whilst negotiating tram tracks? You do know that a cyclist/human died at Shandwick Place earlier this year? On this plan, it will be extremely difficult to see the tracks particularly with a bus/taxi/lorry/car two feet behind.

This junction is not just for cars. Just because too many people try to drive through it between 08.45-09.30 and 16.30-17.45 each day, do not spoil the experience for the pedestrians using it in far greater numbers throughout the day. This is not 1970. Leith Walk/Queen Street are not motorways. Leith Street is currently shut to motor vehicles and the world has not ended.

An outdoor swimming pool on the triangle in the middle, flumes and diving boards in summer and in winter jacuzzi and heated water (with all year round sprinklers and waves)

Traffic lights for buses to go first (If not a swimming pool, a bike riding course)

On middle triangle there could be an outdoor swimming pool with diving boards and flumes. The monte casino sculptures should definitely stay together.

Potential areas of conflict between pedestrians & cyclists where bus passengers cross the cycleway on Leith Street & between cyclists and cars at the crossing points on Little King Street & Cathedral Lane.
Is a single lane sufficient for motorists coming from York Place & going down Leith Walk? I have never taken the route from York Place to Leith Street.

The St Mary's Cathedral really needs a dedicated area for disabled parking, funerals & weddings.

Could this be on Little King Street?

Concerns over making sure pedestrianised area outside the Cathedral is large enough?

It would be good to know more information on which bus stops would continue to exist on surrounding streets e.g. Broughton Street.

More to be done about frequent road crossings for pedestrians.

Much Improved on previous plans.

I came to find out if what, if any, consideration had been given to disabled parking/access to St Mary's RC Cathedral. I bring disabled people to Mass every week, which would be impossible if no disabled parking was available in the immediate vicinity of the Cathedral. I sincerely hope the council will take this concern on board.

Keep triangle to a green space.

No bus stop outside Cathedral - too noisy

Ensure disabled parking spaces are provided for Cathedral.

Good to see joined up thinking, that the council has considered wider implications of this plan. Illustrations of each stage were useful, especially the video example. Also useful to speak to people involved in the planning & development. Public open space area to be commended!

Keep and enhance green space on triangle. Don't build on it.

Thank you for an opportunity to comment. I'm disappointed in provision for cyclists. I don't think shared cycle lanes/pedestrians is realistic, nor that cyclists should dismount in order to carry out typical journeys. A 2m wide 2-way lane is too narrow for cycle-commuting. The gyratory drawing looks like the central space will be unused - it's surrounded by 3/4 lane roads.

Very disappointed in provision for cyclists, cycle routes seem like an add on that won't really work with cycle routes interrupted by pedestrian crossings and cyclists having to actually stop, get off their bikes and cross with pedestrians. Commuter cyclists will not tolerate on off, stop start cycling and will end up being in the now narrower and more dangerous road lanes. It is designed for cars not for a city that promotes cycling, shows a willingness to sometime put cyclists before other vehicles. Cyclists need to be able to cycle safely and without stopping & starting.

The route for East/North bound cyclists from York Place is a bit convoluted compared to the earlier proposals. I would prefer a straighter cycle route that followed the NW side of the island site.

I would be in favour of keeping the island site with no more than very low - level development- this would keep open sight-lines to the Cathedral etc.

Plenty of trees would be nice.

Don't consider the island site should be developed, so much traffic moving around, environmentally & for health reasons, it would be irresponsible i.e no café culture - and it would be noisy.

September consultations - we were not informed.

Appears to be no vehicle access to front of Cathedral. What about wedding cars, hearses and disabled?

Cathedral is not just a Parish Church. It hosts major church events. There may be bus loads at times from outside the city.

The parking in front of the church for weddings, funerals & disabled vehicles appears compromised with the withdrawal of pay & display & permit spaces from Picardy Place. What provisions are to be made for additional parking. The roundabout at London Road/top of Leith Walk is not being reinstated. Where will the clock be located & the pigeons?

I am happy to see final plans with more space to the front of the Catholic Cathedral but please check length of Cathedral Lane - I don't think it is suitable for large vehicles, so again to enter via Elder Street is vital. The Paolozzi statue is artwork that happens to be in 3 parts - so please help to three parts to face each other not to have one piece separated by the road.

I am frankly appalled that the gyratory is still being pursued, with minor revisions. This design will create a traffic dominated sterile environment with no possibility of high quality public space. the noise and fumes, difficulty of crossing the three or four lanes of traffic will create an incredibly hostile space for people trying to walk in the area. I urge the council to abandon these plans and seek an alternative solution, such as the 2014 sustrans proposals. We need pedestrian and public transport priority (including bus lanes) plus safe cycling facilities. The aim should be to reduce private motor vehicle traffic not sustain it. Comply with your own transport policy.

Lack of green corridor to the city. Great concern with buses & volume of traffic heading to bus depot 24 hours a day, noise & pollution of waiting buses. Where is the clock?

Elm Street trees, retain these, current proposal of cycle path, these trees are beautiful, great loss if removed.

Involvement and comments from conservation & Unesco Heritage sites.

Top of Leith Walk vista, no termination or focus point, disappointing to see traffic lights here, would be great opportunity for focus point & Welcome to the City.

Concern on quality of pavement & transition paths used, should be high spec in keeping with new town planning.

Concern with bus pollution and noise.

Although seen as "optimal" the revised plan seems poor in terms of future plans to do with both trams and right turn from London Road also Tesco, Hertz & Holiday Inn traffic. I have used the area for over 10 years as a pedestrian, cyclist and car user. Currently see no issue with roundabout....understand about GAM agreement for area but it must be decided what is more important, cars, buses or public transport and "active transport". Six junctions to go from London Road to Leith Walk is almost laughable and will add significant journey times and also add traffic to outlying residential areas. The central area should be reduced as much as possible to allow larger public realm. While I understand the traffic issues with the option it is much better for local residents and the local community. The Paolozzi's should not be moved (temporary movement always become permanent) from area outside the Cathedral should at very least try and be maintained.

Some 3D pictures would be beneficial.

Discussion of central area should include something for local community.

Very concerned about provisions for cyclists. Cycle lane is in fact a mixed space on Leith Street as pedestrians cross from bus stops to pavement - Dangerous. Current proposal makes cycle route from Leith Walk to Queen Street unworkable, need to dismount and cross 2 roads. Need to rethink to prioritise cycling. Have already seen how trams have made cycling difficult and dangerous.

The one lane first past Hertz will cause major problems with buses & traffic coming from North Bridge & pedestrian crossing.

The number of crossings (5) and traffic lights round the island will cause problems unless they are very well phased. An underpass would be better. Cycle lanes - what can be done to ensure they follow the rules of the road & don't hit pedestrians, they are a menace at the moment.

One lane onto York Place for buses and traffic will cause problems.

Why no left turn onto Broughton Street from York Place. Forcing a driver to go round the island will add to congestion.

Existing pedestrian crossing at the Playhouse - removing this would cause problems as it is in reality well used. Pleased to see Paolozzi sculptures relocated closer to their original location as they relate directly to the Catholic Cathedral in their symbolism and were meant to be located by the Cathedral. Maybe the "hand" could be nearer the others instead of the other side of Little King Street, or they could be put in the central triangle in front of the Cathedral.

I am a resident of Forth Street. Can I make a plea in the strongest possible terms that the space in the middle of the prepared gyratory system is NOT used for building development purposes. Large numbers of pedestrians are going to be moving through this area from the many bus stops and the tram stop (assuming this goes ahead). This should remain a public space and not be used for further development. The Council should forego the possible profit from sale of this area in order to allow public use of the central area.

The extra space in front of Cathedral may help but it is important that there are disabled parking spaces and certainly more than one, also space for funeral and wedding corteges which do have to be stationary for more than just set down & pick up. Set down & pick up disabled parking is not feasible. Many disabled people are on their own. Please note the Cathedral is not just attended by local people but from other parts of the city.

I endorse the spurtle criticisms of the proposed layout, also any SPOKES suggestions. I favour a straight junction between Picardy Place, Broughton Street and Leith Walk. I do not favour a gyratory road system as proposed. I favour a pavement and cycleway following the obvious desire lines.

Not enough consideration is being taken of the day to day running of the Cathedral. Hearses and wedding cars cannot "drop off" coffins in a loading bay. Surely the cycle lane should be used for the exclusive use of the Cathedral, and should be a lane for the Cathedral. It also seems unnecessary that a double bus stop should be in front of the Cathedral. The 3 streets surrounding the central traffic island should take the bus stops. Priority should be given to the 2500 people who use the Cathedral.

The proposal is too motor vehicle dominated. We need to move to a greener cleaner city. Reduce the space available to drive and many problems go away. Specific improvements needed, no sudden new lanes appearing just before junctions. There are very hard for cyclists. It should not require more cycles or the lights to cycle through than to drive through.

While recognising too many priorities in designing a solution to satisfy all various modes of travel, I feel the solution presented is a 1970's scheme to facilitate vehicular movement. The important lessons from designing streets and active travel action plan are not obvious. The pressures to address traffic generated pollution and more this beautiful and historic city towards a traffic free environment have been lost. The opportunity to set a new standard for urban decision has been deferred by this proposal which lacks a vision for the future. Picardy Place is a small part of the inner city and any vision for addressing the traffic problem has to be city wide. The focus has to be in active travel and public transport to take us in the right direction in the ever growing city.

CEC policies prioritise walking & cycling. Picardy Place is already traffic heavy - the gyratory design is inappropriate and non-compliant with Scottish Government & CEC Policies - consider place over movement and then push towards active & sustainable transport. Multiple traffic lanes don't sit well with this. While buses may need to turn, this doesn't require a gyratory or facility for all traffic. The potential for a transport hub/bus/tram interchange by say, rotating buses to the north side of the central area beside the tram stop, does not seem to have been exploited. NB Buses are only on Leith Street? The east/west York Place/Leith Walk cycle route seems to have disappeared, being replaced by crossing in front of the Cathedral and x2 crossings. Broughton Street & Leith Street now involves x5 crossings for cyclists to gain the cycleway. Both these change to "shared space" an approach to junctions, this creating areas where most pedestrian/cycle conflict is likely. 3 metre wide so the footway widths meet CRC street design guidance)? segregated cycle paths are needed. If any gyratory remains, these paths should be on all three sides.

Why is the extension to Edinburgh Trams assumed to be approved? CEC is struggling to achieve budget cuts and yet this vanity project is still being considered a priority, over essential, life saving services for the elderly and vulnerable. It is common knowledge that £160K is being paid weekly on the interest for the loan for trams phase 1. The inquiry into trams phase 1 is ongoing, to the shame of all concerned, and yet CEC has the audacity to pursue phase 2. The majority of citizens (not tourists or councillors) in Edinburgh do not want and never wanted trams. The area of public realms in front of St. Mary's Cathedral, which is attended by 2.5k Christians every weekend, is being massively compromised, such that funeral corteges, wedding cars and disabled access is almost impossible. This area was designed to incorporate sculptures and a market and has been a well used social "hub" and vital setting for St. Mary's for years. I am completely against the clearly unsustainable prioritisation of traffic and trams over society and the environment. Phase 2 of the trams should not go ahead and the area of public realm in front of St Mary's should be conserved and enhanced as part of any new designs for the area. The community Y option is so much better coupled with closure of Calton Road and busgate on Leith Walk, which would allow the space to be useful people using space, more with is required to improve cycling connectivity. Other reasons why the layout won't work; Office blocks in the middle, how will it get serviced by vehicles where is the delivery area for the vehicles. There is insufficient space in front of the Cathedral for the cars /funeral/wedding, to safely move than the pedestrianised space. The Y option should be further exploited.

Paolozzi statues should be kept together not separated by the road.

Keep Leith Street closed to traffic and significantly widen pavements. The widths of the pavements to gain access to road crossing is totally inadequate on Sept 17th plan (not shown on most recent plan) At rush hour this would be a disaster as pavement very heavily used by both cyclists and pedestrians in both directions all in a rush.

If Leith Street closed this would also reduce the number of crossings between Leith Street & Broughton Street, there would be no need for the roundabout or gyratory, for emergency vehicle access could be kept open or possibly Leith Street could be open to buses too as pedestrians favouring space but with vehicle access at 5mph. Similar idea to road at side of V&A think Exhibition Road? Where there is no demarcation between roadway and pavement and mass of pedestrians @ busy times would make vehicles slow down i.e. staggered pedestrian crossing are really annoying - could they be made more direct?

Other traffic travelling up or down the Bridges could remain directed along Waterloo Place & Regent Road via Abbeyhill gyratory. Regent Road/London Road/ Waterloo Place are not used as much by pedestrians, not as narrow or closed in so would reduce all pollution & Regent Road doesn't have residents unlike Leith Street.

Letter attached

Points and manuscript attached

- Picardy Place as part of City routes North/South open to private travel is critical – if residents are to be protected and preserved in the City.
- Shared routes / desire lines
- Flexibility of island to really futureproof – but without leaving us with a concrete junction meantime.
- The bike is not king!

- Tram only area on York Place (westbound) needs clarification
- Share space at west end of tram stop may not be wide enough bearing in mind the OLE pole
- Recommend yellow boxes on either end of tram stops
- Length of ramps at either end of tram stop do not look correct, noting that the stop is on a slope
- Crossing angle for west bound traffic over new extended tram lines.
- Motorcycles will likely have issues
- How will the central site be serviced if it is developed?
- Opportunity of allowing westbound buses/cycles through central island site

- Put people not vehicles first
 - Designed to keep city moving – so we go through Edinburgh and not stop and enjoy it.
 - Tiger crossings segregate cyclists and pedestrians.
 - Does traffic modelling take growth into account to show reductions in car based journeys
 - Blocking pedestrian and cyclist desire lines
 - Summary of benefits does not include the benefit to drivers to drive and park in the middle of Edinburgh speed limits
 - Not included in benefits summary – still a gyratory with inconsistent cycle and pedestrian routes tacked on – “Having your cake and eating it” (Brent Tondonian)
-
- Restricting traffic on Leith Street is not desirable in terms of North South traffic flow in this part of the City.
 - Empty space best used as transport interchange with limited retail development to maintain sightlines down Leith Walk.
 - Welcome addition of space outside of Cathedral
 - Concern about conflict between pedestrians and cyclists, and poor planning of crossing points (i.e. desire lines).
 - Additional car parking in St James Centre will result in increased traffic in area – need to reconsider whether this plan is still appropriate
 - Need to consider impact of and on commercial traffic that is servicing commercial businesses in the area
 - Traffic modelling does not take account of increased activity from reopening of St James Centre
 - Need to model pedestrian numbers to ensure crossings/pavements adequate for volume of people walking between difficult sides of Picardy Place
 - Consider relocating taxi rank to east side of central island site to facilitate transport interchange with buses/trams.
-
- Very strongly want to promote the idea of not developing the ‘island’ for building retail/commercial uses. Suggest making it an open/flexible area (i.e. Bristo Square) and possibly transferring sculptures to this area and making it pedestrian cycle friendly. Could be a sunken terraced area for seating – temporary festival buildings etc
 - This would preserve sightlines up/down Leith Walk
 - Careful consideration of cycle and pedestrian desire lines and constricted crossings, especially crossing in front of Playhouse – potential for ‘Jay’ walking.
 - Strongly suggest residents of RRCTMA would want Leith Street to remain open
 - Consideration to be given to the setting of Picardy Place in overall City Centre plan

Public realm cant simply be empty space with no building in it. It must encourage people to site, stay and relax. It needs benches and trees (perhaps in planters).

City people need urban spaces with access to greenery, plants and trees. Sherlock Holmes is a main tourism draw for the City – his statue should be stored, or placed in an isolated space where there is no footfall. If it cant be placed by Conan Doyle pub it should retained at a site visible to passersby on foot/car.

Disappointing that gyratory modelling assumptions were not clarified.

What about the impact of closing Leith Street to vehicles other than buses and diverting No. 5&34 via current diversionary route?

Would these facilitate a Y/T junction?

How does the modelling link to CEC to cut care share of vehicle miles from 42% to 29% between 2010 and 2020?

It is unclear how pavement widths compare with Street Design Guidance (i.e. minimum desirable of 4metres or more).

- Preference for central island site to remain green, but could have underground building (i.e. theatre/cinema)
- Reduce clutter – avoid too much signage
- Pedestrian/cyclists desire lines are not being met.
- Views down Leith Street/up Leith Walk/along York Place etc are important
- This is a design that is clearly led by traffic movements (isn't this against CEC policy)
- Street furniture required and should be carefully designed so as not to encourage rough sleeping etc.
- Statues to be returned in an appropriate grouping as originally composed by sculpture
- Paving materials should be from a minimal palette to match rest of New Town

Residents want a beautiful space to experience as an environment in which we live. No-one has thought of the town planning visual impact of this gyratory. I don't want to cross six lanes of traffic to get to a café or shop. Space in front of the cathedral needed for wedding, funerals, markets, trees, sculptures which tell the stories of local heritage and community. New immigrants use the cathedral. It is a community hub. We walk and breathe in this place. It is a world heritage site.

More information required in relation to future phases (i.e. is it possible to remove the gyratory in the future? / further options).

Concerns in relation to pedestrian desire lines, shared space between pedestrians and cyclists, East to West Cycle links and cycle links to Broughton Street/Picardy Place itself.

More understanding of how the public space will look and work in three dimensions

supportive of a single junction solution with a peninsula in front of the Cathedral. Although it was explained this is an option which could be considered/explored in the future as part of the City Centre Transformation.

2. Over emphasis on the transport design rather than defining the public realm (i.e. define the public realm in front of the Cathedral – detailed design inc street furniture, landscaping proposals etc). What is the purpose of the public realm space at the Cathedral?
3. Prioritising traffic flows over other modes of transport
4. Would be good to see images of the area rather than just 2D plans.
5. Existing busy crossing at the Playhouse is replaced by 3 crossings and does not follow desire lines. Keen to see this re-introduced.
6. Whilst it was acknowledged the shared space is wide, these areas were not liked and preference for full cyclist and pedestrian segregation.
7. Keen to reinstate the cycle lane to north elevation of the central island site.
8. Whilst it was acknowledged the shared space is wide, these areas were not liked and preference for full cyclist and pedestrian segregation.
9. Segregation at crossings for pedestrians and cyclists given how wide the proposed crossings are (i.e. 6m).
10. Lothian Buses were not against the layout, however keen to understand connectivity in the area and the movement of pedestrians and cyclists, in particular the proposed locations of bus stops and tram stop.
11. Lothian Buses keen to see a bus tram interchange with the introduction of a bus lane adjacent to the tram stop. This was widely supported. This would prevent unnecessary movements around the junction and delete the bus stop at the Cathedral, thus improving the public realm (i.e. keen to see creation of transport hubs in the City).
12. Generally, all wished Council to explore and publish future options for the area and how the design could change in line with the City Centre Transformation.
13. Short sighted design – keen to see a greater level of change now given Leith Street closed and create congestion to promote alternative forms of transport.

Overall plan for the city – where does Picardy Place fit in?

Appreciation that balance needs to be struck.

Hold off development of the island site until clearer about what is being planned for the city

Still concerns around pedestrian / cyclist conflict points.

Can we look at Tiger crossings (separate out walking and cycling)

20mph welcomed

Can we undertake pedestrian counts to get an understanding of how people are using it

Need to re-examine desire lines (eg coming out of Playhouse and wanting to get to Picardy Place road side – convoluted under current proposals

Pedestrian cycling conflicts a concern – tiger crossings.

Why does cycle way stop at top of Leith Street

Broughton Street remains a concern

Put back cycle path by Tram Stop

Displacement – why not simply shut streets

Residents in general like the gyratory

Sharing of spaces is fine for residents

Don't develop island site to give greater flexibility

Don't develop island site now until we know what we want for the city centre. - tie in with Central Edinburgh Transformation

- 3 streets approach here doesn't replace traditional layout.
- Should look at wider opportunities to reduce vehicle traffic into the area.
- Central area's potential as a space sterilised by road - unless there's something on it, people won't cross roads to it. (vs St Andrew Square where they do, was pointed out)
- Layout should reflect central area which could change the use and feel of the space
- Essence of any space is what happens around it / activities.
- Priorities for this space are set differently by every stakeholder; the design should have had a list of priorities and been clear about that
- Project limited in imagination. Opportunity to do something like Piazza Santa Croce in Florence, build space to the front of the cathedral.
- Unrealistic to say we can 'disappear' traffic
- Missed urban opportunity – not designing a place
- Design should follow Designing Streets hierarchy of users.
- Space not sufficient for numbers of pedestrians using it; this will only increase with tram stop
- Needs to be some modelling and analysis of current pedestrian routes, desire lines and volumes
- Still safety issues with crossing at Conan Doyle/Broughton; Playhouse. People will still cross dangerously
- Issues re disabled drop off / access to Cathedral – more blue badge space
- Better solutions for people with mobility impairments. (mobility devices available?)
- Cycle route from Broughton Street needs to be clearer.
- Not clear how cyclists will enter and leave segregated provision
- Concern regarding angle of track crossing for cyclists who want to go straight to Leith Walk from York Pl
- Cars have direct routes here; cyclists don't. 300 yard gap between York Place and Leith Programme tracks
- Is there scope to segregate cycling in Cathedral area?
- Should cycling be encouraged on Abercrombie place instead.

1. Cathedral concern - parking for general cars - also drop off (if not at cathedral very important)
2. Cathedral concern 2 Parking for disabled people attending services
3. Picardy Place residents - general concern about impact – especially loss of parking and loading
4. Too many stages to cross the road - indicates lack of pedestrian priority (fairly unanimous - including both Councillors)
5. Crossings should be on desire lines - concern about staggered crossings and deviation from desired routes (fairly unanimous – including both Councillors)
6. Feeling that more priority should be given to pedestrians in setting signal timings
7. Concern at lack of a direct crossing of Leith Walk outside the Playhouse
8. Fundamental issue about design and degree of priority being given to traffic and PT movement over pedestrians and public realm - not unanimous
9. Major concern about loss of a direct route from York Place towards Leith Walk.
10. Concern that cyclists will use the direct York Place to Leith Walk route even if official cycleway is not provided causing much worse conflict with pedestrians than if an official route was in place
11. Strong wish (fairly unanimous) for more cycle/pedestrian segregation including in crossing areas
12. Concern about lack of provision for cyclists to and from Broughton Street
13. Concern about cyclists needing to use shared area parallel to Little King Street - they should be able to use the roadway 2 -way
14. Some concern (not unanimous) about provision for cyclists not being 'intuitive' ie not always available on the right side of the street
15. Why no bus lanes if public transport is a priority? – not even on the approaches to the junction
16. Buses should be able to use the westbound tram line alignment through the tram stop (NOT a separate lane). Claire Carr of SWECO stated that this would be possible. Suggestion of combining this with side platforms (though is this compatible with level boarding for tram)
17. The design doesn't really seem to prioritise interchange - bus stops are not as close to tram stop as possible
18. Concern that, especially if central island is developed, the proposed layout would 'lock in' a traffic gyratory (how otherwise does westbound general traffic access Queen Street given the need to cross tram tracks?). AS TOPIC 4 POINT
19. Buses should be able to use the westbound tram line alignment through the tram

2. Greenery – possibly planters, green walls, seating outside cathedral.
Specification of seating to be considered (Hunter Square to be viewed for reference – Fiona Rankin).
3. Place to linger
4. City trees as per Glasgow – George Square (Amy McNeese-Mechan)
5. Position of statues is critical
6. Depends on use of central island site.
7. Not gyratory
8. Keep Leith Street closed except public transport
9. Multi stage crossings – poor connectivity
10. Too much shared space, conflict at crossing points and to access bus stops
11. Some of the extra space created outside Conan Doyle not particularly useful.
12. Legibility of cycle routes through junction for young cyclists (i.e. children).
13. Loss of East West cycle link on central island site
14. Increased cycle numbers on alternative route – increased conflict
15. Broughton Street to Leith Street connectivity - multiple crossings
16. Conflict at crossings – segregated cycle/pedestrian areas/crossings
17. Footway widths as per Street Design Guidance (difficult to determine on plans) – David Spaven
18. Poor connectivity, multi stage crossings
19. Not an ideal transport interchange due to length from bus stops to tram stop (John White)
20. Future change in tram frequency may make crossings tracks at tram stop more difficult
21. Scope for public transport only lane to south of tram stop – but not if island site fully designed out.
22. Reducing lane in future may not result in much-any more usable space, depending on use of island.
23. Critical to the success of place.
24. Would a retail/leisure use be feasible/viable given proximity of Edinburgh

restructuring plans for in relation to the area of land outside St Mary's Catholic Cathedral, Edinburgh. My concerns are as follows:

1. Title: I understand that the area of land immediately in front of St Mary's Roman Catholic Cathedral belongs to the Catholic Church and not to the City of Edinburgh Council. Edinburgh City Council therefore has no right over this area of land and no right to make amendments to it.
2. City of Edinburgh Council National Heritage Area: This proposal appears to fall within a National Heritage area of the city and appears to breach many of the stipulations in relation to Edinburgh's National Heritage area.
3. City of Edinburgh Council's Development Plan; Structure Plan; and Local Plans: This proposal appears to breach many of the stipulations set out in the City's Development Plan, Structure Plan and Local Plan. It would therefore be ultra vires for the City of Edinburgh Council to alter a) this area of land and b) the use of this area of land in the manner proposed.
4. Established Use of area of Land in front of St Mary's Catholic Cathedral:
 - i. Funeral hearses and wedding cars: The area of land immediately in front of St Mary's Catholic cathedral provides access and parking for funeral hearses, which require to drop off and pick up coffins at any time, and for wedding cars to drop off and collect brides and grooms at any time.
 - ii. Disabled Drivers: The area of land immediately in front of St Mary's Catholic cathedral provides access and parking for disabled drivers and parishioners who otherwise would be unable to access and park there in order to attend mass, religious services and events.

for Picardy Place. Several members of our Planning Group attended the stakeholder and public sessions and there has been subsequent discussion within the Group.

Spokes is against the basic gyratory design and the car dominance, that make it very difficult to successfully accommodate people travelling on bikes and by foot and bus. This is the opposite of current design philosophy that makes active travel and "Place" the priority.

However we do accept that the proposed design includes facilities which will make it easier for some cyclists in some circumstances, as compared to the present layout. However these facilities are not always convenient, sometimes taking circuitous routes and involving several crossings.

We are also disappointed that suggested improvements made at a stakeholder engagement meeting in July have not been included in the current plans and that detailed drawings have not been made available, as was promised, making it difficult to comment on many aspects of the proposals.

It is also important that we see the detail of how cycle routes will connect to neighbouring routes – the South end of Leith Street, the City Centre West East Link at York Place, Leith Walk and Broughton Street – points that we raised in July.

We feel that there are several ways in which the design could be improved to make it more convenient for people on bikes and we outline these below together with some questions:

1. Broughton Street to Leith Street.

Cyclists heading from Broughton Street to Leith Street will need to cross to

Having looked at the latest revision of the road layout for this area I would like to express my disappointment.

This seems like a once in a generation opportunity to create a new public space in front of St. Mary's Cathedral, while still accommodating traffic flow from East Princes Street down to Leith and the north of the city.

I hope the Council revisits the design of the proposed layout to produce a solution that gives more priority to pedestrians and cyclists. (I am not associated with the extremely vocal pressure group Spokes!)

I look forward to seeing a new proposal that doesn't create a marooned island surrounded by a sea of traffic.

As a daily cyclist using Picardy Place and that junction, I am writing to say that I am very disappointed by the proposals for the redesign.

The council's own guidelines and plan indicate that there should be a place-based rather than a traffic-based approach to such an important junction, on the edge of the World Heritage site and a crucial entry point to central Edinburgh. Spokes' recent bike count indicated how many cyclists are now entering and getting about Edinburgh by bike – and this is clearly because of the good work the Council has been doing over some years now to encourage active travel. The current proposals don't match up to the past work and will make it harder to get about on a bike. A place-based approach would prioritise active travel, and make this an attractive place to stop and enjoy Edinburgh, not a place to rush through.

The Picardy Place roundabout up until the closure of Leith Street has meant a daily feeling of putting one's life at risk (as does the London Road roundabout still) and the current proposals are an improvement. But the tortuous routes around the gyratory will lead to people taking their chance with the traffic, and risking life and limb as they do so.

I'd urge you to reconsider and aim for a T-junction with appropriate segregated cycle routes.

spaghetti junction.

2. There needs to be full sets of 3D drawings of how the townscape will look with special care not to block the sightline of the Cathedral.
3. The Cathedral needs to be free to be the hub of the local community and so there must be space for hearses and wedding cars in front of the cathedral as there is no road or parking place or loading bay.
4. You say the area in front of the Cathedral is now 25 metres deep but this has to take in a wide pedestrian footpath, a bus shelter, a proposed cycle path and the Paolozzi sculptures.
5. The three Paolozzi sculptures tell a story, see attached text for an information board to be put up alongside the bronze plaque with the translation of inscription round the sculptures. Therefore all three sculptures must be shown as a group and not separated.
6. We need more space for pedestrians at the sides not in the middle of the gyratory. We don't want to cross 6 lanes of traffic to get to a public space on an island.
7. If there is an island plant it with trees.
8. Put the Sherlock Holmes statue beside the Conan Doyle pub.
9. If there is to be no sheltering public space in front of the bank and Tesco and bars and hotel on north side of Picardy Place but 3 lanes of traffic hard up against the pavement we may need railings to protect pedestrians.
10. This area has different needs at different times of the day and night. Daytime is shopping John Lewis, Mass at Cathedral, cafes, restaurants, hotels, bank, Tesco Express. It needs friendly well designed seating and street furniture. At night it is an area of clubs, bars, cinema and theatre goers. It needs excellent lighting, good crossing points, a taxi rank and bus stops with wide enough pavements. At all times it needs trees and soft planting areas or tubs. This is a holiday destination!
11. We need better community policing and more police patrolling to cope with beggars by Cathedral and bank cash machines and the winos by the Cathedral. We need to make sure it doesn't become a no go area with sex workers.

Living Streets Edinburgh is the local voluntary arm of the national charity which campaigns for improved conditions for 'everyday' walking. Our manifesto for the 2016 Council Elections set out four key aims for Edinburgh:

- invest much more in walking
- make a comprehensive transport plan for the city centre
- pedestrianise George Street
- transform street management.

With regard to the latest (17 November) Council proposals for the Picardy Place area, while we welcome some planned improvements over the present highly sub-standard conditions for walking and cycling, we also have major concerns.

Living Streets Edinburgh has long been worried about two key aspects of this scheme: first, the unsatisfactory nature of the 'consultation' process; and second, the 1960s' approach to traffic management, constructing a three-lane road gyratory roundabout system which would be a barrier to walking and cycling.

2. The consultation process

Unlike the good level of consultation on other adjacent projects such as the West-East cycle route, in the case of Picardy Place – which will be a major change to the public realm – the level of consultation to date has been most unsatisfactory. There appears to have been no formal public consultation between a pre-application consultation in 2013 and a consultation exercise in summer 2017. The 'ground rules' seem to have been set dating back to the tram proposals from 2009.

There is a lack of transparency about the relationship between the Council and the developer, with big decisions on traffic and parking being taken behind closed doors before local people and citizens as a whole can have their say. The Council appears to be constrained in its transport decision-

I wish to be one of the people registering how strongly I disagree with the proposals for the Picardy Place public space and roads re-arrangement currently being put forward by the council and St James Centre developers.

If Edinburgh is to present itself adequately as the forward thinking city it wishes to be, it will not carry out a scheme which shows no improvement and probably a worse result than the countless increasingly poor re-workings of the space I have seen in my 30 years in Edinburgh.

This proposal:

- appears to make the situation worse for almost all users of the space bar perhaps the motorised ones, even they will not be happy with more traffic lights
- creates an even larger “no man’s land” in the centre of the “roundabout”, I do not believe that jugglers and markets and other mitigating activities will suddenly want to be in the middle of a roundabout
- does not make the roundabout a site a developer will be desperate to pay good money for, businesses need footfall and deliveries, two pedestrian access points on to the island do not create either of these
- reduces the amount of greenery and public realm in front of some of Edinburgh’s major venues
- severely reduces the buffer zone between the traffic and places where people live and work on the North side
- uses the decrease in public realm to make a bigger roundabout
- manages to make the situation for “active travel” (walking and cycling) even worse than the current highly inadequate provision
- makes shared spaces for different users; these do not work unless it is universal for all transport methods, cars, trucks, buses, trams, cyclists and pedestrians. Pedestrians do not want to have to be concentrating while walking along the pavements, some cyclists can be impolite even when sharing space

Your name was passed on to me by colleagues in The National Federation of the Blind of the UK, as I represent the organisation in Scotland in relation to new developments and access issues affecting the blind and visually impaired. Unfortunately I did not receive advance details of your drop-in sessions held on 21st & 22nd November, I would therefore be grateful if you could give me details of the proposed development. With help from colleagues I would be able to study plans on-line, so details would be appreciated, however I would like to know details of the following:

Will standard height kerbs be used throughout?

Will there be cycle lanes and if so, what delineation will be present between pavement and the cycle lane?

Will Puffin controlled crossings be used throughout the development?

Answers to these questions and any other information would be greatly appreciated, together with details of any forthcoming consultation sessions on this and any other proposed developments.

I am writing in my capacity as a trustee of the Paolozzi Foundation to let you know about the proposed re-siting of the Eduardo Paolozzi sculpture outside St Mary's Catholic Cathedral (see attached).

The current plans for the reconfiguration of Picardy Place envisage that most of the sculpture (the ankle, the foot and the stones) will remain where they are, but that the hand will be moved to the other side of the road. From the Foundation's point of view, this is not a desirable solution, as it was clearly the artist's intent that all the parts should be seen to be fragments of a whole rather than separate sculptures, and that they should be next to the cathedral. The new siting would weaken not only the relationship between the constituent parts but also that between the sculpture and the cathedral.

Since you were so involved with the making of the sculpture, I thought you would like to know the Foundation's position on the current proposal and that you might agree to being copied into an email the trustees have drafted to Mr McConnel of Edinburgh City Council (see below – it is much the same as this note to you). Would you let me know as soon as possible – the deadline for objections is 15 December.

anecdotal evidence that gyratory junctions are not friendly to pedestrians:

On Monday a woman died in London after being hit by four vehicles on a pedestrian crossing. None of the vehicles stopped. It was in a one-way gyratory traffic system at Tulse Hill (Norwood Road, South Circular).

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-london-42322526>

People in Tulse Hill have been campaigning to remove the one-way gyratory and restore it to a two-way system in order to improve pedestrian and cyclist safety.

<http://love.lambeth.gov.uk/streetworks-brighter-norwood/>

A local said the one-way gyratory junction 'encourages aggressive driving': "If there is an opposite to 'traffic calming' then this is it." He said the current design encouraged speeding and the road had become "a racetrack". (This is)... "poor urban planning on a road that encourages excessive speed and dangerous driving,"

Multi-lane one-way road systems cause excessive speeding and dangerous driving, and it can be exacerbated when there are traffic lights. An Edinburgh example is the route between Lothian Road, west end of Princes Street and South Charlotte Street, where motor vehicles race in either direction at unsafe speeds in order to get through the lights. I have seen or heard of several instances of cyclists being knocked off and pedestrians intimidated by motorists. It's like a war zone at these junctions.

vehicular traffic (and particularly private motor traffic) in the “indicative” revised layout for Picardy Place and (ii) the number of places in the plan where there would be conflict between pedestrians and cyclists, my main concern is with the re-siting of the Eduardo Paolozzi sculpture "The Manuscript of Monte Cassino".

This important sculpture, made by a famous son of Edinburgh and given to the City by a generous donor, has contributed significantly to the character of this part of Edinburgh for many years. Its three parts have been viewable together in relative peace by members of the public on its site in front of St Mary's Cathedral for all this time. The site was chosen by the sculptor himself, partly for the reason that he had been brought up in Leith, frequented Leith Walk and worshipped in the Cathedral as a boy, and with reference to the Italian community in Edinburgh. The sculpture should remain where it is.

The “indicative” plan shows the three parts of the sculpture separated, with one element placed in front of John Lewis across Little King Street from the other two parts. From a sculptural point-of-view this makes about as much sense as splitting the tram stop into two separate parts does from a transportation stand point. The “indicative” solution has been to fit the sculpture in wherever there is space left over after other considerations have been satisfied. The parts of the sculpture should be kept together, in the same space, with the stones rescued from Leith Walk Station and the planting, as they were intended.

The cycle lane across the space in front of the Cathedral is quite unsuitable

I have reviewed the proposal put forward for the changes to the area known as Picardy Place design proposal in Edinburgh.

I have no immediate concerns with regards to the road layout, providing the appropriate traffic signal phasing is implemented.

I do have concerns about the shared space and the possibility of conflict between the cyclists and pedestrians. I also have concerns regarding how cyclists from the segregated lane join the main carriageway in a safe and legal manner in certain locations however I believe that this is being reviewed.

The other concern I have is the lack of provision for drop off to the Omni or Playhouse and the impact this will have on traffic flows. I appreciate that vehicles are not allowed to stop for drop offs however this does not cater for the elderly or disabled and I believe that this will become an issue.

location: it serves as the main gateway to the City Centre from the North and East, it is home to a wide range of leisure destinations (Omni Centre, Playhouse, Cathedral and the new St James redevelopment) as well as a variety of business and a residential population. I welcome the opportunity to comment on the Council's proposals. First I will summarise what action I want the Council to take, then I will complain about the nature of the consultation and finally I will elaborate on 10 problems which I see with the current proposed design.

My essential request:

That the Council stops all planned construction work relating to Picardy Place and puts it on hold until the consultation, research and analysis of the City Centre Transformation project is complete and the final decision on the Tram extension has been made, and then brings in a reputable professional urban design team with expertise in large scale public projects to design, from scratch, a Picardy Place that ties in with these other strategies and Council and Government policy, and that recognises Picardy Place's unique setting and functions.

While this moratorium is in place, Picardy Place should remain as it currently is, a simple roundabout. This design is not attractive, and there is a level of congestion at peak times, but it is safer than what the Council are currently proposing, it works and the delays caused by congestion are tolerable. There are limited opportunities for small scale changes in response to specific issues, for example, intelligent traffic light control could be added to the roundabout, and low-cost temporary off road cycle routes could be created if there is felt to be unacceptable risk to cycling safety.

consultation and engagement with all parties and stakeholders in order to maximise the information exchanges and data flows to ensure that any process delivers a best possible solution for our city.

In particular respect of this consultation we have found it to be both constructive and inclusive and this has ensured that all views are shared. The stakeholder roundtable engagement session gave the opportunity for all parties to gain a greater awareness and understanding of others needs and demands and how we can move towards creating optimum solutions that balance these where possible.

Context:

Picardy Place is a key and integral part of the city in so much that it becomes an entry point from both the East and the North for high levels of all types of 'traffic' (definition of traffic being all modes including walking, cycling etc); the bus plays only one part of that, however the part it does play is very significant in many ways.

The existing design and layout of Picardy Place does little to maximise potential for the area, with the exception of the historic gyratory concept and has evolved over many years of change involving the historic construction of the road space and the buildings and infrastructure surrounding it. This leaves a current space that is at best functional but does little to inspire desire or integrate all the required elements in a joined up way and futureproof the design of the city.

The emerging solutions of design contained within the project do much to address this within the obvious constraints of the available space of the area within a historic city. Merging the requirements of the many stakeholders will always be a challenge but the proposed scheme does do this and helps to connect a number of distinct areas of the city that are currently segregated,