

# Response ID ANON-XSEF-ZXTJ-6

Submitted to **City Mobility Plan**  
Submitted on **2020-03-13 20:49:20**

## Introduction

### 1 What is your name?

**Name:**  
Lawrence Marshall

### 2 If you are responding on behalf of an organisation, what is their name?

**Organisation:**  
Capital Rail Action Group

### 3 What is your email address?

**Email:**  
lawrence336@btinternet.com

### 4 The City of Edinburgh Council would like your permission to publish your consultation response. Please indicate your publishing preference.

Publish response with name

## A three-stage vision (2022, 2025 and 2030)

### 5 To what extent do you support or oppose the vision set out for 2022?

Support

#### Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions about the vision set out for 2022.:

CRAG supports the short-term goals in the 2022 vision. We are conscious, though, that - without an overall long-term vision in place - elements of the City Centre Transformation Programme may compromise the efficient delivery of a more ambitious series of on-street public transport improvements than those currently officially envisaged.

### 6 To what extent do you support or oppose the vision set out for 2025?

Support

#### Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions relating to the vision set out for 2025.:

Whilst we believe the goals to be laudable and worthy of support, we feel that the means to achieve these goals are lacking in the Plan. In particular, rail - especially heavy rail - hardly figures yet has the potential to deliver faster journeys into and across the city than any other mode of public transport, especially on-street. Heavy rail needs to find a place in the city's thinking - it currently seems as if the City of Edinburgh Council, with no responsibility for heavy rail, has chosen to disregard this mode for travel within the city. We would recommend the establishment - commonplace elsewhere - of a transport authority with responsibility for all travel modes. There should be seamless smart contactless payments across all travel modes as part of an integrated capped pricing policy (as, e.g., in London). Transport for Edinburgh is a pale shadow of what it could be.

In terms of a data driven approach to mobility needs, we believe that bus delay minutes throughout the city should be published and studied to ascertain where current bus-based public transport is sub-optimal even with respect to the timetables prevailing today - which are much slower than those of ten of twenty years' ago. Measures should then be taken to address where those delay minutes are most prevalent. We note the public transport accessibility map on page 10 of the Plan - but are concerned that it fails to mention how long those public journeys available take at the moment and what time one might expect such journeys to take in comparable cities. For instance, this week I took a 113 bus from the Western General Hospital at tea-time to the Kings Manor Hotel on Milton Road East. It took over an hour - in fact, 63 minutes. CRAG believes that such a journey should be possible in Edinburgh in around half an hour via a combination of light rail and heavy rail.

### 7 To what extent do you support or oppose the vision set out for 2030?

Support

#### Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions about the vision set out for 2030.:

Whilst CRAG is supportive of the completion of the tram line to Newhaven, we would support completion of the northern circle before extension westwards from the airport to Newbridge - since we support sustainable brownfield development along the Waterfront within the city rather than continued fairly unsustainable development on the Green Belt to the west of the city.

Thereafter, we feel that a fresh look should be taken at tram routes within the city - is The Bridges the best corridor? See the "Keeping Edinburgh Moving"

strategy from Robert Drysdale which we think worthy of consideration - which we will send separately to you and publish soon on the CRAG website.

We believe that Cameron Toll should become an important transport interchange between bus, trams, tram-trains and heavy rail. Tram-trains would run from the Haymarket area to Cameron Toll on the South Suburban railway - to then run on-street to Little France. Meanwhile, heavy rail trains (e.g. from Bathgate) should run through Waverley station to Cameron Toll via Portobello. Any re-modelling of Portobello Junction should allow for trains to serve a re-opened Portobello station on both the main line south, the Waverley line and the South Suburban railway.

Further heavy rail capacity increases are: (i) re-doubling the Calton North tunnel (and possibly also the South tunnel); (ii) re-instatement of the Abbeyhill double track loop line; (iii) re-instatement of four-track running from Piershill to Portobello. Just outside the city, we believe that Musselburgh station should be re-developed as a staffed station with wider and longer platforms. Yet further afield, we support a four-track railway from Prestonpans to East Linton - and, in particular, a new alignment for a double track railway parallel to the A1 and serving Haddington.

CRAG also believes that, eastbound from Waverley, scarce track capacity is currently misallocated to serve the "needs" (four of five trains an hour serving Newcastle and York) of long-distance travellers as opposed to those wishing to make more sustainable short and medium-distance journeys efficiently.

West of the city, Curriehill station in particular should be far better used than it is. Local train frequency needs to be improved on the line from Haymarket to Curriehill - which should also open up more efficient travel opportunities for those living near Wester Hailes, Kingsknowe and Slateford stations.

As for Waverley station, we believe that the existing main building should be demolished to make way for an all through platform modern station which will improve operational efficiency and vastly improve the ease of use of the station for all. The historic main booking hall could be re-located to either a new mezzanine entrance at the foot of Waverley Steps or at the Market Street entrance to the station. Waverley Mall should be better integrated with the station. Office and train-servicing facilities should be provided in the East Market Street area - with the ugly signalling centre currently there being re-located to Portobello, Newcraighall, Millerhill or Slateford.

Waverley station could also become a logistics hub during the night.

## **Enhancing public transport**

### **8 To what extent do you support or oppose the following proposals to enhance public transport?**

**Support for Enhanced Public Transport proposals - Co-ordinate bus, tram and bike hire operations to better serve the city and wider region.:**

Strongly support

**Support for Enhanced Public Transport proposals - Expand the tram network in the city and potentially into the wider region in order to carry high volumes of people in a clean and efficient way:**

Strongly support

**Support for Enhanced Public Transport proposals - Introduce smart contactless payment options across all public transport and operators:**

Strongly support

**Support for Enhanced Public Transport proposals - Support the introduction of shared transport options to complement timetabled public transport – this could include community run buses, car clubs and bike hire:**

Strongly support

### **9 Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions on what we are doing, or propose to do, to enhance public transport.**

**Please provide comments::**

CRAG is not convinced that buses can provide a step-change in journey times within Edinburgh. Trams - particularly where segregated - can as can tram-trains and heavy rail. Buses run reasonably freely along Princes Street at the moment - but encounter huge problems approaching the city centre and in suburban centres such as Portobello, Craigmillar, Morningside, etc.. Moreover buses often hold up other buses - with lengthy delays as they queue at bus stops.

We believe that current tram plans are not commensurate with the needs of an ambitious and growing city - and compare poorly with other cities in Europe and elsewhere. As for heavy rail, it's seemingly largely disregarded as a mean of travel within the city. This needs to change - with responsibility for all modes transferred to a beefed up Transport for Edinburgh.

CRAG would not support extension of street-running trams into Fife - though tram-trains around the Fife Circle may help alleviate congestion on the heavy rail tracks between Haymarket and Waverley.

## **People friendly streets**

### **10 To what extent do you support or oppose the following proposals to create people friendly streets?**

**People friendly streets - support proposals - Create direct, segregated cycling routes along main arterial roads to provide for safe and quick journeys by bicycle:**

Support

**People friendly streets - support proposals - To support the transition to cleaner vehicles, develop a comprehensive network of electric vehicle charging points:**

Support

**People friendly streets - support proposals - Minimise the number of freight vehicle trips by developing distribution centres and click-and-collect hubs across the city:**

Strongly support

**People friendly streets - support proposals - Develop a city operations centre to monitor and control travel, transport and road works across the city:**

Strongly support

**11 Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions on what we are doing, or propose to do, to create people friendly streets.**

**Please provide comments::**

Walking should be a first priority for short journeys.

Cycling is "green" - but private. Collectively, however, it deliver public benefit. But not everyone can cycle. Public transport can provide for the travel needs of the many - and should be prioritised in street re-design where available space is constrained.

Whilst electric vehicles are an improvement on those fuelled by petrol or diesel, overall private vehicle numbers still need to be reduced. To justify such measures, public transport must be able to compete with car journey times throughout as much of the city as possible.

## **Planning new developments**

**12 To what extent do you support or oppose the following proposals relating to planning new developments?**

**Planning new developments - support for proposals - Introduce transport hubs in major new developments to accommodate public and shared transport, and to enable co-ordinated deliveries and click-and-collect hubs:**

Strongly support

**Planning new developments - support for proposals - Control the level of parking in and around new developments and include requirements for car club, electric vehicles and bike hire provision:**

Strongly support

**Planning new developments - support for proposals - To change travel behaviours, require travel plans for major new developments, workplaces and schools that include targets for walking, cycling and public transport use:**

Strongly support

**13 Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions on what we are doing, or propose to do, regarding planning new developments.**

**Please provide comments::**

We generally support the use of brownfield sites for housing envisaged in the forthcoming Local Development Plan - but are conscious that, over the past 40 or 50 years, many sites previously providing employment locally to people have been given over to housing, resulting in long commuting journeys for an ever increasing percentage of the population - often to the outskirts of the city. Where significant compatible local employment opportunities arise, these should be prioritised over housing.

## **Managing demand**

**14 To what extent do you support or oppose the following proposals to manage travel demand?**

**Managing demand - support for proposals - To create space for public transport, walking and cycling, reduce the level of on-street parking in areas well-served by public transport whilst enabling parking for residents and people with mobility difficulties:**

Strongly support

**Managing demand - support for proposals - Explore the introduction of road user charging within the city to reduce the number of vehicles:**

Support

**15 Please use the space below for any comments or suggestions on what we are doing, or propose to do, to manage travel demand.**

**Please provide comments::**

There may be a case for the "stick" as well as the "carrot" - and the former could provide funds for the latter - but, generally speaking, the city should "accentuate the positive" in its approach.

## **Impact of City Mobility Plan**

**16 What, if any, impact do you think the proposed strategic priorities detailed in the City Mobility Plan will have on any of these characteristics?**

Please consider potentially positive, negative and differential impacts, supported by evidence, and, if applicable, advise on any mitigating actions we should take.:

## About you

### 17 What is your age?

Prefer not to say

### 18 Do you have any long-term illness, health problem or disability that limits your ability to carry out day-to-day activities?

Prefer not to say

### 19 What is your gender?

Prefer not to say

### 20 Do you have caring responsibilities?

Prefer not to say

### 21 What is your ethnic group? (Choose ONE section from A to E, then tick ONE box which best describes your ethnic group or background)

Scottish

#### Other white ethnic group, please write in:

Not Answered

#### Any mixed or multiple ethnic groups, please write in:

Not Answered

#### Other, please write in:

Not Answered

#### Other, please write in:

Not Answered

#### Other, please write in:

Not Answered

### 22 What religion, religious denomination or body do you belong to?

Not Answered

#### Another religion (please specify):

Prefer not to say

### 23 What is your sexual orientation?

Prefer not to say