

1) To what extent do you support the aim of improving conditions for people cycling in Musselburgh and into Edinburgh and Midlothian?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
1	Strongly support	I would like the opportunity to cycle more but the current road layout and congestion reduces my inclination to do so
2	Strongly support	Musselburgh has huge traffic congestion, mostly caused by short journeys which could be made on foot or bike (e.g. to school and work) if travel plans like those for Dunbar were implemented
4	Strongly support	Cycling is better than car travel in so many ways that I don't need to repeat here. ELC should be doing everything possible to get people out of their cars for local journeys and combining bike and bus/train options for longer journeys.
6	Strongly support	As a bike user I've seen the benefits cycling brings to my life, I'd like infrastructure that encourages more people of all ages to use their bikes. They encourage a feeling of safety so people won't be so reliant on motor vehicles to ferry kids around needlessly. Segregated bike lanes do this everywhere they're introduced. More bikes being used for short journeys means less pollution, less impact on roads etc.
9	Strongly support	I am a cyclist - both to and from work as well as in my spare time and current cycling provisions, whilst a little better in EL than Edinburgh, are still inadequate
11	Strongly support	Supporting active travel via the provision of *quality* cycling infrastructure is one of the most important ways in which we can improve the health of the population and hence save vast amounts of money on the management of long term chronic health conditions which result from inactivity and obesity. Plus it will reduce air pollution due to reducing traffic. Well-being and improved "sense of place" will also result if towns are less dominated by traffic, and more people-orientated. It has been shown that when cyclists are encouraged into town centres they help local commerce thrive (this opposes many's view that removing parking provision from town centres and devoting it to cycling infrastructure will affect local trade - many studies show that if trade is affected at all, it is affected positively). Studies have shown cycle commuters had a 52 percent lower risk of dying from heart disease and a 40 percent lower risk of dying from cancer. They also had a 46 percent lower risk of developing heart disease and a 45 percent lower risk of developing cancer at all. However, they health benefits are currently offset by the likelihood of being injured by traffic - this is the reason that *safe* and preferably segregated cycle routes are a must to capitalise on this health benefit. (Source: https://experiencelife.com/article/the-benefits-of-active-commuting/)
12	Strongly support	Experience in many european countries is that if safe cycle routes are segregated from motor traffic, there can be a big transfer of personal transport away from the motor car.
13	Strongly support	I think cycle path are good in Musselburgh but could be greatly improved
14	Strongly support	Current road conditions are unsafe with extensive pot holes and disintegrated roads. Busy traffic with little respect for cyclists make commuting by bike too dangerous for many. If cycle lanes were improved both recreational and commuting cyclists would increase in numbers.
15	Strongly support	I regularly commute to and from Edinburgh by bicycle
16	Strongly support	I live in Musselburgh and cycle almost daily - often with y 3 year old little boy on the back of the bike. I currently don't feel Musselburgh has a safe cycling environment for us, with the obvious exception of the prom. Edinburgh ha some amazing cycle lane provision - I used to cycle to work on George Street daily and my trip along the Innocent Railway was excellent. However, getting from my home of Newhailes Road to the beginning of the track meant being frequently overtaken without being given enough space, breathing in fumes and navigating huge pot holes and drains.
17	Strongly support	I cycle 5 days a week to work. Pollution levels are rising, as is I'll health due to lack of exercise and poor air quality. Insentivise people and prioritise safe cycling and you save lives. Creating better, smoother and wider cycling paths will also make me feel better about my little boy cycling to school in the future.
21	Strongly support	0
22	Strongly support	Cycling is environmental friendly and good for everyone's health
23	Strongly support	Musselburgh (and the roads into it) is a gap in safe cycling provision. Joining up the Innocent Railway, Portobello Prom, Esk Path and coastal route would extend the range people are able to cycle without battling traffic. With e-bikes, even fairly long journeys are possible without having to be super fit but the infrastructure has to be safe.
24	Strongly support	0
25	Strongly support	Active travel should be encouraged and if routes are better this will encourage more participants. Better for health, wellbeing and economy
26	Strongly support	The government has targets for increasing this sustainable mode of transport as part of the Cycling Action Plan.
27	Strongly support	As a cycle commuter when working in Edinburgh, Musselburgh has always been a bit of a challenge.
28	Strongly support	Active travel is good for health and safety and the environment
29	Strongly support	We're subjected to endless through motor traffic with associated fumes and potentially fatal collision risk, hopefully this will reduce both. Many people are terrified by the traffic and feel unsafe cycling, hopefully this will help.
31	Strongly support	0
32	Strongly support	I live in Portobello and access into Musselburgh could be improved, particularly along the A1 and A199 which is a daunting ride for a cyclist and ideally one which would be avoided if another route could be created.
33	Strongly support	I would use my bike to get to places around Musselburgh and the surrounding areas if there was an improvement to the cycling conditions. Currently I only use it when I consciously decide to bike for leisure, however could commute on it if there was a lane into town.
36	Strongly support	Traffic is quite bad in the morning it takes ages to get to town and it's also dangerous for the cyclist to be on the road due to plenty other vehicles. Also it would be less annoying for the cars to follow slow cyclist whenever they can't overtake them
37	Strongly support	Encouraging cycling, and supporting an already vibrant cycling culture, can in time reduce the traffic load on streets in areas that are already overly congested. While it's folly to assume this is panacea to traffic woes, it is a positive step that carries other health benefits as well.
41	Strongly support	As a resident of East Edinburgh, I cycle to Musselburgh for every day journeys such as shopping. Currently, it feels unpleasant and dangerous to cycle along the main shopping roads in the town, which means I shop less frequently there, and so local traders lose out on my business.
42	Strongly support	Roads are becoming too congested. Need to make cycling a safer and more friendly option for commuters
43	Strongly support	The Musselburgh to Porty link needs to be brought to the fore when it comes to funding decisions. The current situation of children cycling on the pavement with "Cycling not permitted on pavement" signs and parents cycling either on the pavement or trying to supervise them from the road, and separated from them by parked cars, is not sustainable.
44	Strongly support	I regularly cycle with my kids who cannot use anything other than the quietest residential streets. From Portobello Prom it is possible to cycle in North and West Edinburgh traffic free, while south Edinburgh can be done through the Brunstane Burn path and Innocent railway path. Getting between these paths and Musselburgh is, at them moment, a real barrier and improving that would greatly improve cycling options. Getting onto the Esk Path, which takes us out towards Dalkeith and Midlothian is also difficult. Negotiating the junctions around the Tesco Store is awful. Access from one side of the town to the other is relatively easy via the coastal path, access to the High Streets is very difficult, as is the south side of the town and swimming pool, a common trip with the kids.
46	Strongly support	With all the additional housing proposed for Musselburgh (over 50% increase in the population) there will be so many extra cars on the streets unless we find alternative and safe ways for people to travel and get them out of cars.
47	Strongly support	I think promotion of sustainable transport is extremely important - making it easier, safer and more enjoyable for people to cycle.
49	Strongly support	I cycle daily in Musselburgh and the conditions just now are awful for cyclists. High Street and North High Street have no cycling infrastructure whatsoever and I find drivers often pulling out of parking spaces without checking their mirrors are a problem as well as car occupants swinging doors open without checking. This is particularly bad in the evenings on North High Street when people are desperate to pick up their takeaways! It's difficult to encourage people onto bikes instead of cars if there is nowhere safe to cycle on direct commuting routes. The road surfaces are terrible for cyclists and the lane that does exist on Edinburgh Road often has cars parked in it and, again, the surface is terrible. I fully support improvements for cycling conditions as it will surely encourage many more people to take to the bike instead of the car and hopefully lead to a reduction in air pollution and congestion.

50	Strongly support	I live in Portobello and regularly to and from Mussleburgh - on my own or with my children. An improved link between Mussleburgh and Edinburgh would hopefully address the missing link between Portobello and Mussleburgh - this section is very stressful and potentially dangerous with young children on the road and although they are legally allowed to cycle on the footpath, there are signs stating no cycling on the footpath which then creates potential conflict with pedestrians taking umbrage with children cycling on the footpath (even though I am still on the road)
52	Strongly support	It will make it easier to cycle through Musselburgh
53	Strongly support	I would happily commute into Edinburgh by bike if the infrastructure was safer.
56	Strongly support	I commute to Edinburgh from Tranent by bike through Musselburgh. Musselburgh is pretty scary to get through, especially when it's dark in the winter.
57	Strongly support	I cycle a lot and many folk I talk to are intimidated by the traffic on the roads. Would be a great forward looking development. We could remove a lot of traffic from the roads.
58	Strongly support	Environmentally friendly, healthy way to travel. Needs to be safe to encourage people .
60	Strongly support	The current arrangements are not well coordinated and discourage cycling or walking
61	Strongly support	Cycling should be further promoted, and the proposals are superb; I cycled on one of the proposed routes today (on road) from the royal infirmary to Musselburgh, and it was unpleasant to do so. A dedicated cycle route would transform this, and the other routes being proposed would constitute a sensible, useful network. This will promote cycling and ensure cyclist safety.
65	Strongly support	I am a resident of the town and a regular cyclist as are my children. As a society we must do all we can to get people out of their cars and onto either walking or cycling or some other means to reduce our carbon footprint and to make commuting/travelling safer for all.
66	Strongly support	Musselburgh is HEAVILY congested with cars. Riding a bike to school, to work, for leisure or just to the shops is not an appealing choice to new cyclists. Even for more experienced riders there are many challenges.
68	Strongly support	I would like to be able to cycle more safely around Musselburgh - for commuting and pleasure - and would like to encourage others to do so too. Currently I avoid the High Street and North High Street and am scared taking my son on his bike there too. Improving cycling conditions would mean I would cycle more and hopefully others will too - taking more cars off the road.
71	Strongly support	Spending money on cycle infrastructure is proven to have benefits for all residents via improved air, traffic flow and reduced NHS bills. Good cycling infrastructure in Musselburgh would also be of aid for me personally to allow safe travel out to East Lothian etc for cycling on the weekends.
72	Strongly support	So many benefits. no brainer
76	Strongly support	Improving conditions would encourage more people to cycle. More people cycling would reduce congestion, improve air quality and make Musselburgh safer and more pleasant for people on foot as well.
79	Strongly support	I sometime cycle to work in Edinburgh and also cycle around Musselburgh. I am aware that some small changes could vastly improve how safe some of that cycling feels.
80	Strongly support	Dedicated infrastructure will encourage cycling as people are currently put off by unsafe road conditions. Increasing cycling in our community will improve health, reduce air pollution, tackle climate change and give local businesses a boost by increasing footfall - but only if the infrastructure makes it easy to get through the town centre rather than around the outskirts of the town.
82	Strongly support	There are already some fantastic links between musselburgh and Edinburgh but connecting the town with other areas and within Musselburgh itself should massively increase the uptake of cycling in the area. the most hazardous area when cycling to Mussleburgh is when you come off the Innocent railway path and are spewed out onto the busy road. The town centre has fast traffic and lots of parked cars so with protected lanes cyclists will feel much safer
83	Strongly support	I would consider cycling to and from work if I felt like a safe route was possible and I do cycle in my free time to run errands and for pleasure. However at present I use a car for my work commute.
85	Strongly support	i cycle from musselburgh to edinburgh daily for work. I also cycle around musselburgh for leisure
86	Strongly support	Cycling is an excellent alternative to driving and should be fully encouraged. By improving resources and safety measures for cyclists, people are more likely to adopt it as a method of transport.
89	Strongly support	I would potentially walk or cycle to work if there was a direct and specific cycle/walking path.
92	Strongly support	Musselborough is the ideal distance from the city centre for cycle commuters to take advantage, but many wouldn't even consider this without decent paths into the city and around Musselborough more generally to change the ethos.
94	Strongly support	The current planned increase in housing will create a huge increase in traffic congestion in Musselburgh. Without a move to encourage, facilitate and plan for improved cycling, Musselburgh will come to a standstill. The current congestion and lack of alternative safe options is not sustainable for the future of our town.
96	Strongly support	encourage the use of cycling for both leisure and commuter purposes, healthier options as well as a more sustainable greener option for commuting.
97	Strongly support	Safe cycling is good for people's health and for the environment. It is also a good family activity
99	Strongly support	0
100	Strongly support	The dedicated cycle oaths we'd to be linked up and better work done to access villages such as those inland from Dunbar and eyemouth
101	Strongly support	The route to get into Edinburgh from Musselburgh is bike friendly. Even at the cross roads of the A1 it is difficult to gain access to the cycle path from the main road.
105	Strongly support	In general I think any approach that both encourages and make safer cycling around Musselburgh is to be welcomed. in particular this should make it safer for young cyclists and make parents more comfortable at letting the cycle around town, to school etc. If this can be encouraged it may be of particular you young people who will hopefully see cycling as the norm and change attitudes. Thew health benefits should be clear as well as the environmental ones. For adults it can only help but may not necessarily reduce car use by much, old habits and cultural change may make this more of a long term benefit rather than a short term fix.
106	Strongly support	I think it is vital to increase the percentage of journeys made by bike. I am a regular vistor to Hamburg and Copenhagen and am appalled by the provision for cycling in our own area when compared to these cities.
107	Strongly support	I cycle from Tranent to Edinburgh via Musselburgh. While Musselburgh is relatively safe we still share road space with vehicles. Separate cycle lanes would be fantastic.
113	Strongly support	I have cycle commuted to Edinburgh for 12 years from Musselburgh. I have commuted to work and University within Edinburgh for twenty years prior to moving to Musselburgh. Dedicated cycle routes and protected paths are a necessity. Sadly, I would never let my children cycle in Musselburgh unless off-road.
116	Strongly support	There is a need to encourage people to use other forms of transport other than their cars and to enable this modal shift there needs to be improved cycling conditions especially for short and medium journeys
118	Strongly support	Cycling, like walking, is a more healthy option for individuals and society as a whole. It is more environmentally friendly, requiring fewer scarce resources and causing less pollution.
119	Strongly support	I cycle through Musselburgh every day.
120	Strongly support	Musselburgh is becoming gridlock due to the imposed housing developments on a massive scale. Encouraging safer travel options is the key way forward. to encourage ore people to cycle there must be safe, clearly identified cycle routes otherwise it will be in vain.
5	Support	It is important that people be able to travel safely throughout the area, regardless of the mode of transport.
7	Support	Cycling is an obvious choice for transport/pollution issues being faced, but more importantly it helps tackle fitness or lack of in our population. More segregated areas to cycle off roads would ease traffic issues and potential clashes between motorists and cyclists whilst encouraging more people to cycle safely.
8	Support	Easy traffic (and therefore improve air quality) improve fitness
34	Support	0
35	Support	0
39	Support	Cycling in the proper environment is a useful form of travel and exercise.
45	Support	I support but NOT at the cost of safe walking paths and areas.
48	Support	Cyclist safety amongst the huge volumes of traffic.
54	Support	It needs to be safe for cyclists
59	Support	My view is that cycling conditions would be greatly improved if there were no potholes and roads were kept in a good state of repair
62	Support	Musselburgh is not pleasant or easy to cycle round. It will get worse in future and that is why I support new cycle lanes preferably off road to keep bikes away from cars as much as possible.
73	Support	More and more cyclists of all ages are using pavements as their route of choice . Police don't take action .It has become dangerous to step out of your house .
74	Support	Cycling is better for the environment, better for public health and reduces volume of vehicle traffic on main routes
81	Support	0

84	Support	TO MAKE CYCLING SAFER WHICH WILL ENCOURAGE PEOPLE TO CYCLE IMPROVING HEALTH, GETTING PEOPLE OUT OF CARS ETC.
87	Support	We need good quality, easy to use and safe alternatives to travel by car. We also need a network of routes which make it easier to use public transport and to get to key services and destinations. However, I think that walking is as important as cycling in terms of an alternative to the car for many people.
88	Support	If cycle routes were better, I would get my bike out of the shed and use it!
102	Support	enabling better and safer cycling opportunities for people is a good idea, as long as it doesn't make already congested roads even worse. Better to take cycles off existing roads and create alternative cycle only paths off main roads, and NOT on them!
104	Support	I'm supportive of improving cycling conditions as long as the improvements are sensible and well thought out.
109	Support	good for the environment
111	Support	Road Conditions need to be improved for cyclist safety, along with dedicated lanes
114	Support	Whilst being an admirable aim ie to make cycling safer and to provide better & safer conditions for cyclists - the reality is that commuters are not going to get out of their cars when travelling in and through Musselburgh. The focus should be on infrastructure for motorists and mass public transport systems. Improvements to infrastructure should concentrate on traffic management systems and better transport services.
115	Support	I believe that everyone has the right to travel safely, cycling included. However, this should NOT be given precedence over the value of people's homes, their already restricted onstreet parking availability, the fact that people do still need to drive their vehicles and that Musselburgh is already a horribly congested town!!! There are sensible and logical ways of doing this and wiping out people's only place to park safely and securing outside their family home is not the answer.
3	Neither support or oppose	There are sufficient bike paths along main roads currently, and most bikes travel along the sea front to bypass the town centre. This is an effective route that allows road traffic to move more effectively. Pavements are adequate for pedestrians and are currently wide enough. Those wishing to walk access local paths do so, and these are already away from busy roads. The road traffic is too heavy for the roads as it is, and if the conditions are changed to reduce capacity for vehicles the town will be gridlocked. Pollution is at a premium already on main roads. Build capacity for bikes and pedestrians away from the main road.
18	Neither support or oppose	0
19	Neither support or oppose	I don't nor plan to cycle.
30	Neither support or oppose	the bigger problem is that Musselburgh is generally gridlocked, with further enormous housing developments taking place all around the town this will only worsen. Cyclist (for their own safety) should be encouraged to use routes that avoid the main thoroughfare, I cycle and I would never cycle on the main roads in or around the town, I value my life! It is also somewhat naive to think that people are going to give up their car to commute to work 10+miles away or that the bus and train options are viable as demand and costs increase.
40	Neither support or oppose	0
51	Neither support or oppose	I would embrace more cyclists on the roads but only if they have passed a Highway Code and cycling skills test, as well as having full Public Liability Insurance to cover claims made against a cyclist. I either walk or use public transport and on numerous have almost been forced off a pavement by an adult cyclist, or have witnessed a cyclist going through a red traffic light. Far better to have bus lanes in permanent operation to assist commuters.
63	Neither support or oppose	I feel we are very lucky in musselburgh with our off road cycle paths and think improving and increasing these would be the best solution for traffic to run freely and cyclists/ pedestrians to be safe. I don't think adding cycle ways to roads would benefit. Cars park in these and it causes more congestion with traffic at a standstill.
67	Neither support or oppose	I support cycling in general, but think the infrastructure we need to prioritise in East Lothian and particularly Musselburgh will not be helped by this suggested route.
69	Neither support or oppose	I don't cycle but I do drive and park outside my property
90	Neither support or oppose	I do not cycle.
91	Neither support or oppose	Not sure that pedestrians are being prioritised
95	Neither support or oppose	I have no issue with improvements being made to cycling conditions in Musselburgh, however, what I don't support is the knock-on effect and disruption to those who need private vehicles for their jobs and their family commitments. Not everyone can scoot their two young children and dog about on bicycles across the county. There are already cycle routes through Musselburgh that are already very popular. I don't understand why you feel there is a need to create another cycle route parallel to one that is mere meters away. Progress for progress sake isn't always the smartest approach. Your assumption is that the majority of those living in Musselburgh are within a distance able to walk/cycle to work. In reality, the majority of the new residents descending on the area will be commuting into Edinburgh. Perhaps it is worth having a discussion with the transport services to improve their offerings into the capital first? More trains are an absolute must and quicker bus routes before we begin digging up the roads and creating elaborate cycling routes that impact residents living along them.
108	Neither support or oppose	0
117	Neither support or oppose	The question covers cycling in Musselburgh and cycling from Musselburgh into Edinburgh and Midlothian. I believe this covers to issues and it's not helpful; to combine them. I support improving facilities locally which can be accommodated in a less intrusive way. I believe the proposals for main routes for those cycling to Midlothian or Edinburgh is disproportionate and does not address the key issue of more traffic.
20	Oppose	The traffic conditions in Musselburgh are already ludicrously busy, narrowing the streets is not going to solve the problem only exacerbate it. Where are the locals who own cars supposed to park if these lanes come into operation? Where are people supposed to park who shop and work in the town? They A1 is already at bursting point so adding another 3000 houses to Wallyford area is only going to make that worse not better.
70	Oppose	You are planning to put cycle lanes along already busy roads that are also used for on-street parking. Where are residents to park? Also why do you need 2 cycle lanes basically going to the same place. Your proposal has cycle lanes along Linkfield Road and also along the back of the Racecourse. Is this not overkill? Also the drawings for Linkfield Road are completely out of proportion. This road will never cope with 2 cycle lanes, parking and 2 lanes of traffic. Have you ever driver along this road especially on a race day? This will cause absolutely gridlock. Would Pinkie Road not be better for cycle lanes? It has large grass verges that could be adapted. Linkfield Road does not have this. Finally, should ELC not have thought about the traffic in Musselburgh before approving the thousands of houses to be built??? Cycle lanes are just going to make it worse for those who need cars. Why are a few cyclists getting thousands of pounds spent on cycle lanes. Will the packs of cyclists even use them? Could the money not be better spent on fixing the hundreds of potholes that litter our town?
93	Oppose	Proposals are mainly aimed at cyclists and are in part detrimental to pedestrians, especially along Linkfield Road with the proposed loss of pedestrian refuge islands
110	Oppose	Cyclists currently can safely cycle to the city; they often travel in large groups on our road and don't require any special measures given the room they deliberately take up. Many flout traffic regulation applicable to them and cars on the road. I oppose additional measures to benefit these groups but I would support greater development of the path going along the sea wall for cycling.
10	Strongly oppose	The roads at the moment are now road safe for cars and you feel it is a good decision to waste thousands of pounds to make the roads smaller to allow cyclists to have their own lane.
38	Strongly oppose	The pictures used show areas with residential parking and parking required to support local businesses. No consideration has been given to parking. Any new builds be it flats or any other properties, the council has a responsibility to ensure sufficient parking is provided. In fact, planning permission is not given unless this is properly addressed. On what grounds would it be appropriate or reasonable to remove parking for local residents, without offering other parking facilities. This is clearly flawed. Focus on other roads where parking is not required or where there may be land at the side of the road that could be used, such as Pinkie Road.
55	Strongly oppose	Cyclist are a pain in the arse.
64	Strongly oppose	Nothing wrong with current. Roads congested enough

75	Strongly oppose	Blanket 20 mph speed limits are stupid. It will just create more congestion, pollution and increase journey times. Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide. Would like to see improvements to train services. There can be extreme overcrowding on peak time services. It is sometimes not possible to board trains because there is no room leaving many passengers stranded at platforms. Ticket validators at stations are often broken. It is ridiculous that ScotRail run old diesel trains on a line which was electrified decades ago. Services are not frequent enough. Missing a train can result in an hour to wait at times. There is too much congestion at the human ticket barriers when arriving into Edinburgh Waverley. I think the council should stick to improving public transport (buses and trains), repairing roads (especially potholes) and leave road layouts and speed limits as they are. Tax payers expect value for money so expensive and unnecessary projects like this should be cancelled.
77	Strongly oppose	I am fed up with the lycra wearing brigade being given priority over insurance paying, road tax paying motorists. Even considering these proposals is a joke!
78	Strongly oppose	Too much money spent on minority interest group at expense of pedestrians
98	Strongly oppose	Traffic in Musselburgh is bad enough without making the streets narrower.
103	Strongly oppose	My house is located on Victoria Terrace, Linkfield Road. There are other cycling routes that could be considered that would not impact the main roads through Musselburgh particularly as many cyclists go via Musselburgh Promenade and not via the main roads.
112	Strongly oppose	There is already cycle lanes plus you are not considering drivers pedestrians or shoppers accessibility It needs to be fair and appropriate for all

2) To what extent do you support the aim of improving conditions for people walking in Musselburgh and into Edinburgh and Midlothian?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
1	Strongly support	I choose to walk whenever practical and possible
2	Strongly support	Huge health benefits, and greater awareness of environment and social contact
4	Strongly support	same reasons as for cycling. well known benefits.
5	Strongly support	People need to be safe walking to their destinations.
6	Strongly support	As with my cycling answer, I think people need weaned off their cars. Improvement in provision for walking will encourage folk to walk instead of drive.
8	Strongly support	Encourages activity. i am also a keen runner and therefore makes that a lot more pleasant.
9	Strongly support	People should be less reliant on motorised transport and enjoy the health benefits
11	Strongly support	For many of the same reasons as I support improving cycling conditions. We need to stop towns being dominated by motorised traffic. Again, walkers have a 27 percent lower risk of heart disease and a 36 percent lower risk of dying from it.
13	Strongly support	There are some lovely walks but lighting and paths need improvement
16	Strongly support	Healthier options than driving can only be of benefit to the whole community
17	Strongly support	0
21	Strongly support	0
22	Strongly support	Musselburgh is set in a lovely location, by walking (safely) around Musselburgh you can fully appreciate this
23	Strongly support	While walking from Musselburgh to Edinburgh will likely remain a niche activity (public transport and cycling are better suited for that), walking within Musselburgh could certainly be improved. The High Street could have a lovely village atmosphere but is currently dominated by through traffic. Changes to improve walking and encourage through traffic onto the A1 would be most welcome!
24	Strongly support	0
25	Strongly support	As Q1b
26	Strongly support	Walking is the most sustainable method of transport.
28	Strongly support	See previous views
29	Strongly support	Anything which gets us out of our cars has to be good. Separation of pedestrians from both cyclists and especially motorists is essential.
31	Strongly support	0
33	Strongly support	again I would walk more if there were places to walk with less traffic and fumes
35	Strongly support	0
36	Strongly support	I'm a young mum with two children so wide pavements and accessible paths are essential to my children's safety
37	Strongly support	While there exist good walking paths in and around Musselburgh in particular, that tie into other walking systems, these should always be prioritized moving forward.
39	Strongly support	Walking is an excellent form of exercise and is best in an safe and clean environment.
40	Strongly support	Musselburgh is a lovely town and to have more areas to walk and walk safely would enhance the town
41	Strongly support	Musselburgh has a number of natural assets to encourage walking, e.g. the prom. However, it is currently unpleasant to walk in the town itself due to the dominance of motor vehicles.
42	Strongly support	Obvious health benefits, make routes safer with better lighting and sign posting
43	Strongly support	This goes hand in hand with cycling. There is currently a pinch point along Seafiew Terrace, Eastfield and Edinburgh Road where walkers, cars and cyclists get in each other's way.
44	Strongly support	Traffic levels in Musselburgh and the surrounding areas are unsustainable. Walking (and cycling) need to be encouraged as much as possible.
45	Strongly support	0
47	Strongly support	as for cycling - same reasons
48	Strongly support	Pedestrians must be protected from accidents involving vehicles and also said vehicles emissions.
49	Strongly support	There are already lots of lovely places to walk in Musselburgh but the pavements on the main streets could be improved. Some bollards on wide pavements to prevent pavement parking would be welcomed and some trees and planters would brighten the place up (as long as they're not causing an obstruction!) People walking should always be prioritised in my opinion.
50	Strongly support	Walking is good for you! If the route into Edinburgh was pleasant it may encourage some people to walk a section and then get the bus to continue their journey.
51	Strongly support	Many people, myself included can either don't cycle or actively choose to walk. It is better if one can walk in safety away from all traffic - cycles and disability scooters can be a real nuisance and at times downright dangerous!
53	Strongly support	0
54	Strongly support	It gets people fit but needs to safe
55	Strongly support	Everyone has the right to be safe when out walking
57	Strongly support	All round a great idea. Why would be want to keep developing more car journeys until roads are full.
58	Strongly support	As for cycling. Also needs to be pleasant, free of traffic fumes
59	Strongly support	Again walking on sound surfaces and having appropriate crossing points would be invaluable
60	Strongly support	Current arrangements are uncoordinated and don't encourage walking
65	Strongly support	In order to cycle into Edinburgh from Musselburgh a cyclist at some points has to cycle along roads which are busy and a re bus routes, being so they can use the path as opposed to the road making it less safe for people walking. Safer for all!
66	Strongly support	Musselburgh is HEAVILY congested with cars - better paths, routes that actually take you where you want/need to go, might help get people out of cars.
68	Strongly support	Musselburgh is a great place to walk - especially the river and the sea front but again it is not pleasant along the main arteries - North High Street and the High Street. I am relatively young and able but I know that some of the paths around the racecourse for example are not good if you are walking with a buggy or wheelchair. This could be improved. Wider pavements too could make walking more pleasant and encourage more people out. The Musselburgh trail was a great way to highlight a great route along the river. Perhaps more could be done to promote walking routes. Musselburgh feels like it has so much potential for walking and cycling but is let down by a cluttered and car filled high street.
71	Strongly support	Walking is the most spatially efficient transport mode there is. Improvements to cycling should aim to come out of road space first and pedestrian space only when necessary
76	Strongly support	Musselburgh is a compact and well connected town, but there is too much road traffic. Improving pavements, signage and routes would encourage more people to walk, especially for shorter journeys.

79	Strongly support	Being able to walk safely around the town is good for quality of life, peoples health, it's more sociable and help's people to appreciate what our town has to offer.
80	Strongly support	Safe walking routes encourage walking for pleasure, boosting physical and mental health.
82	Strongly support	Pavements need to be widened to encourage walking. There are areas, especially in Musselburgh, where cars park on the pavements. This needs to be stopped.
83	Strongly support	Pedestrian routes are important
85	Strongly support	I enjoy walking as much as possible
86	Strongly support	I walk within Musselburgh regularly, and sometimes find it difficult to navigate efficiently between safe crossing spots, as traffic is so congested through the town.
87	Strongly support	Making it easier, safer and quicker to walk to services and destinations, especially for non-recreational purposes, is vital to encourage people not to use cars for short journeys
88	Strongly support	traffic in Musselburgh is terrible and makes the High Street a horrible place to shop
89	Strongly support	I would walk more often if there were more direct paths.
90	Strongly support	I walk often
91	Strongly support	I walk everywhere.
93	Strongly support	encouraging people to walk is beneficial for all
94	Strongly support	There are many short journeys taken by motor vehicles due to convenience which could easily be done on foot. This would assist reduce the traffic on our roads and encourage a more healthy active lifestyle. But there needs to be good signage, and a good network of paths which provide easy links between various destinations throughout the town.
96	Strongly support	as per the previous question
97	Strongly support	Most people can walk - they just need the conditions that make it easier and with a goal at the end
99	Strongly support	0
102	Strongly support	Walking is an activity that promotes health.
104	Strongly support	There should be proper walking routes all round Musselburgh. These routes should be accessible for all - children, pet walkers, those with mobility issues etc.
105	Strongly support	Similar to Q1 anything that gets more people walking can only be helpful.
107	Strongly support	0
108	Strongly support	0
113	Strongly support	Pavements and walking routes along roads for commuting, shopping and leisure are discouraging with their noise and pollution.
116	Strongly support	Similar to the last question in order to encourage people out of their cars there needs to be good facilities to encourage more active travel including walking. this will both help the environment and improve health and wellbeing
118	Strongly support	Same answer as Q1b
120	Strongly support	There are many car journeys taken for very short distances. By improving walking condition this will hopefully encourage more people to leave their cars for short journeys. Walking to destinations will only be encourage by clear routes which clearly show destinations and distance so people can plan ahead and make best use of the routed available. These must also be supplemented with both off and online maps to highlight these routes.
3	Support	Walking into town means following the road. Create off road paths where possible.
7	Support	For the same reasons as cycling. It provides good health benefits amongst other things
10	Support	People of Musselburgh always need good footpaths.
12	Support	0
14	Support	More attractive routes will encourage walkers.
15	Support	Walking into Edinburgh e.g. Portobello already has a pretty good route. Some improvements could be made with making Edinburgh road easier to cross
19	Support	Pavements need improved
20	Support	0
27	Support	I would like to encourage people to leave their cars behind for short journeys.
30	Support	Pavements that are even and accessible for users with mobility problems is a great step forward. However widening pavements resulting in the loss of the already limited parking around the shops on the main thoroughfare is not an option for the small business that already struggle to survive.
34	Support	0
46	Support	People can only walk so far, especially with young children or elderly and really want to be away from traffic when doing so. The scope for dedicated walkways is limited.
56	Support	It would encourage people to walk rather than take the car.
62	Support	Everyone likes a stroll and walking alongside busy roads is not as nice as walking along off road paths.
63	Support	Some of the pavements and walk ways are very narrow or not lit well . More routes away from the roads would be a huge benefit .
67	Support	The current routes are suitable, I think they could how we be negatively impacted by these proposals by the narrowing of many paths
69	Support	Some pavements in Musselburgh are in a bad state of repair
70	Support	There should always be safe routes for walkers.
72	Support	Get people out of cars, reap the health benefits
73	Support	As previously mentioned
74	Support	0
78	Support	Poor pavements in need of repair
81	Support	0
84	Support	0
92	Support	any active transport is good - but infrastructure for cycling is a bigger barrier than walking and has a greater chance of actually changing the way a person lives their life.
101	Support	I would not walk that, as it is quite far. But I imagine if I did walk there I wouldn't want to do it next to a busy road. Quiet woodland paths are proved to improve our mental health
106	Support	I support provision for improving walking conditions, though do not see it as a priority when compared to improving provision for cycling. I think provision for walking is actually fine locally.
109	Support	good for health and environment
111	Support	Improved walkways with encourage visitors to the area
114	Support	Walking conditions are already satisfactory with many local residents using paths around the town within the centre and further afield. There is a need to improve the area surrounding the interchange at the new development at ST Clement Wells (especially if the new high school is ever built) but beyond that, there is no pressing need for pedestrianised areas or other pathways to receive priority development.
119	Support	Traffic in Musselburgh is awful, anything that can help will be good.
18	Neither support or oppose	0
32	Neither support or oppose	I find walking into Musseburgh, certainly from Joppa fine.
38	Neither support or oppose	We have pavements which are sufficient for walking. To be honest, I've never got the cycling and walking on the same path. To me, this is not safe. If you feel this is safe, then why don't you just use the pavements for cycling and walking. You may say, this is nonsense, but this is what you are actually proposing. You cannot mix cycling with walking in my view.
52	Neither support or oppose	The walking routes are already fairly good, although there is probably still a bit of scope for improvement.
61	Neither support or oppose	Walking conditions are already good. Resource should be focused on areas of maximal benefit (I.e cycle routes).
75	Neither support or oppose	Current walking conditions are fine.

95	Neither support or oppose	Same comment as before - I have no issue with improvements being made to cycling conditions in Musselburgh, however, what I don't support is the knock-on effect and disruption to those who need private vehicles for their jobs and their family commitments. Not everyone can scoot their two young children and dog about on bicycles across the county. There are already cycle routes through Musselburgh that are already very popular. I don't understand why you feel there is a need to create another cycle route parallel to one that is mere meters away. Progress for progress sake isn't always the smartest approach. Your assumption is that the majority of those living in Musselburgh are within a distance able to walk/cycle to work. In reality, the majority of the new residents descending on the area will be commuting into Edinburgh. Perhaps it is worth having a discussion with the transport services to improve their offerings into the capital first? More trains are an absolute must and quicker bus routes before we begin digging up the roads and creating elaborate cycling routes that impact residents living along them.
100	Neither support or oppose	0
103	Neither support or oppose	Walking trails would be welcomed, however, the walking conditions in my surrounding area are already good.
115	Neither support or oppose	I choose this option because I don't think there is one thing wrong with the walking routes. I have a double buggy and if I can get from A to B with that, then in my option there is nothing wrong with the walking conditions. On the most part the pavements are very wide and I never feel unsafe.
98	Oppose	I see no problems with regard to walking.
112	Oppose	There seems appropriate pavement facilities and pedestrian crossings - educating people to use them would be more beneficial
117	Oppose	Given teh volume of foot traffic I consider the current pathway infrastructure to be adequate.
64	Strongly oppose	Plenty existing safe paths. Waste if money
77	Strongly oppose	The pavements are wide enough so what more do you want? Perhaps you should consider filling in the pot holes on the roads.
110	Strongly oppose	It's not a value add developing this proposition when many would not avail of it. It's 7 miles from Musselburgh and 7 back. Longer for other areas. Many would simply not avail of it. The money would be better invested elsewhere. If one wanted to walk to the city currently there are pathways they can avail of.

3) To what extent do you support Masterplan's proposed network of key Strategic Routes?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
4	Strongly support	It makes best use of the existing options for quite/safe routes around Musselburgh.
6	Strongly support	I use my bike to commute, any improvement of provision of routes into Edinburgh will be a massive boon to all. Car drivers included ,whether they accept it now or not.
9	Strongly support	It will give a wider range of traffic free routes - with hopefully a better surface than the current road network which is little better than a farm track in places
11	Strongly support	They looks like good routes if they are done properly (segregated and safe). The route past Shawfair Train Station looks too much like a detour through... active travel will never win favour if people feel like they have to take a detour to capitalise on it. People will want to take the most direct and convenient route - if we're serious about active travel then this is what the cycle/walking route should be. Also there seems to be a gap in provision in Musselburgh around the A6124 and Pinkie Road.
12	Strongly support	The study appears to have carefully identified the principle strategic routes to, from and through Musselburgh
13	Strongly support	0
14	Strongly support	Any improvements should be supported.
17	Strongly support	I do support this, but I am extremely surprised that the entire length of newhailes hasn't been earmarked. You've missed the busiest section of the road out.
22	Strongly support	There seems to be quite a few shockh is good.
23	Strongly support	This looks great! Encompassing all the existing cycle routes AND the train stations.
24	Strongly support	0
26	Strongly support	They seem reasonably placed and connect key features.
27	Strongly support	seems to have good coverage
28	Strongly support	Plenty of direct cycling routes. Excellent plan
31	Strongly support	0
33	Strongly support	they look like reasonable routes initially contain signage etc for walking cycling. The more obvious street signage and furniture we have out there the more likely it is that people walk and cycle. Hopefully also has an affect on traffic volumes and speed on these routes too.
36	Strongly support	Brilliant connection of the towns where you can stay safe
39	Strongly support	0
41	Strongly support	The proposed network of routes provides a number of options for people travelling on foot and by bike, instead of just a single route
42	Strongly support	Key routes will hopefully encourage users to travel on them (foot, bike or car)
43	Strongly support	I strongly support all enhanced cycling and walking infrastructure. You need to join up your thinking with Edinburgh Council on the Musselburgh to Portobello link though.
44	Strongly support	Seems like a fairly comprehensions set of routes, though a lot depends on how they will be implemented. Painted lanes without segregation are common in Edinburgh and mostly used for car parks.
47	Strongly support	0
49	Strongly support	It seems that there will be useful routes for walkers and cyclists in places where people actually want to travel (not just out of town leisure routes) which I commend. I hope, though, that routes will be segregated to provide a safe space that would benefit cyclists of all ages and experience levels. Painted on lanes provide no protection and are often just used as parking spaces for cars.
56	Strongly support	It covers a lot of the routes I currently use to commute to Edinburgh
57	Strongly support	It would make travelling as a family by bike so much more achievable.
60	Strongly support	The proposals are sensible and will encourage walking and cycling and improve driving as well
61	Strongly support	Sensible, practical and useful. Delighted to see this proposal.
65	Strongly support	As a cyclist is it important to make cycling safer and encourage people to cycle, I believe this will aid that process
68	Strongly support	It would be great to see improvement s and dedicated walking/cycling routes that really encourage people out of their cars and homes! I would like to see this extended to schools - clear safe cycling and walking routes to all schools should be on the list too!
71	Strongly support	Cycling infrastructure should be on arterial routes providing a convenient and direct path, which these routes look like they would do.
76	Strongly support	0
79	Strongly support	National Cycle Route 1- which provides a safe car free cycle route from Newcraighall Road to Edinburgh City Centre via the Innocent railway is not on your plan! Cycle use should be made safer if we are hoping to get people out of their cars.
83	Strongly support	I work at Edinburgh Bioquarter so better connectivity from Musselburgh to the hospital is greatly appreciated
89	Strongly support	I like the new proposed routes.
92	Strongly support	NIDDRIE MAINS ROAD NEEDS A REAL ALTERNATIVE OR REAL IMPROVEMENT!!
99	Strongly support	0
100	Strongly support	The link between shawfair and musselburgh appears better than the current extremely dangerous old craighall road which is far from quiet despite what current guides say
101	Strongly support	0
105	Strongly support	0
106	Strongly support	I will support anything that involves developing safe cycling routes.
107	Strongly support	0
113	Strongly support	I have tried every combination of cycle routes into Edinburgh and none are satisfactory: either they are on busy roads or on peicemeal paths which are iced-up in winter, slippery with leaves in autumn and congested with dog walkers the rest of the year. A coherent, uninterrupted network is a good step forward.
118	Strongly support	They appear to be a considerable improvement on current situation. I hope there will be good onward links in Edinburgh, i.e. to the West, and to the East. There appears to be a missing link between the Olive Bank Road roundabout (by Aldi) to The A199 / Fisherrow Harbour
119	Strongly support	If the final version looks anything like these plans, Musselburgh will be a shining example of how things should be done.

1	Support	It's a start!	
2	Support	I am not clear on all of the details - particularly on those routes which are also autoroutes , and may not be segregated or controlled , eg. for parking and loading in cycle lanes which is a major issue in other such schems. However I am pleased to see links suggested to both main train lines in areas, and to RIE , a major local employer. I also think the paths through the links will help to safeguard it as a recreational space, but would like to see an environmental impact plan on the areas where it crosses the local nature reserve.	
5	Support	It will enable safe and convenient journeys.	
7	Support	N/A	
15	Support	It's laudable however I think too much emphasis on segregated lanes but there doesn't seem to be anything regarding making the difficult junctions like at the Quay/New St and at the lights at the bottom of Milton Rd safer and easier to navigate by bike	
16	Support	I live just off the part of Newhailes Road between Aldi and Lidl. You have missed that one tiny section of road off your proposed route. That is ridiculous. The road may be wide, but it's hugely busy. I am on that road several times a day and I see cyclists forced onto the pavement frequently, which makes it impossible to get past with a buggy or wheelchair. Frankly I don't blame cyclists who do that as there is no cycle lane and not even a section at the traffic lights. Even for pedestrians it's a horrible bit of road, so busy and unpleasant, full of nasty emissions. So many people use that bit of road to get from the Stoneyhill area to the sea front or North High Street - surely it should be a priority? These plans don't go nearly far enough.	
21	Support	This looks very good. There are some notable missing links, though, particularly through Newhailes (which you might not be able to do anything about) and from Inveresk to Musselburgh town centre.	
25	Support	Routes look great apart from the section along North High Street, behind the Brunton Theatre. This routes cycling traffic over the footbridge which is narrow rather than over the road bridge which could easily be remodelled as one lane is redundant in any case (from South to North) as it merges from two on the bridge to one immediately on the north side.	
29	Support	The improvement for pedestrians and cyclists is great, but what about the main roads? We'll still have the same volume of motor traffic crossing Bridge street. Something has to be done about this. Parked cars on Musselburgh High Street are a menace to all.	
32	Support	I support most of what i see but the A1 and A199 corridor could do with some work	
34	Support	There seems to be a section missing between Musselburgh and Whitehill Farm Road leading to the hospital which needs to be inserted. Also it might be handy to have a more direct route from Musselburgh to Shawfair station - the one shown seems to be long and complicated. I think their needs to be more routes from within residential areas in Musselburgh to the likes of Linkfield Road	
35	Support		0
37	Support	It's always difficult to fully understand an abstract representation such as this. It's helpful to walk the site or to see landmarks that go beyond large obvious landmarks. I find myself trying to recall all the streets and paths and can generally imagine they make sense. I think it's key to try and remove cycles and walking from vehicles to the greatest extent possible, for safety sake but more importantly for the health aspects and general enjoyment that comes from being away from traffic, especially in those parts of the Council that are in the countryside.	
40	Support	To have areas where people can walk and cycle safely and away from the ever increasing traffic can only be helpful	
45	Support		0
52	Support	It should make it safer to cycle on the more busy roads than it is now.	
53	Support	Generally good but I think you should consider using pinkie road as there is ample space to create cycle lanes in both directions for a large section.	
54	Support	Covers a lot of routes	
58	Support	Very good accessibility for many different areas. Could be extended to include more areas	
62	Support	There needs to be direct routes and a network of paths in and around Musselburgh which I support. I would prefer most of these to be on quiet or off road rather than shared with cars though.	
63	Support	I think some of the areas are not needed though support in principle, especially keeping pedestrians/cyclists away from cars to slow both to run smoothly	
66	Support	Good to see improvements to infrastructure and, crucially, integration of routes across LA boundaries. Would want to see improvements at the pinchpoint of the pedestrian footbridge over the Esk (adjacent to the 'Electric Bridge). Could the Electric Bridge be made available to pedestrians/cyclists on non-race days?	
69	Support		0
72	Support	the more cycle and walking routes the better	
80	Support	Key routes make sense but there is a gap in the town centre - how do people safely cycle to the High Street, Burgh Primary School, Grammar School, leisure centre, Lewisvale Park?	
81	Support		0
82	Support	There doesn't seem to be a link to the new Shawfair path which is on an old railway line to Roslyn. It's also hard to see if there are links to the Innocent Railway route and the Portobello path. If these are linked in then the networks would be way more complete and travelling by bike and foot much more interconnected.	
84	Support		0
85	Support	its important to improve cycling and walking routes.	
86	Support	Improving these routes is great, but why not extend the cycle route a little further, to take in Prestongrange Museum and Drumohr Caravan Park? The museum is often used as a stopping point for cyclists, and it would encourage tourists to bring their bikes.	
87	Support	The work so far has made a really good start but is missing some important elements	
90	Support		0
93	Support	there are other potential routes, not highlighted on the plan	
94	Support	Whilst I support the plan, there needs to be further consideration to alternative routes which are well use. For example, better use could be made of Pinkie Road in relation to segregated cycle paths rather than the recent advocacy widening of th south footway. Greater safety would encourage more cycling, especially on a key school route which is also a key bus, police and heavy traffic route. There are various options from this route through Pinkie, Lewisvale Park to link better cycling provision. There should also be a review of the current bus stop locations as Pinkie Road for example has 6 alone. A review of distance and location with a view to some reduction would help speed up bus journey times.	
96	Support	good link up with public transport, also opportunity to encourage visitors to come in via train then cycle in Musselburgh area.	
97	Support		0
116	Support	I think there is a need to concentrate the Routes between Musselburgh and Edinburgh / Midlothian first and then move the network further East, so that networks are not developed that lead to nowhere and to mitigate the effects of the proposed housing development around Musselburgh. there should be off road links between Musselburgh and Danderhall through Shawfair to tie into the Roslin/ Loanhead/ Danderhall link. The aspirational off road link between Fisherrow Harbour and Coillesdene Avenue is not shown on this plan.	
120	Support	Whilst I support these routes, there are other routes which are clearly obvious and have not been included. These include Pinkie Road, which had just had the south path widened. This was short sighted and should have been made into a segregated cycleway from the outset to provide a safe cycling route to school for one of the biggest schools in the town (when full roll is achieved) it would also link to other routes which could service the new Secondary school as pupils from Pinkie will go to this school. This should be included in the master plan. It is not clear as to what buy in has been given from the City of Edinburgh Council and Midlothian Council as both these areas feature in the proposals. On paper it looks positive with required adjustments but the joining up to other local authority areas must be achieved and committed to.	
18	Neither support or oppose		0
19	Neither support or oppose	Unless you can widen the roads I can't see how it can work. It's tricky enough to go around cyclists with the size of the roads as it currently is. I don't understand how this could work.	
30	Neither support or oppose	I would need further discussion in the matter to express an opinion on the routes	
46	Neither support or oppose	Too much of the network is on busy roads. We need new dedicated cycle ways and footpaths away from traffic. We need to be more radical and that may mean acquiring land or closing some roads to through traffic	
55	Neither support or oppose	N/A	

59	Neither support or oppose	The drawing for Linkfield Road is short of some serious thinking in my opinion. Approaching Loretto corner where would the cyclists cross. There is no way a group(or individual) cyclists would cross the road to head east along a cycle path as pictured. Where have all the residents in Linkfield road parked their cars ? How many egress points would you have in the proposed cycle way for cars if everyone used their front garden to park off road ? Where have all the traffic islands gone to allow walkers to cross the road ? Where do delivery vehicles park in an environment which is one of the main arteries through Musselburgh ? Have you seen the traffic build up in Linkfield road at certain times of day, when racing is on, when the fairground attractions and all the undesirables cause havoc, it would take one removal van to cause havoc to the traffic in thi picture. I am a cyclist and would not use this route as it improves nothin for me, improving the standard of the road surface would benefit both cyclists and car users. Loretto corner would become a death trap for cyclists, why not resurface and reduce the speed limit to 20 mph for cyclists as well as cars ☺ Finally how are the elderly impacted with unloading of shopping on Linkfield road, removal of bus stops, removal of traffic islands, all for a very small number of cyclists ? A large number of cyclists also use the footpaths. why not make this more acceptable ?	
74	Neither support or oppose	Not sure of impact this will have on existing routes eg Pinkie Rd, can't see the detail on how routes will become "sustainable" routes. Is a one way system being proposed? How will problem areas where drivers regularly excessively exceed the speed limit be addressed?	
88	Neither support or oppose	anything which involves cycling on busy roads is not suitable. Also, why have you ignored the sustrans route beside the Esk from Whitecraig to Musselburgh. Not sure how you will sensitively manage a safe crossing in the middle of the Inveresk conservation area. Not sure how you will separate cyclists from walkers and ensure good behaviour of cyclists. Not sure how you will prevent motor bikes using these routes	
91	Neither support or oppose	Usually when space is being shipped cyclists abuse the safety of pedestrians.	
95	Neither support or oppose		0
98	Neither support or oppose		0
109	Neither support or oppose		0
114	Neither support or oppose	The existence or otherwise of this infrastructure will not change my personal travel habits.	
8	Oppose	Monktonhall Terrace is already very narrow for driving, to improve it for cyclists/ people walking would make it even more narrow and potentially dangerous.	
50	Oppose	A direct north south connection from Bridge Street to Carberry Road is also needed. Why isn't the River Esk included?	
51	Oppose	I have 3 young granddaughters who need to be safe when out and about with me, my husband or their parents and I know their safety and well being could not be guaranteed unless there are pedestrian areas kept entirely separate from cycle ways or areas that mobility scooters use. Many cyclists and mobility scooter users seem to go along at speed - I have seen a cyclist overtaking a car in a 20mph zone in Musselburgh!	
70	Oppose	Same answer as Q1. Cycle lanes will be used by the few but will cause mayhem for all other road users.	
73	Oppose	It has not been thought through ! With regards to safety .or impact to residents along routes	
78	Oppose	You can't have a Walking & Cycling Route. They're incompatible/	
108	Oppose		0
111	Oppose	Don't believe the proposals take into account the existing residents of properties along the routes and the current traffic flows. Specifically Linkfield Road, narrowing the road will decrease safety especially with the increased house building in Wallyford, increasing the traffic flow through Musselburgh. Route 3 behind the race course is a much safer proposal. Route 2 cycle lanes should be on the opposite side of the road, the current proposal increases danger for families parking in front of their properties with small children having to cross a cycle route.	
112	Oppose	Taking more road space from drivers eg Musselburgh main roads is inappropriate and the artists impression I saw on the stretch at Brunton Theatre is completely and utterly far from truth and reality. It also adds more risks to pedestrians who dart in and out of traffic too	
117	Oppose	I live on Linkfield Rand and strongly oppose this road because of the implications for local residents in terms of local car parking which is already severely limited. I would support the route which goes behind the racecourse and effectively bypasses the busy main routes in Musselburgh.	
3	Strongly oppose	The majority of marked improvements are on main roads. This will significantly impact traffic which is already too heavy. Create cycle and walkways on smaller roads to lessen the impact on traffic.	
10	Strongly oppose	I think the idea to change all this route is ridiculous.	
20	Strongly oppose	As before, where is the new traffic being brought to Musselburgh due to the increase in housing supposed to go?	
38	Strongly oppose	Its far too much and main roads should not be used. I would say that minor roads, where appropriate, could be used but kept to one route to reach a goal, not pretty much every route.	
48	Strongly oppose	No consideration is given to Pinkie Road onto Newbiggin. This is farcical considering the level of traffic (and the speed many cars travel on Pinkie Road) that uses this route through town to get to the High Street. Pinkie Road must be included.	
64	Strongly oppose	Waste of money. Sort roads out first	
67	Strongly oppose	Many of these routes already get heavily conjested, this is likely to cause more single lane traffic, and on Pinkie Road as an example we see many drivers dangerously over take as a result. On Linkfield Road bear the race course parking can already be difficult for many residents and those visiting the race course and using adjacent roads to attend sporting events at Pinkie School, these proposals would compound this and I believe cause caos to a main route that is set to become more busy with more housing being built. I think these ideas are idealistic, and whilst the idea is a positive one the reality would be a massive negative for the residents of Musselburgh this would causetravel caos. If the money were directed to turn the route at the lagoons and seafront there a cycle bypass could be achieved as many of the routes are already used by many cyclist and this could increase further if properly resources.	
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.	
77	Strongly oppose	It's a fucking disgraceful waste of money you bastards are going to do it anyway! You people are not living in the real world your too busy patting yourselves on the back whilst spending money building monuments to your self.	
102	Strongly oppose	I am very frustrated that the proposal involves putting strategic routes onto EXISTING busy roads! This is only going to make things worse! One of the proposed routes by the Brunton is already very congested, the image on the flyer is very deceptive suggestign the road is wider as it is. The same on Linkfield road which is already a busy road for cars, and it removes all onstreet parking for residents creating greater problems in an area already tight for parking. Please take cyclists OFF existing roads, rather than making roads narrower and busier!	
103	Strongly oppose	As stated previously, my house is located on Victoria Terrace, Linkfield Road and therefore this would directly impact us on a significant basis. Currently we are able to park outside our house, however parking is already restricted and limited, particularly due to the fact there are no personal driveways on this street. We have a very young family and being able to have easy access to our car is of high importance. Furthermore, parking on side streets is very limited around here as well. This would also greatly impact Windsor Gardens where parking is already difficult due to the Care Home that is also located there which attracts much traffic from visitors, workers and deliveries.	
104	Strongly oppose	The route through Musselburgh high street and Linkfield road is not a sensible proposal. Adding a cycle lane through these routes will impact trade, reduce accessibility for the racecourse and leave residents of linkfield road nowhere to park their cars.	
110	Strongly oppose	The map tells us nothing without any context; I support tangibles like one way systems into and out of Musselburgh using a new route over the electric bridge for traffic and generation of the path along the sea wall. I live on Linkfield Road and any reduction in volume of traffic or slowing of traffic is welcome but I don't support a new cycle path in front of my home removing the parking where we have no drive and where many big groups of cyclists will simply not use the space. Holyrood Park is a classic example where there are cycle paths but cyclists still choose to continue on the road.	
115	Strongly oppose	How many routes do cyclists need!?? And why has Pinkie Road not been taken into consideration? This for me, would make largely the most sense - especially as there is offset and off-street parking.	

4) Do you feel any other key Strategic Routes should be considered as part of the Masterplan?

No.	Comments
1	
2	I am aware of a plan to move Musselburgh GS to a new campus near to Wallyford. I think it is really important that routes should link to primary and secondary schools which would allow bike training strategy to work more effectively in the Burgh. When I was involved in this both the schools and ELC bike officer felt it was too dangerous to train children to use the road network. Of course they did anyway, but without training.
3	
4	Connect The Harbour to Olivebank Rd. It's wide enough for a cycle lane. Connect the Grammar School to the network. My son currently has to cycle on pavements by the Burgh School to go from the Harbour to School (often being yelled at by Pedestrians)
5	The route from Whitecraig to Wallyford is not safe, particularly for children and young people, with two busy slip roads to cross and areas without pavement.
6	I note Portobello isn't included in any plans - that may be because the existing cycle route along the Prom. Fine in winter but on nice summer days it's all but impassable for bikes, and Portobello High Street is a no-go area because of traffic. I'm aware that this isn't in East Lothian but you've included other routes bordering EL including Niddrie etc.
7	N/A
8	
9	
10	Fix the roads first.
11	See previous comment
12	
13	
14	
15	The coverage within East Lothian looks good. Need to join up with Edinburgh/Midlothian councils so we can create uniform coverage
16	See previous comment about making ALL of Newhailes Road a priority. The road up to Inveresk should be considered too - I often cycle to the sports centre and again there are no cycle lanes which seems a huge oversight given how many people use the cycle racks at the sports centre, or cycle through Lewisvale park.
17	Please complete the strategic plan by including the section of road I mentioned in my previous comments.
18	
19	Off route pathways improved (as in not main roads) there is a lot of lovely walking/cycling routes that don't involve being near the main roads. (Morrisons haven as an example)
20	
21	Through Newhailes, from Newhailes Road to Fisherrow. Carberry Road, from Inveresk to Musselburgh High St.
22	
23	The River Esk path and road leading up to it don't appear to be marked. This path is a great route through to Dalkeith and further east via NCN196. Parts of it are in need of maintenance (tree roots mainly) and others would benefit from widening.
24	A199 to Aldi along Newhailes road is a clear missing link
25	no
26	A safer link to cross the A720
27	If you are considering routes into Edinburgh can you extend the segregated cycleway to Wallyford up to Tranent please.
28	These seem good
29	
30	the promenade in its entirety
31	
32	A1 and A199
33	would it be possible to have a route through Newhailes? From Newhailes Road main entrance into the house and coming out down on the A199?
34	Not familiar with the route towards Joppa/Portobello but is there already a path that you can cycle on starting from the Edinburgh boundary as your map stops at the Edinburgh boundary. I would have thought the River Esk path would have been shown on the map.
35	
36	
37	Probably but that would be better addressed with better maps and a public charrette
38	The bottom line is that unless Edinburgh does the same, then other councils, it's really not a suitable use of public money. I understand that more people are cycling thus on this basis let's look at other safety measures to protect cyclists. I would also say however that some cyclists clearly don't follow the rules of the road and that maybe it should be mandatory that they take a road safety test. It's not always the car/van/lorry or bus at fault. Thank you.
39	
40	
41	A protected cycleway on Milton Road into Edinburgh would provide the most direct route. Extend the route as far as possible along the B1348.
42	Not at this time
43	Creating a segregated cycle route from the Southeast gate of Dalkeith Country Park along the A6094 to the Whitecraig roundabout would create an excellent way to get from Musselburgh to Dalkeith up the River Esk. The last stretch along Cowpits Road is very quiet and wouldn't need any upgrading.
44	There needs to be a connection down Newhailes Road to the harbour, there's plenty space for one there. The southern area around the pool and beyond has no provision.
45	Create link between Olivebank Rd / Newhailes Rd and A1 at Ship Inn
46	River Esk Walkway (The Grove). A new route west from Fisherrow Harbour along the back edge of the beach to link up with the Edinburgh network away from traffic. Crookston Road. The Whitecraig to Smeaton railway path.
47	expansion onto Milton Road to connect with city centre and Brunstane train station and into Portobello to connect to Leith
48	Pinkie Road onto Newbiggin. Why leave a key strategic route through the town out? It seems utterly short sighted to do so.
49	I would like to see the route continuing up Milton Road to join onto the path through Magdalene Glen/Bingham and onto the Innocent Path. While I appreciate that there is an off-road connection via the Brunstane Burn path, this is often busy with dog walkers and not lit or gritted in the winter.
50	North south connection between Bridge Street and Carberry
51	I really don't mind, just as long as all cyclists have insurance and a competency certificate. Perhaps they should also pay some 'tax' towards the upkeep of nominated areas?
52	I would like to see the River Esk path improved as it's a very busy, popular path - there are quite a few tree roots which have made the path very bumpy and hard to cycle over in some places.
53	Pinkie Road is wide enough for dedicated cycle lanes, possibly to run through Pinkie St. Peter's grounds and link up to High St.
54	No
55	N/A
56	Between Tranent and Wallyford. The John Muir way to Prestonpans. The path just outside Wallyford to Carberry
57	I think this will be enough for the initial scope.
58	Including more residential areas
59	What about Pinkie Road, why no cycle path there? Or on Salters Road?
60	No
61	No, this is sufficient
62	No - the broad directions are fine - it's the details of where the routes would be and how attractive they are for cyclists
63	A walking/cycle route to Musselburgh Grammar School would be of benefit
64	
65	

66	Yes- a *direct* route between Musselburgh and Portobello High Street (i.e. the A199) needs to be considered. There is nothing to link Musselburgh/East Lothian to the Portobello-Leith (and then North Edinburgh Cycle Network) route. This is a key commuting route and the A199 beyond the Milton Rd junction is very wide. The sea-ward footpath is equally wide, sufficient to accommodate a segregated cycle lane as has been built on Leith Walk. Alternatively, consider creating a 'quiet route' or a cycle lane route along the lines of (emerging from Newhailes) Brunstane Burn Path/Brunstane Mill Rd/Milton Rd/Eastfield Gdns/Collisdene Ave/Morton St/Dalkeith St/Argyle Crescent/St Mark's Pl/Windsor Pl and emerging onto Portobello High Street
67	At the lagoons and seafront at Musselburgh, but to seek to alter the main road and routes through Musselburgh, I believe would be a detriment to the residents of the town, and compound the awful traffic situation that can already arise. To seek to propose this whilst increasing the housing, does not make sense.
68	Walking and cycling routes to schools - Musselburgh to Whitecraig path also needs improvement.
69	
70	Please rethink where the cycle lanes are going. There is no need to have one along Linkfield Road and another right behind the Racecourse.
71	Old Dalkeith Road should be included as it would link up a lot of existing cycle infrastructure and has ample space for it.
72	Routes to continue down the coast
73	Certainly proposed route along Linkfield road should be on racecourse side of road away from driveways and houses .there is plenty of room to expand on that side and would be less dangerous.
74	Why have no routes between Musselburgh and either of Prestonpans or Tranent been considered?
75	No, stop wasting public money on stupid vanity projects like this.
76	
77	No
78	No
79	See previous comment - National Cycle Route 1- which provides a safe car free cycle route from Newcraighall Road to Edinburgh via the Innocent railway is not on your plan! Cycling on Cycle paths is always going to be safer than cycling on the roads.
80	A direct route for the west side of the town across the Esk toward the Grammar School and leisure centre.
81	No direct route from Dalkeith to ERI
82	See previous comments. There needs to be links to the Innocent Railway Path and the Shawfair to Roslyn path. Also, why not continue the cycle route along the A6106 to improve links to the hospital.
83	a more direct link from fisherrow to fort kinnaird and fort kinnaird to hospital.
84	NO VISIBLE LINK FROM THE NEW DEVELOPMENT AT CRAIGHALL TO MUSSELBURGH GRAMMAR SCHOOL
85	
86	Extend route along B1348 to Museum and Caravan Park, for reasons on previous page.
87	National Cycle Route 1 is a major omission, as are connections to National Cycle Route 196. There appears to have been no consideration of connecting Whitecraig to the strategic network, or acknowledgement of Dalkeith as a destination (a link which is partly provided by NCR1). Other existing major paths such as the former Crookston Road to Salters Road link, and the Shawfair to Roslin SUStrans path. Connections to Prestonpans are also missing.
88	Whitecraig to Musselburgh along the Esk. Could something be done through Lewisvale Park?
89	A direct route from Wallyford to Musselburgh town centre would be good.
90	Yes, from all the new houses and Primary School in Wallyford
91	Make segregated spaces for cyclists to keep them away from pedestrians
92	I think the most important think is linking up with existing routes as well to maximise the whole network across Edinburgh!
93	route to the north of levenhall links
94	Pinkie a Road as mentioned in previous question.
95	
96	
97	There should be more routes that lead directly to the greenspace
98	Opening the bridge over the river to ease traffic in the high street,
99	
100	Sheriffhall roundabout needs a safer cycling Rossi with at the very least pedestrian lights
101	
102	Be more creative when you consider routes for cyclists. Don't just look at main and existing roads. Consider putting cycle routes along the far side of the racecourse for instance.
103	I feel that there should be other routes considered for cyclists that do not directly impact the main roads in Musselburgh. It would be worthwhile considering cycle paths on the other side of the racecourse, particularly around the Lagoon area and Coastal wall/path.
104	no
105	
106	I appreciate it is not East Lothian, but linking Fisherrow safely to Portobello promenade would a great step forward for cyclists.
107	
108	
109	not to sure
110	Just about every road in Musselburgh is already marked bar Pinkie for what ever reason.
111	no
112	
113	1) A continuous River Esk route under the Mall Bridge to connect the Esk River path to the town centre avoiding the ludicrously busy Mall roundabout. 2) Another crossing of the River Esk to avoid the Olive Bank Road junction (and Mall roundabout). 3) Safe routes along Inveresk Road and Dalrymple Loan and Newbiggin as traffic is too fast. This is the biggest failure of this Active Travel Network: its failure to provide safe routes to the Grammar School and the Burgh Primary School through the town centre. What is the point of persuading kids to cycle to school without any protection? A ludicrous omission.
114	I would suggest that cycle routes be taken off main roadways altogether. In other words, purpose built cycle tracks away from roads would make leisure cycle more pleasant. I am reluctant to support cycle paths being carved into existing roadways because the infrastructure is already under strain for driving and parking and this is likely to make it worse. Beyond that, those who commute daily by cycling are a tiny percentage of the residents of the relevant area. I cannot foresee that making it marginally easier to cycle next to traffic will persuade more people to journey on foot or by bicycle. You either do or you don't.
115	See previous comment. Pinkie Road!
116	as stated previously the off road link between Fisherrow Harbour and Collesdene Avenue and it is hard to tell from the plan but the aspirational off road multi user path extended within Shawfair to connect with National Cycle Network routes 1 and 76; and with Queen Margaret University also links to Danderhall and Loanhead/ Roslin
117	
118	See answer to previous question - I'm particularly concerned that there should be a good link to Portobello. On West side, I hope link will include Kinwegar. I am assuming existing path along the Esk will remain and hope it will be improved - tree roots make cycling hazardous and must put pedestrians at risk of tripping, too.
119	If you could find a way to make Sheriffhall roundabout possible then that would be great - shame there wasn't an underpass put in with the railway.
120	Yes, Pinkie Road as previously mention and whilst there are clear linkages to Midlothian and Edinburgh on various routes there is no clear linkage to Portobello as it stops at the Local Authority boundary on the A199. Why is this as this is a clear obvious route for walking and cycling for many people? This route must be includes to ensure that tourism, visitor and local travel is accessible to Musselburgh from both a tourism and economic perspective.

5) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions in the town centre, between Milton Road East and Millhill?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
1	Strongly support	Separation strips very important to provide some safety to cyclists

4	Strongly support	It provides a safe route through most of Musselburgh. Note that the crossing shown over the river is not actually Bridge St which is the next bridge upstream.	
5	Strongly support	Currently, the roads are congested, there is parking on both sides in places, pedestrians jay-walk, so any improvements will make things better.	
6	Strongly support	A safe route kept apart from the already terrible road traffic can only be a good thing in my opinion.	
9	Strongly support		0
11	Strongly support	The only way to make real headway in encouraging active travel is infrastructure which is safe for families - cycleways you would happily let your children cycle on - that really means segregation and this plan appears to do that.	
13	Strongly support	I would be much better to keep people away from traffic	
14	Strongly support	Segregated cycle routes are the best option for keeping cyclists safe. Cars can't encroach or park in the cycle lanes.	
16	Strongly support	I cycled that route this week with my son on the back. I was cut off at a junction by someone in a car and beeped at by someone else who overtook me at speed. It's awful. The segregated bike lane would also serve to keep cars further away from pedestrians on the pavement too which can only be an improvement.	
17	Strongly support	It will save lives.	
21	Strongly support	This is amazing!	
22	Strongly support		0
24	Strongly support	6.5 carriageway could be cut to 6 to give 2.5m cycleways. 2m is bare minimum and only suitable for low use. 6m is fine even for buses to pass at 20mph	
27	Strongly support	good to see increased bike and pedestrian priority.	
29	Strongly support	Currently it's just motor traffic, fumes and parked cars everywhere. Did I see a cafe with chairs outside, might be possible if we can rid our highstreet of parked cars!	
32	Strongly support	I think anything that improves active travel is a good thing. I work in public transport and it would be good to know how the public transport infrastructure will be affected.	
33	Strongly support	Im sure cyclists would be more confident going through town on a bike with these improvements.	
36	Strongly support		0
37	Strongly support	It's a great idea. I suspect there'll be considerable resistance to it, but these positive changes sometimes require a bit of stretching to make happen. They'll be loved once incorporated. I do suspect that shops that won't have parking at their street front will be quite concerned. This is no small matter and must be otherwise addressed.	
42	Strongly support	To help ease the flow of travellers - separating bikes from cars making it safer and more attractive to cycle	
43	Strongly support	It would dramatically improve cyclist safety by keeping them away from cars on a busy stretch of road. It would also keep pedestrians safer by keeping those cyclists who currently cycle on the pavement, off the pavement.	
44	Strongly support	This looks excellent, and I would be happy to use this to get my kids right into the centre of town.	
47	Strongly support		0
53	Strongly support		0
56	Strongly support	It actually looks safe to cycle instead of terrifying	
57	Strongly support	Great idea that will probably help all road users.	
58	Strongly support	Reduce traffic, make the area safer for cyclists	
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling whilst addressing traffic requirements	
65	Strongly support	Make commuting safer for all and encourage people to get out of their cars and be healthier. Possibly reduce traffic congestion through the town	
66	Strongly support	This route, my current commute to work, is challenging. A physically segregated cycle lane (that cars cannot park in/on!) is to be commended and would enhance the appeal of cycling to Portobello and beyond. You need to consider how this links to Portobello though - no point in having fantastic cycling infrastructure if it stops dead just past the LA boundary - could a shared path be created from Easthouses to Porty Prom?	
68	Strongly support	currently it is unsafe to cycle along this route and not a pleasant experience. This will certainly encourage me and others to return to cycling. Currently there is not a safe route to cycle from Musselburgh to Portobello with young children - this would make a big difference. Currently the town feels dominated by cars and the pollution is high. Anything we can do to get more people walking and cycling is important. I like the route that goes behind the Brunton and opens up that space.	
71	Strongly support		0
72	Strongly support	must keep cyclists and pedestrians safe	
76	Strongly support		0
79	Strongly support	Safer conditions would encourage more people to cycle	
80	Strongly support	Clearly defined cycling space rather than lines of paint on the road are more likely to encourage use.	
86	Strongly support	Separating cyclists and cars will improve safety considerably, and may help traffic flow.	
87	Strongly support	This is a heavily trafficked route which would benefit from a reduction in the dominance of cars	
89	Strongly support	More walking and cycling paths will benefit walkers and cyclists.	
92	Strongly support	separating cars and bikes and separating bikes and pedestrians is essential - shared use walking and cycling is not actually very practical a lot of the time.	
94	Strongly support	This is a key route into Musselburgh and requires to be improved to encourage safe alternative modes of transport. However there requires to be further linkages into Edinburgh and Joppa through key partnership working with the City of Edinburgh Council so that commuting journey continue from Musselburgh.	
97	Strongly support		0
99	Strongly support		0
101	Strongly support	At the bottom bikes cut round by the mariner, but I imagine this is irritating for the locals in the area. A bike and pedestrian friendly city-centre would be a great improvement	
105	Strongly support		0
106	Strongly support	Segregated space for cyclists away from cars is vital in my opinion.	
107	Strongly support		0
113	Strongly support	Separating cycling/walking from cars is an essential safety feature that shouldn't have to be debated.	
120	Strongly support	Firstly what are Public Realm Enhancements? Whilst I strongly support this proposal, there are number of unanswered questions! How will the segregated cycleway be designed at passing junctions? How will businesses be affected in terms of deliveries? Any enhancement to make cycling safer will hopefully encourage more people to use this method of travel and reduce congestion in the town centre.	
2	Support	I like most of the proposal. Currently the cycle lanes are heavily potholed and eroded due to use by public transport and HGV. if this is avoided by dedicated space that would be a tremendous improvement. I don't feel the pedestrian bridge is an easy route for cycles and pedestrians to share, and would prefer a solution where one bridge is priority for pedestrians and the other downstream bridge is priority for cycles (which is also on the cycle route through town)	
7	Support	Segregated cycle lanes from traffic and pedestrians help everyone feel safe. Pedestrians are not being hounded by bikes and cars are not being held up or have to give adequate room by moving into the path of oncoming traffic to avoid cycles. Having options to provide on street parking in town centres to support local businesses is good, but careful thought should be taken on restriction times and lengths so as not to discourage. Some neighbouring councils haven't considered this in decriminalised parking areas and local businesses are struggling to keep attracting trade. I don't think you will ever stop the population using cars for short journeys, they have become too convenient. Consideration should also be taken to cycle security to encourage shopping by bike.	
8	Support		0
12	Support	I'm personally convinced that only physical separation of cycle and motor traffic is safe, for major through routes. There will be deep-throated opposition to this proposal, if it requires that vehicles other than public service vehicles do not stop in these streets: a lot of time, energy and effort will be wasted if these consequences are not recognised from the outset.	
15	Support	Most bike traffic goes along New St rather than N High St at present	
23	Support	While most of the changes are a huge improvement over the current situation, the foot bridge looks like a recipe for conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. I don't understand why the segregated route doesn't continue along Bridge Street and use the road bridge. The 2nd lane heading north west is redundant as it merges back to a single lane immediately after the bridge. This would give plenty of space. If other measures are taken to reduce through traffic (both along the High Street and Pinkie Road), the junction between Mall Ave/Bridge Street/High Street/Dalrymple Loan could also lose a lane.	

25	Support	Great having segregated cycling, walking and driving routes, however as before the section along North High Street, behind the Brunton, should be reviewed. This is already a walking route and the footbridge isn't really wide enough to cater for cycling traffic as well. The cyclists could be routed along Bridge Street, over the road bridge. The lanes could all be shifted across one as there is no need for two on the south to north side as the road merges immediately after the bridge anyway.	
26	Support	Segregated cycle lanes are welcome, but the 2m lanes for settings 4 and 5 are too narrow to be considered 2-way cycle lanes and are below the minimum standard width.	
28	Support	The 2m space for cyclists would be better at 3m. I think parking is unnecessary.	
31	Support	"Electric Bridge" should be opened to cyclists on a permanent basis with other traffic excluded except for race days etc	
34	Support	I like the idea of cycling in a dedicated and separate lane but would have preferred an off road route altogether. Don't think it should be painted a bright colour as these always fade and get patchy after a while.	
35	Support		0
39	Support		0
40	Support	Although support not sure if there is enough space for it all to be included all the way through Musselburgh. There is so much traffic at present and not easy to get through the town at present. Will this not cause more delays?	
41	Support	2m is too narrow for 2-way cycling. 8.3m is far too wide for the road in section 2, and would just encourage higher car speeds. Need more details on what 'quiet route' would entail.	
45	Support	Cycling should not share pedestrian bridge unless they dismount and push bike over bridge.	
46	Support	You will only be able to do this without making traffic conditions worse if you reduce the amount of traffic passing through Musselburgh. You can do this through a charging regime using number plate recognition which does not penalise those coming into the town to shop etc.	
48	Support	Common sense dictates that these proposals are implemented.	
49	Support	I think the map is mis-labelled. Bridge Street is labelled twice and the mention of it on the route doesn't seem to be Bridge Street at all. I assume that cyclists will be routed down the back of the Brunton then over the pedestrian bridge? If so, I'd be slightly concerned about the possible cyclist/pedestrian conflict on the bridge and I'm not convinced a contraflow on Shorthope Street (if that's the suggestion) would allow sufficient safe space for cyclists. Why not continue on Bridge Street? Two car lanes are not required heading east bound over Rennie Bridge so there could be space for a segregated lane to continue over the bridge.	
50	Support		0
51	Support	I would prefer all on street parking to be removed and bus/cycle lanes introduced on a permanent basis to help keep traffic flowing. This would enable cyclists to permanently use bus lanes and pedestrians to use the footpath/pavement.	
52	Support	It will give cyclists more space.	
61	Support	Good idea. Possibility of the street jamming up though, so need careful thought.	
62	Support	I support this but would prefer it to be on New Street rather than North High Street. Narrowing North High Street could cause traffic congestion which could delay buses. Plus I feel it would be more attractive to cycle on cycle lanes on New Street.	
63	Support		0
69	Support		0
74	Support	segregated cycle lanes will benefit all road users. Not clear on how the use of the bridge changes or priorities are junctions.	
81	Support		0
82	Support	Good designs and full segregation important. the level difference between the pavement and the cycleway is also very important to help distinguish the bike path from the pavement. Leith Walk is an example of how keeping them at the same level doesn't work well with pedestrians always in the cycle path and mostly unaware they are so. If it were at all possible it would be best if there was a cycle way on each side of the road heading in the direction of the traffic. This makes it easier for changing routes and for less conflict between bikes.	
84	Support		0
85	Support	would be good to have a separate cycle path	
90	Support	Keeps cyclists from main section of road where they often ride 2 or 3 abreast. Much safer this way.	
96	Support	cycle route would make cycling safer in the high street	
109	Support	good for high street	
115	Support		0
116	Support	Need to see more detail around how you handle junctions and the requirements of shop keepers / businesses along the route	
118	Support	A bit concerned that 2 metres for two-way cycling is too narrow but I can see that the walkway is also narrower at those points because of allowance for car parking. A problem.	
119	Support	It will be great for people who use the town center. Hopefully there will be cycle parking provision also.	
19	Neither support or oppose		0
30	Neither support or oppose	again, i feel cyclists could be encouraged to use the quieter road along New Street or the Promenade rather than North High Street The area at the Brunton Hall with the expansion of the already large pedestrianised area has long standing issue with youths congregating, this will surely encourage more of the same! The removal of the bus stop -where has it gone?, The angle of the corner seems to be tight for 2 buses to pass each other. Loss of parking for the local restaurants patrons to use ... not good!	
55	Neither support or oppose	Walking yes I support safety for walking but don't narrow the roads for driving.	
83	Neither support or oppose	I'm strongly in support of better cycle networks but it seems that you have done this by removing all street parking. I am sure the local businesses would be very badly effected if there was no street parking available for people to pop in and out of shops. Not everyone has the time or capability to do all this on foot or on bike.	
88	Neither support or oppose	Not sure about this. Will it slow down the public buses and prevent them running to timetable? You do not detail the losses in parking - this affects the viability of local shops.Needs to be a balance between different travel sectors and not enough information supplied to evaluate how other forms of travel will be affected.	
91	Neither support or oppose	Making shared space just encourages cyclists to abuse the pavement. They shouldn't use any designated pedestrian space. The segregated cyclepath looks ok though.	
98	Neither support or oppose	Road appear wider on these road and do not have the same traffic build up .	
111	Neither support or oppose	.	
10	Oppose	This section of road would be very difficult to change due to park cars and then deliveries to local stores.	
18	Oppose		0
54	Oppose	Can use the beach front psth away from traffic	
67	Oppose	There are already bus lanes which can impact commuting traffic, this could cause bus routes take longer and it can already take 60/90 mins to commute into town mid week at peaks time from East Lothian to Edinburgh.	
70	Oppose	Same as all other answers. Please rethink where the cycle lanes are to do. Travelling through Musselburgh is a nightmare most of the time. Chunks of a busy road being given over exclusively to bikes will only make it worse.	
73	Oppose	The proposal is not an improvement !	
100	Oppose	The cycle path along the promenade is sufficient. The separated cycle path would be better placed in so here like the A1 near Dunbar or old dalkeith roa	
104	Oppose	This would have an impact on trade within this area and would further reduce support for local businesses.	
112	Oppose		0
114	Oppose	the proposed plan for segregating the cycle path will ultimately make the road narrower, and reduce parking spaces. There is already pressure for parking spaces along Linkfield Road and the roadway is already busy and congested. If the cycle way was not carved out of the existing roadway, then I would support the changes. Linkfield Road has to cope with every day domestic parking and also congestion on race days. Taking away at least 2m or more of the road will make conditions for residents untenable.	
3	Strongly oppose	It doesn't improve for walking so this should be removed from the proposal. The changes are in effect mostly around improvements for cyclists. There is an existing route that could be developed along the sea front and New Street. North High Street does not have the capacity to have two way traffic and a two way cycle track. There will be no stopping places for vehicles which will have a significant impact on businesses in the main streets. Deliveries will be affected, and sales impacted heavily. It does not support the development of Musselburgh as an economically viable town for small business.	

20	Strongly oppose	Why not locate the cycle path along the Fisherrow promenade as at Portobello/Seafield? Use the electricity bridge and make a path along lagoons.
38	Strongly oppose	As stated earlier. Parking has not been considered for residents and businesses. Parking in this area is already a problem so unless you can create more parking locally, it is not acceptable. I have pointed out that sufficient parking must be maintained for the amount of residential. I would also again refer to the damage to business on the high street, which is already in a terrible state. The Scottish government is supposed to back and support small businesses, so what have they to say on this proposal.
59	Strongly oppose	I strongly oppose segregated cycle ways as it would appear these changes are purely for the benefit of cyclists without thought for other road users and local residents
64	Strongly oppose	Nothing wrong with existing
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.
77	Strongly oppose	Yes, complete waste of money!
78	Strongly oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
93	Strongly oppose	current call for moratorium on shared spaces, so idea should be rethought main cycling route to high street should be new street via the footbridge, cyclists should not be permitted to use the footpaths of the footpaths of the current roadbridge
95	Strongly oppose	Are you aware of the problems with parking in this area already? You have businesses which rely on the ability of their customers to park nearby and then you have the residents, who you currently won't provide parking permits for (another gem of an ill-thought out "improvement"). What happens to the residents ability to park near their homes when you introduce this new quiet route? What do you envisage happening when you introduce these new cycle routes? All of sudden thousands of people will decide to get a bike and flock to use the routes? I think a dose of realism is needed about the impact on people who live in the area. You're going to narrow the road, which presumably means you are going to get rid of parking along the street? So, you have disabled people and those with young children living on these roads, who need their vehicles. Where do they park? Where does everyone park? Who gets impacted? Those on the surrounding streets. And for what? The ability of a few dozen people every day able to go down north high street rather than the route 100m away along the coast? Which, lets be honest is a far quieter cycle route as there are no cars there already! Put your thinking caps on guys! How is your proposed "masterplan (read LOL)" going to actually improve the area?
102	Strongly oppose	This is a very congested route for cars and buses especially at rush hour. This proposal will only make it worse taking part of the road away for a cycle lane.
103	Strongly oppose	There are very few cyclists that use this route. The majority of cyclists do not use the main roads and will use/prefer to cycle along the Promenade. This area is already particularly narrow and the majority of the current parking spaces are used all day. As residents of Musselburgh this would have a negative impact on these shops etc. as the limited and reduced parking spaces would certainly deter me from shopping here.
108	Strongly oppose	0
110	Strongly oppose	I'd be affected by section 5, Linkfield Road. Currently there is insufficient space on the road for all the cars to park. You are proposing a 2m wide parking space - my car with mirrors is wider than this. I can also not tell if I'd have to park on the opposite side of the road to my home or outside of it based on the diagram. If across from it I'd have to navigate more tightly packed traffic and a cycle lane which from a h&s perspective and well being is not acceptable. Many on my road have multiple vehicles - we have 1. We work in Edinburgh and the train stations/times don't suit our working hours/locations. We have no choice to drive. The bus is too infrequent and even getting the express it's too long a journey - going in the car is simply faster.
117	Strongly oppose	Implications for parking.

6) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions along the A199, between Wallyford Roundabout and New Street?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
1	Strongly support	getting a bit repetitive!
2	Strongly support	No other comments
4	Strongly support	this is already a well used cycle route so should be improved.
5	Strongly support	The road is wide enough to allow these improvements, which should improve safety and accessibility.
6	Strongly support	a safe, segregated cycle route any way in our though the town is a positive
9	Strongly support	Anything that keeps motorised transport and cycles separate is a good thing as long as it is not compulsory for faster cyclists as pedestrians will use the cycleway too.
11	Strongly support	That looks amazing.. that section of road has been crying out for a segregated cycleway - it's currently excessively wide meaning traffic travels too fast and it's a really unpleasant cycling experience. These plans look good
12	Strongly support	0
13	Strongly support	It's such a busy piece of road and would put me off Taking my children there
14	Strongly support	As before
16	Strongly support	A segregated route by the racecourse and over that roundabout would be a far more pleasant option, but I do feel this needs to be in tandem with the route down the High Street, not an alternative.
17	Strongly support	0
21	Strongly support	I am astounded at how good these proposals are. Seriously good stuff, please keep it up! Opening the electric bridge to pedestrians and cyclists is absolutely critical. Simply replacing the current barriers with collapsible bollards would make a huge difference.
22	Strongly support	0
23	Strongly support	This looks great. The details around the electrical bridge (please no chicanes) and Levenhall roundabout will be critical.
24	Strongly support	Same comment- give 0.5m more to the cycleways
25	Strongly support	allowing cyclists across the electric bridge avoids the issues with the narrow bridge
27	Strongly support	Just what it needs. How will the bus stops be arranged?
32	Strongly support	Again this looks to improve cycling safety and should promote active travel, it would be good to see plans of how public transport infrastructure will be affected
33	Strongly support	again it just looks safer for cyclists. only think is what would happen to buses? would there be bus stops in the parking sections?
36	Strongly support	0
42	Strongly support	0
44	Strongly support	Looks great, a real positive step forward for active travel.
45	Strongly support	0
47	Strongly support	0
49	Strongly support	If I am right in understanding that it is fully segregated then I fully support it and I am particularly pleased that Levenhall Roundabout will have a segregated path.
53	Strongly support	0
56	Strongly support	I actually use that route just now, if you were to improve anything I would suggest this route as it avoids the high street. If you could improve the Wallyford roundabout as well, as it is really unsafe for cyclists.
57	Strongly support	As before all round a great idea. Get folks out of their cars.
58	Strongly support	0
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling whilst addressing traffic requirements
61	Strongly support	Already a busy cycle route, this is the logical one to prioritise (more than North High Street, the benefits of which are more marginal if this one exists).
65	Strongly support	Make routes through the town safer for pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Increase health reduce pollution
66	Strongly support	Linkfield Road can be congested, with parked cars making it hard to cycle along this route. Segregated cycle lane is fantastic!
68	Strongly support	this would encourage and link up each end of Musselburgh and could encourage more train travel too. Also attractive for visitors to the town who might arrive by train at Wallyford and walk/cycle onwards. Housebuilding in the Wallyford area means we need to address the huge increase in traffic that we could see.
71	Strongly support	0
72	Strongly support	important to keep cyclists and walkers safe
76	Strongly support	This route is ideal for cyclists to cross Musselburgh. Support signalised junction and improved cycle lanes by racecourse.

79	Strongly support	Cycling along that stretch of road never feels very safe as people have to squeeze by.
80	Strongly support	Same as before but really important this route becomes 20mph as at the moment it is a fast road so even with dedicated infra would be offputting.
83	Strongly support	good use of a wide road
86	Strongly support	See previous comment
87	Strongly support	Provides a really good alternative to travelling through the town centre if that isn't your intended destination
89	Strongly support	Improved conditions will be good for walkers and cyclists.
90	Strongly support	Keeps cyclists from main section of road where they often ride 2 or 3 abreast. Much safer this way.
92	Strongly support	like it, actually segregation of road users is awesome.
94	Strongly support	This is a well used route which would benefit from future sustainable infrastructure which would encourage safe alternative modes of travel. However any future infrastructure must ensure that it meets the needs and requirement to ensure that businesses and even locations, eg Musselburgh Racecourse, are considered.
96	Strongly support	links directly to park and choose - good options for commuters, esp. with increased house building in Wallyford it will provide safer option for getting into work in Edinburgh
97	Strongly support	Links with the train station are really positive
99	Strongly support	0
101	Strongly support	0
105	Strongly support	This stretch affects my household directly (Victoria Terrace). The plans, if I'm reading them correctly, keep street parking from Windsor Gardens into the town centre (section 1). This is important as there is little alternative to park elsewhere, both in terms of distance and space. If this isn't the correct interpretation then I would be less supportive.
106	Strongly support	Again, I strongly support any proposals that keep cyclists away from cars.
107	Strongly support	0
113	Strongly support	Would prefer path to be on the north side of the road. Use this route for recreational purposes often. Traffic is too fast. Protection is needed at the Levenhall roundabout.
119	Strongly support	A vast improvement to what's there, which can be difficult, especially the footbridge and the cars parked on the corner of Millhill.
120	Strongly support	There requires to be a safe network for cycling all the way through Musselburgh, however it must be balanced against the needs of local businesses so that it does not discourage people from the town centre and thus have a detrimental affect on local traders, visitors and residents.
3	Support	This route is more suitable for changes to the existing set up. The road is wider, has less traffic and currently has capacity. The second part of the route at Linkfield Road is wider and can support access for more users.
7	Support	As before, good segregation of pedestrians/cyclists/road traffic helps encourage the different users without intimidating one another.
8	Support	0
15	Support	The difficult right turn at the end of New St isn't addressed. Less might be unhappy at losing pavement space
26	Support	Segregated cycle lanes are welcome, but the lanes are below the minimum standard width.
28	Support	I would prefer wider cycling space and no parking
29	Support	This looks a big improvement, but why two way motor traffic still? As a car owner/cyclist who lives on this street I'd prefer reduced the reduced motor traffic this would bring.
31	Support	Instead of segregated cycle route on Linkfield Road the pavement on the north side should be shared use
34	Support	I like the idea of a dedicated cycle route but would have preferred it to be next to the racecourse or just inside the racecourse rather than alongside the houses.
35	Support	0
37	Support	same as previous comment
39	Support	0
40	Support	Cyclists cross over the bridge next to the electric bridge at present without dismounting regardless if there are pedestrians or it is a cycling club, it would be good to make more use of the electric bridge
41	Support	While I fully support the council's ambition for kerb segregated cycling facilities, 2m is too narrow for 2-way segregated cycling.
46	Support	Same comment as above.
48	Support	Common sense approach.
51	Support	The explanation is identical to the previous comments.
52	Support	It's not a route I often use, but it should make it easier and safer for cyclists.
54	Support	Makes the route safer
62	Support	I support this because using Millhill and New Street makes sense. While Linkfield Road would appear to be wide enough I wondered whether cycling on the racecourse side might not be a more attractive route.
69	Support	0
74	Support	I support the opening of the electric bridge to cyclists. Will pedestrian crossings be upgraded on Linkfield road in places where there is only a pedestrian walkway on one side of the road? How will cyclist traffic be prioritised at Links roundabout?
81	Support	0
82	Support	Glad to see the cycleway taking precedence over parking in some areas and not being reduced to less than 2m.
85	Support	0
88	Support	This looks better and will have less adverse effects on bus routes. but note that Wallyford park and ride parking is already completely full on occasions and will get worse with the new housing, so drivers who want to park there and bike into Edinburgh will not be able to do so.
116	Support	it looks a better option than the first option but again need to see the detail
118	Support	Again concerned about 2m width for two-way cycle lane
19	Neither support or oppose	0
43	Neither support or oppose	The Western half of this is not required as you can already cycle from the Harbour to the River on cycle paths that hug the coast. The rest of it is a good idea.
63	Neither support or oppose	0
84	Neither support or oppose	0
91	Neither support or oppose	Looks like pedestrians are not being prioritised
100	Neither support or oppose	0
18	Oppose	0
30	Oppose	Have you even visited Musselburgh on race day! where are visitors to park? the road appears to be narrowed, it is already under pressure for resident and visitor parking
50	Oppose	Better off having 2no. one way segregated cycle ways rather than 1 dual direction.
55	Oppose	Again too much of the road being given to cyclists
95	Oppose	Again, have you thought it through with regards to the impact on residents? Your snapshot of what Linkfield road would look like....why would you not put the pathways on the other side so that residents have the ability to park outside their homes. Where will their cars go? Oh wait, they'll be one of the thousands flocking to Halfords to go pick up a bicycle, right?
112	Oppose	0
114	Oppose	There is insufficient allowances for resident parking on Linkfield Road, particularly at Victoria Terrace. If a segregated cycle path is installed, it should be built on the Eastbound side of Linkfield Road adjacent to the Racecourse perimeter. That would also mean that cyclists are on the opposite side of the road to the junctions at Beulah, Ashgrove and other exits into Linkfield Road from side streets in the area. That would reduce the risk of motorists emerging from junctions into the main road and colliding with cyclists.
10	Strongly oppose	0
20	Strongly oppose	Again bring the route along lagoons not a199

38	Strongly oppose	The problem here is the racetrack. Racedays are a nightmare already for residents and you shall be removing more parking spaces. I am aware of the free car park, but racegoers are not using it. To be reasonable, and if this was to happen, it must be an assurance that parking on the residents side must not be removed or diminished. It should also be the case that signs are put up warning racegoers not to use residential parking.
59	Strongly oppose	Existing wall, these walls will disappear as people will want to park their cars in a front garden, making the cycle way dangerous to cross. This road is wide enough and safe enough for cyclists as it is, the only problem I currently have is the poor quality of the surface, this extra finance for making these changes should be routed into resurfacing(not just resurfacing when the Tour of Britain happens to pass by this route.
64	Strongly oppose	Is this a joke. Calming bumps try following the cycling club 3 abreast on the roads. This is ridiculous
67	Strongly oppose	Strongly object, the road is already narrow, parking is already difficult for those who live near the race course and near Pinkie School, this would cause travel chaos for people who travel to race course and Pinkie School for events.
70	Strongly oppose	Linkfield Road drawing are completely out of proportion. This road is busy every day of the week and will cause issues leading into Musselburgh if even less space. Already traffic can be queued right back past where the Woodside Hotel was. Also where are you expecting residents to park? This is a terrible idea. Again, why have 2 cycle lanes a few hundred metres apart (Linkfield Road and behind the Racecourse)? Would it not be safer for cyclists and motorists to keep them apart - direct cyclists to the cycle lane behind the Racecourse.
73	Strongly oppose	It would be dangerous
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.
77	Strongly oppose	Waste of money leave it alone!
78	Strongly oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
93	Strongly oppose	don't understand requirement to signalise junction of millhill and linkfield road. cyclepath introduced at detriment of pedestrians as refuge islands are removed- ridiculous. whatever happened to road user hierarchy? any cyclepath should be on north side as easier to link to electric bridge, with no junction to negotiate. don't believe that the high numbers of 'serious' cyclists that use linkfield road would use any segregated 2 way facility. cyclists should be removed to either the north of the racecourse or the north of levenhall links, ie not on linkfield road
98	Strongly oppose	Traffic build up on this road at the moment ,in future with new housing being built it will be a nightmare .
102	Strongly oppose	This plan is extremely deceiving. The road is very busy already, especially at rush hour and worse on race days. The plan suggests it is wide enough to add in an additional cycle route without impacting on parking or traffic flow. I think this is very unlikely and will instead cause significant additional traffic problems. Narrowing the pavement on the side with houses is not helpful, it is not very wide at the moment and will therefore cause congestion particularly as there are many families with buggies and prams, and people with disabilities using the pavements. I would caution about the loss of on street parking, especially on victoria terrace where more than twenty homes are already struggling for space and parking is under pressure, especially on race days. This will therefore impact exponentially on streets round about.
103	Strongly oppose	As stated in previous responses, my home is located on Linkfield Road. As a mother of a young child I would be greatly concerned about the narrowing of the current footpath. This would also mean that parking would not be allowed outside my home and this would put significant pressure on the side streets, particularly Windsor Gardens which is already a busy street with the Care Home also situated here. Having direct access to my car is significantly important with a young family. Additionally, there appears to have been a failure to consider the implications that this would also have on Musselburgh racecourse. Many people attending the races park on Linkfield Road. On particularly busy race days the cars can be parked all the way down the main street. I'd be keen to hear what the Council's proposal is to deal with this. If there's limited parking for race go-ers this will impact attendance figures as people will be deterred from attending.
104	Strongly oppose	This would have a major impact on race days and parking for local residents. This would create a bottleneck on an already busy road. Would interested to know what studies have taken place to establish how much traffic will reduce in future years to make this plan feasible.
108	Strongly oppose	0
109	Strongly oppose	lack of parking spaces for houses
110	Strongly oppose	I can't tell if I can park outside my home anymore based on this diagram - is Linkfield Road in section 1 or 2; I don't think the big groups of cyclists who travel in packs will use the cycle lane. It makes no use of the wall along the sea front which would be safer for cars and have much less impact to those actually living in the area versus those travelling through it. Adding an additional set of lights at the racecourse compounds an existing problem coupled with those on the high street. You need to think less about segregating the existing space and more about how you can transform under used spaces like developing the path along the sea wall, linking it to Portobello.
111	Strongly oppose	Don't believe the proposals take into account the existing residents of properties along the routes and the current traffic flows. Specifically Linkfield Road, narrowing the road will decrease safety especially with the increased house building in Wallyford, increasing the traffic flow through Musselburgh. Route 3 behind the race course is a much safer proposal. Route 2 cycle lanes should be on the opposite side of the road, the current proposal increases danger for families parking in front of their properties with small children having to cross a cycle route.
115	Strongly oppose	I live on Victoria Terrace. I can't work out from the diagram which is pretty pixelated what you are proposing to do on my street, but if it in any way means I can no longer park outside my home or close to my home, this would not only infuriate me, it would have serious implications on the value of my family home, my health (I am currently being tested for arthritis in my spine) as I suffer with serious back pain and I have a 10 month old and 2.5 year old I need to get safely to nursery and other outings. I do not have an option to cycle and I find it almost incomprehensible that the few cyclists I see along our street would take priority over the people who live there when there is an off road route (over the back of the racecourse) that could be the perfect solution to this.
117	Strongly oppose	Implications for parking

7) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions through Levenhall Links?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
5	Strongly support	This is a popular area for people walking their dogs, running etc and sometimes conditions underfoot are terrible. Resurfacing the road at Section 2 would make a big difference for those driving to the outdoor education areas.
6	Strongly support	I am involved with Cycle Without Age Musselburgh. This is EXACTLY the kind of path our trishaw would use to take the elderly or those with mobility issues out on rides!!!
9	Strongly support	0
11	Strongly support	Looks good
12	Strongly support	0
13	Strongly support	0
14	Strongly support	Segregation required at all times.
15	Strongly support	This path is in dire need of upgrading as it's prone to flooding
17	Strongly support	0
20	Strongly support	Great idea, use existing space and don't punish drivers
22	Strongly support	0
24	Strongly support	0
28	Strongly support	Good wide paths
32	Strongly support	I run along here and it would be good to have segregated pedestrian and cycle lanes
33	Strongly support	a better path surface would be great for that section and also keep bikes away from the traffic fumes for a section.
34	Strongly support	This is a path I would use in preference to one alongside a busy road. This would encourage me to get on my bike more. A new bridge at this point shown would be very good .
36	Strongly support	0
37	Strongly support	perfect spot to extend a route to/from already existing trail systems.
38	Strongly support	Now that's ok. Not a main road and not causing any loss of parking. Plus safe for cyclists, but maybe not safe for walkers with idiot cyclists. Not all of them, just some.

39	Strongly support	0
42	Strongly support	encourage more use. take bikes away from cars
43	Strongly support	This would be a very good use of funds as it is fairly low cost and controversy free. It would encourage further leisure use of this area and enhance commuting from Levenhall into or through Musselburgh.
44	Strongly support	Again, looks very good. The existing roads around the lagoons are a possible issue. While the surface is fine for leisure cycling passing cars tend to kick up a lot of dust and debris. Some people drive too fast and there is some fairly imaginative parking which makes some areas dangerous. While more of a leisure route than an active travel one, a circular route around the lagoon site using the coastal path would be good.
46	Strongly support	The lagoons area is ideal for a safe route away from traffic and the paths there are in urgent need of improvement.
47	Strongly support	The full potential of Levenhall Links - recreation and tourism needs to be realised and this will help. Access to this wonderful asset should be encouraged as much as possible
49	Strongly support	Good width of shared path and excellent that there will be improved surfaces, however, the existing shared use path between Levenhall and Prestonpans could do with being resurfaced.
53	Strongly support	Current pathway awful for cyclists and buggies
54	Strongly support	Its a good path away from traffic
56	Strongly support	I us this route sometimes and it gets a bit ruff around the part you aim to improve. I would suggest lighting for the John Muir way so it can be used all year round and not just the summer.
57	Strongly support	0
59	Strongly support	Less impact on current residents and road users and the best way forward for all
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage cycling and walking
61	Strongly support	Great proposal, set far away from roads on a useful route.
62	Strongly support	I really support this beacause it is off road and attractive for me and my children to cycle along. This is a very good proposal. I support a new bridge crossing - anything to smoothen out routes to make them as direct as possible.
65	Strongly support	Make it more accessible to all and safer for all
68	Strongly support	This would be amazing and open up an area that many currently don't or can't access. I enjoy walking around the lagoons and racecourse but wouldn't consider taking my bike or my child on his bike currently. This would do that. A new dedicated bridge would be great. Current bridges have quite a camber and obstacles. Think about the width and obstacles for Musselburgh's new trishaws.
70	Strongly support	This is the best option for safety. Will keep cyclists and other road users separate and safe.
71	Strongly support	0
72	Strongly support	safety of cyclists and walkers
76	Strongly support	Would also like to see route round north side of lagoons improved for walking
79	Strongly support	It's a really nice part of the town and it would be brilliant to provide safe cycling and walking and therefore also better wheelchair access there. Also a route for the "Cycling without age" vehicles
83	Strongly support	0
84	Strongly support	0
85	Strongly support	0
89	Strongly support	Benefits for walkers and cyclists.
93	Strongly support	its the better route
94	Strongly support	This route takes a route away from the main routes and provides an alternative active travel route which whilst currently used to a degree requires significant upgrade in terms of the current path state. This would also encourage more active healthy transport through having a safe route choice to areas which are recreational and have good links to other core paths and road network.
96	Strongly support	good route walkway/cycle to appeal to visitors
97	Strongly support	0
98	Strongly support	This area is ideal for this purpose.
99	Strongly support	0
103	Strongly support	I think this is long overdue and is a much better suggestion for the area.
104	Strongly support	This would be a good addition to the area. The current path is not accessible for those with mobility issues and the path around the perimeter of the lagoons is only tarmaced part of the way.
105	Strongly support	0
107	Strongly support	0
109	Strongly support	.
110	Strongly support	this is an under used area, much more visually pleasing and safer for cyclists as it's completely removed from the existing traffic. It creates a new space for walkers. Cramond shore is a good example of how spaces like this can work. An additional route over the bridge for cyclists would also speed up their journey time to Edinburgh I would expect as they're not going to be impacted by traffic lights. However, some measures would need implemented to ensure cyclists pay due care to pedestrians on the same route. Walking the Edinburgh path (old railway path) many cyclists go too fast & see it as their path not a shared amenity.
113	Strongly support	Section has to have a segregated cycle lane due to number of children who would be likely to use it. I would however prefer a route that went round the lagoon hugging the coast.
114	Strongly support	This is the perfect area in which to upgrade cycle and walking paths. There is plenty of space, and it is away from main roads. It could be used for leisure and commuting - taking cyclists away from busy main roads.
115	Strongly support	YES!!!! This for me is the perfect solution. Musselburgh is so congested - and I honestly and wholeheartedly believe that creating this cycle path will only exaserbate this problem. I'm hoping to see further down this survey a question related to whether I will be more inclined to use a bike if there were safer routes. I think for most, the answer would be no. Bus and train links into Edinburgh are so good, but aren't always an option for people, like cycling. Fantastic if your lifestyle and circumstances allow for you to cycle from Tranent to Edinburgh but for most, that just isn't ever going to be the solution or feasible option!
116	Strongly support	looks like a good quiet route that would encourage cyclists who are not confident in traffic
120	Strongly support	This is a most definitely needed route as it is a safe route and provides access to leisure facilities and the coastal area. The current state of this area is very poor and requires significant upgrading to make it an attractive option. Access to this area for leisure cyclists, families and those who wish to use this area is extremely important and will encourage more cycling and walking and thus improved health and well being.
1	Support	0
3	Support	I support this as it clearly takes some users away from heavily polluted areas in the centre. I have one concern and that is the impact to the ecology of the area at the back of the racecourse. I would like to see minimal impact on wildlife and plants.
7	Support	No comment not made previously.
8	Support	0
16	Support	This seems pretty good, but the path seems most useful for people out for a leisure ride - this wouldn't help me get to and from the places I actually need to get to.
19	Support	These roads need improvement and it takes you away from the main roads
21	Support	I have to admit that I don't know this route, so please ignore me if this doesn't make sense. If there is not room for a separate shared use path at Section 2, then the carriageway width is incredibly important. If the road is too wide or too narrow then drivers think they can overtake a cyclist safely even when they can't. The road should be of such a width that unsafe overtakes are physically impossible.
26	Support	Shared space with pedestrians can work, but care must be taken to avoid the potential for user group conflict.
27	Support	again improved priority for active travel
29	Support	New bridge with segregated cycle / pedestrian markings please.
30	Support	i would like to see the waterfront option to the north of ash lagoon improved also this gives another alternative to prestonpans and beyond
31	Support	a new bridge is not required - see comment above on Electric bridge
35	Support	0
40	Support	Levenhall links needs upgraded to encourage more use. It could take cyclists away from busy roads, opportunity for cycling for families if quieter and safer
41	Support	So long as the carriageway resurfacing doesn't use the council's active travel budget
48	Support	Common sense.

50	Support	0
52	Support	It should be good for cyclists.
55	Support	That's fine
58	Support	Would prefer separate area for cyclists
66	Support	Current footbridge adjacent to the Electric Bridge is not sufficient for cyclists, dog walkers, pedestrians, etc. Strongly encourage new cycle bridge. Could be an opportunity for a flagship design...
67	Support	This proposal make more sense as it creating new and improved routes, that are more scenic and likely to attract more people to cycle, rather than over crowded roads conjested with traffic.
73	Support	Regular maintenance would be required and would support extra employment .
74	Support	Will the upgraded surface be tarmac or will it simply be levelled to remove potholes?
80	Support	Good direct route away from traffic linking Musselburgh with coastal road but I'm not so keen on making accessible to motor vehicles - can a different route be found for vehicles seeking access to the boating pond, perhaps using a permit system so we ensure minimal vehicle movement in the Levenhall lagoons area as it should rightly be a Local Nature Reserve and not easily accessed by vehicles.
82	Support	definitely agree with section 1. traffic is generally slow on section 2 and as long as there is space for cars to safely overtake then it will be ok. If possible this section should be widened to allow for safer overtaking
86	Support	While in support of improvement, I am unfamiliar with the area and cannot comment on the suitability of specific proposals
88	Support	yes, looks pretty good, but I do not strongly support it because shared paths with pedestrians and cyclists require a code of conduct. Commuter cyclists belt along, no bells, no warnings and come up behind walkers who are unaware of them.
92	Support	I'd rather be with pedestrians than cars but whole width shared use is often problematic. consider even a painted separation like the meadows?
95	Support	0
100	Support	0
102	Support	This makes much more sense. It takes bikes off road and is much safer for cyclists and other road users. It is also a more attractive route for cycling.
117	Support	Provides the desired cycle and walkway with minimum disruption to local residents and busy main routes
118	Support	(a) Will existing path near sea wall remain? (b) I welcome the proposed resurfacing but wonder if that means cars will driver faster and therefore present a risk to cyclists and pedestrians.
119	Support	So long as the cycleways are gritted during winter, this would be a very welcome way for people to stay off the roads.
2	Neither support or oppose	I am happy with the type of path being offered, but am a supporter of the existing route around the outside of the lagoons and along the foreshore. It doesn't appear to be marked in the plan , but if it continues to exist I don't see the need for another path, which will involve more construction work and tarmacing
4	Neither support or oppose	a bit of off road terrain is not a bad thing.
18	Neither support or oppose	0
23	Neither support or oppose	This seems fine though Ravensheugh Road seems like the more natural desire line eastwards. The road looks wide enough for segregation at least up to Ravensheugh Crescent (especially if parking is restricted to one side). If there isn't space through the next cluster of houses the cycle route could join Levenhall Links here.
45	Neither support or oppose	Cyclists should NOT share space with pedestrians! Danger to children!
51	Neither support or oppose	If you try to put up a pedestrian bridge, how can someone with limited mobility avail themselves safely of the amenities offered? Discrimination against any group is unlawful!
63	Neither support or oppose	0
64	Neither support or oppose	Doesnt affect me
87	Neither support or oppose	Doesn't really seem necessary compared to earlier options but may have some attraction as a recreational route
106	Neither support or oppose	I think this route is fine as it is.
111	Neither support or oppose	.
25	Oppose	the route is quite convoluted and the park area already has good walking routes. is one of the other two options is done, there is no need to upgrade the cycling routes
78	Oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
81	Oppose	Should be left as green space
90	Oppose	Don't like shared path with walkers and cyclists. Someone will be knocked over by careless cyclists.
112	Oppose	0
10	Strongly oppose	0
75	Strongly oppose	0
77	Strongly oppose	Waste of money. Fuck the cyclists!!
91	Strongly oppose	Shared space just results in cyclists abusing pedestrians.
108	Strongly oppose	Cyclists can't share current they never dismount where should and in winter come close to knocking me off my feet
69	0	0
101	0	0

8) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions between Wallyford Roundabout and Monktonhall?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
2	Strongly support	no further comment
6	Strongly support	A great way to get around the town in relatively rural surrounds!
9	Strongly support	0
11	Strongly support	I don't know this route so well but it looks good in principle
12	Strongly support	0
13	Strongly support	0
14	Strongly support	As before
17	Strongly support	0
19	Strongly support	More routes away from main routes is obviously a good thing
20	Strongly support	0
22	Strongly support	0
23	Strongly support	This looks really good. The section west of the Esk in particular is a significant upgrade to NCN1.
24	Strongly support	Looks amazing
26	Strongly support	The paths meet the minimum standard width requirements. Care should be taken in the design that pedestrian-cycle conflict is avoided
27	Strongly support	good access for alternative routes to south Edinburgh
28	Strongly support	0
30	Strongly support	0
31	Strongly support	0
32	Strongly support	I run along here and this would be good to have segregated cycle and walkway lanes
33	Strongly support	brilliant idea to continue that path along this route. please try to avoid removal of significant trees in the area though.
34	Strongly support	I like this because it is off road, on quiet roads and is attractive and quiet compared with a lane alongside a busy road.
36	Strongly support	0

37	Strongly support	Easy and inexpensive to incorporate with minimal impact on existing infrastructure	
38	Strongly support	same reasons, no impact on main roads and parking, so its fine	
39	Strongly support		0
40	Strongly support	Again quieter area to keep cyclists safer and good for encouraging families	
42	Strongly support	Provides an alternative, quieter route	
44	Strongly support	I don't know these areas at all, but am strongly supportive of cycling infrastructure and this looks pretty good.	
46	Strongly support	Good route away from traffic but something will need to be done about Inveresk Village Road where there is much speeding traffic and where traffic volumes will increase with new housing completions. A signal controlled crossing for cyclists like that on Whitehouse Road in Barnton will be needed.	
47	Strongly support	existing routes need to be used to their full potential and fully linked up	
49	Strongly support	It's not a route I'm familiar with but if it provides a good traffic free path with an improved surface, I'm all in favour of it!	
57	Strongly support	Great idea as this is a tough road for inexperienced cyclists.	
58	Strongly support		0
59	Strongly support	Shared use path, agree with approach	
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling	
62	Strongly support	I really support this because it is an off road cycle route as well as being pretty direct. Like the idea of it going into Inveresk so it can be joined there easily from Musselburgh. Perhaps a link needed from Edenhall which will also be developed for housing.	
65	Strongly support	Make cycling and walking safer and more accessible for all	
68	Strongly support	This is a route that I have walked several times and noticed issues in poor weather along the railway line and debris. Again it would be great link but signage would be important - lots of turns and wee paths?	
70	Strongly support	Another sensible idea. Unlike the ideas for the town centre.	
71	Strongly support		0
72	Strongly support	as before, safety of cyclists and walkers	
76	Strongly support	Could potentially link a circular route around Musselburgh and links to Lothians but these need to be explicit	
79	Strongly support	All are nice route which would get people away from the roads	
80	Strongly support		0
85	Strongly support		0
87	Strongly support	It would be a useful alternative to travelling through Musselburgh town centre to get to Edinburgh and beyond	
89	Strongly support	Benefits for walkers and cyclists.	
93	Strongly support	more sensible that some of the other suggestions	
94	Strongly support	Give. The scale of the new housing at Wallyford this route is an essential link if we want to encourage more sustainable modes of travel. There	
97	Strongly support	Links to the station is good	
99	Strongly support		0
101	Strongly support		0
104	Strongly support	Upgrading this route would add value to local residents	
105	Strongly support		0
106	Strongly support	I think this would good for providing dedicated cycle access to two stations.	
107	Strongly support		0
109	Strongly support		0
110	Strongly support	I don't know the route so I am less informed but it looks ok on the face of it if it is quieter for cyclists and provides an alternative route where everyone won't be going the same way i.e. different destinations.	
113	Strongly support	I use most of this route other than the new section proposed between Monktonhall and QMU. A good route for crossing the town avoiding the town centre.	
114	Strongly support	Again I would support cycle paths that are not carved into existing roadways - taking cyclists away from high traffic areas.	
115	Strongly support	Because this is a good idea and doesn't cause any disruption to people's lives!	
4	Support	very good idea to connect the east side of musselburgh to wallyford station.	
8	Support		0
15	Support	At 4 m wide there's space to segregate	
16	Support	It seems a good option well away from cars and may be helpful for people in Wallyford to get into Edinburgh more comfortably, but this is not a route I would personally use particularly	
21	Support	Very useful connections.	
29	Support	Please put a cyclists /pedestrians segregation marking line on the new surface. It makes life easier for us all.	
35	Support		0
41	Support		0
48	Support	This makes sense.	
50	Support		0
52	Support	This should be a valuable new route - I may use it for cycling.	
53	Support		0
56	Support	Not a route I'd use but could be handy for getting to/ from the train station	
61	Support	Not sure; I don't use routes in this area so cannot fairly comment.	
66	Support	Improves connectivity and increases options for pedestrians and cyclists to get around.	
67	Support	Improving the current infrastructure to make alternative routes available make more sense, as opposed to seeking to drive cyclist through congested main roads.	
69	Support		0
73	Support	As previously mentioned	
74	Support		0
81	Support		0
82	Support	looks good	
84	Support		0
86	Support	As previous answer	
88	Support	looks pretty good. how will you sensitively manage the tricky crossing in the middle of the conservation area in Inveresk, where traffic breaks the speed limit? Again, shared footpaths with pedestrians and cyclists are a problem due to speeding cyclists coming up behind walkers.	
92	Support	same comment as previous.	
96	Support		0
98	Support	Again area would be good for this proposal.	
100	Support	It is essential that the monktonhall routes are made safer and are linked with each other	
102	Support	Yes, this is a good idea and again gets cyclists away from conflict with other road users. As long as it is clear it is a shared route with walkers and walkers feel safe.	
116	Support	It would be nice to show the Drift Path link to Musselburgh	
117	Support	Pleasant and safe environment for walkers and cyclists	
118	Support	Not sure I can quite make this out - my main concern with current situation relates to the 'dog legs' in the route which makes cycling a bit tricky.	
119	Support	Would be an idyllic place to cycle.	
1	Neither support or oppose	Learning to spell pedestrian correctly would help !	
3	Neither support or oppose	It would be good to have alternative areas to walk, however this is too far away from the heavily travelled routes, and most people would stick to a direct route through more populated area.	
5	Neither support or oppose	The plans look good - but would this route be used?	

7	Neither support or oppose	Does the proposal improve the safety of using this route. If so then good	
18	Neither support or oppose		0
25	Neither support or oppose	good because it links the two railway stations, but not really sure there is much of a need for this one	
43	Neither support or oppose		0
45	Neither support or oppose	See previous objection on sharing space.	
54	Neither support or oppose	Dont use it	
55	Neither support or oppose	Don't give cycling too much room.	
63	Neither support or oppose		0
64	Neither support or oppose	If it removes cyclists off the road good	
83	Neither support or oppose	looks good but I don't use the roads to know for sure	
95	Neither support or oppose	I don't know the area to comment	
103	Neither support or oppose	This would be welcomed, however, this isn't an area i tend to spend much time in,	
111	Neither support or oppose	.	
120	Neither support or oppose	Not sure what they key benefits of this route are and whilst it may be beneficial I would rather see the main key strategic routes completed first.	
51	Oppose	Any shared cyclist/pedestrian route would not work - cyclists often cycle several bikes wide - there needs to be a proper barrier to ensure pedestrians can walk safely.	
78	Oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.	
112	Oppose	See previous comments	
10	Strongly oppose		0
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.	
77	Strongly oppose	Waste of money	
90	Strongly oppose	Don't like shared path with walkers and cyclists. Someone will be knocked over by careless cyclists.	
91	Strongly oppose	Shared space just results in Cyclists abusing pedestrians	
108	Strongly oppose		0

9) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions between Old Craighall and Musselburgh town centre?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
6	Strongly support	Future proof routes for all the new building proposed for this area will mean continued bike use. If we are serious about climate action, we need to enshrine bike use in new generations of children. Therefor it's vital that any kids being brought upon in these developments have access to safe segregated paths from day 1 so it becomes second nature
9	Strongly support	0
13	Strongly support	0
17	Strongly support	0
19	Strongly support	0
22	Strongly support	0
25	Strongly support	nice links to midlothian network
33	Strongly support	All looks really good especially including the traffic calming measures too
36	Strongly support	0
37	Strongly support	this all makes sense
39	Strongly support	0
42	Strongly support	The existing roads are narrow with parked cars. Heavy traffic use them. Segregating people and bikes will encourage less dependency on cars, important in view of the proposed new housing/business development in the area
44	Strongly support	I don't know these areas very well, but am strongly supportive of cycling infrastructure and this looks pretty good.
47	Strongly support	same as previous answers
53	Strongly support	0
57	Strongly support	0
59	Strongly support	Traffic calming, another good way to reduce car speed but not bicycle speed
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling whilst addressing traffic requirements
65	Strongly support	Make the route safer for cyclists and walkers and motorists
68	Strongly support	Keen to see this area opened up - QMU and train station linking with shawfair. It is difficult to see what the solution is over the A1? A bridge?
72	Strongly support	0
76	Strongly support	0
79	Strongly support	This is where I live - There a lot of older people who do not drive. Anything to make it safer for them would be great.
80	Strongly support	Will this eventually connect up with Dalkeith Country Park, following a route away from the very busy A720 bypass and A68?
85	Strongly support	very difficult to cycle up there at present
94	Strongly support	Any proposal to creat better links between QMU, and the railway station can only be a positive move but there must be significant improvement through the rail network to provide more cycle provision on trains if we want to encourage cycle as a mode of transport for commuters. There also need to be better secure cycle storage.
97	Strongly support	0
100	Strongly support	It makes so much sense to have a link between shawfair through monktonhall linking with the newly built path from roslin
101	Strongly support	0
104	Strongly support	agree this would add value to the local area
105	Strongly support	0
107	Strongly support	0
109	Strongly support	0
113	Strongly support	Whitehill Farm Road is plagued by speeding drivers and speed humps won't deter them.
119	Strongly support	Great to link QMU/Musselburgh station with the town center.
120	Strongly support	This is an important link between the town centre, the rail station and QMU which will be beneficial to both the town, rail commuters and students.
4	Support	0
7	Support	It will help link the future development in the area with Musselburgh without making the areas feel connected by development
11	Support	Less enthused about this plan. Shared use paths are an improvement over no cycling provision - but pedestrians tend not to enjoy sharing space with cyclists, and many cyclists tend to not want to be slowed down by pedestrians. Full segregation is always preferable.

16	Support	Improving cycling provision on Stoneyhill Terrace would be good as parked cars make it feel quite narrow. Again, it's not a route I would personally find particularly useful, except to say that improving the junctions for cycling to get onto the path leading to the Grove (which might include part of this) would be really beneficial
20	Support	0
23	Support	This looks like a better way of accessing the Esk Path. I don't know Eskview Terrace but it looks like a busy road for accessing a quiet off road route. On the other hand, Eskside West looks much better than Mall Ave/Tesco roundabout. It doesn't look like anything will be changed at the Eskview Terrace/Olive Bank Road junction so maybe the intention is to push over the crossing and along the pavement to the park entrance? Either way, minimizing the distance between the junction and the park entrance will be crucial.
24	Support	Section 2 shows huge space to separate cycles and motors, the proposals are insufficient here
26	Support	More consideration should be given to construction of a segregated cycle lane in section 2.
27	Support	as good as you are going to get on that route, how will you control the pavement parking that is already rife here?
29	Support	0
30	Support	0
31	Support	0
32	Support	0
34	Support	This looks good because it is straight - I like the idea of cycling to the station this way. Not sure what happens when you get to Old Craighall Road - it is busy and narrow and you have no section to show what it would be like. It needs to be off road here as the road is quite narrow.
35	Support	0
40	Support	Concerned about more traffic calming measures
48	Support	Sensible approach.
49	Support	It's a shame there is no segregation in Section 2 but if traffic calming measures are sufficient (not just gentle pillows that drivers tend to straddle and drive over without slowing) then I appreciate that it might provide a slightly safer route for cyclists.
52	Support	It's not a route I would often use, but I might do sometimes. It will certainly be better for cycling than the current route from Musselburgh through Old Craighall to Newton village.
55	Support	Ok
56	Support	Not a route I'd use but looks good
58	Support	Good but prefer to separate cars and cyclists
61	Support	Upgrade of existing route, should be straightforward and useful to some, notably QMU students
62	Support	I support this because people living in the new housing area at Craighall and from Musselburgh need to get to Midlothian preferably on easy direct off road routes or using quiet roads. But a better link to Shawfair might be needed and I do not think Oldcraighall Road is wide enough for a cycleway - off road here would be best.
66	Support	Improvements welcomed, but is there no scope for a segregated cycle lane in Section 2?
67	Support	I support alternative routes being improved, this helps create more options and not push more through already congested main roads.
69	Support	0
71	Support	On your drawing there's an unsafe overtake going on to the bicycle. There looks to be ample space for segregated cycle paths
74	Support	could the existing verge be modified to allow for segregated cyclist lanes?
81	Support	0
83	Support	0
84	Support	0
86	Support	As previous answers
92	Support	0
93	Support	0
95	Support	You at least seem to have given parking a thought here
98	Support	0
99	Support	0
110	Support	0
115	Support	As long as there is still adequate parking for anyone living on this street then ok
118	Support	Again not quite sure how this works out. My current concern is that Whitehill Farm Road and continuation north can be tricky with motorists who are instructed not to pass cyclists at traffic islands doing so by driving on the wrong side of the islands. With so many cars being built with a chassis that is quite high off the ground, they don't risk damage if they drive at normal speed over 'sleeping policemen' and similar traffic-calming devices.
1	Neither support or oppose	getting a bit bored now...
2	Neither support or oppose	Unimpressed by section 2 plan - far too vague, particularly on a major bus route towards a train station and busy college. I also feel that drop kerbs should be available to access the bridge over the Esk on both banks, and separate lanes should be offered to walkers and cyclists. No issues with section 3, but there is vagueness about the path via proposed developments, surely planning regulations could establish the route first and then licence the developments around it.
3	Neither support or oppose	Given the ease to use this route already I am unsure of why improvements are required.
5	Neither support or oppose	0
8	Neither support or oppose	0
12	Neither support or oppose	0
14	Neither support or oppose	Shared space with traffic is not a good solution but space may prevent any other option.
15	Neither support or oppose	Not much improvement to be honest
18	Neither support or oppose	0
21	Neither support or oppose	Given the strength of the other proposals, the lack of segregation for cyclists in Section 2 is relatively disappointing. If segregation isn't possible, then serious consideration should be given to reducing traffic levels on this road by closing off access to Stoneybank Crescent and Clayknowes Crescent for motorised vehicles. Please continue ELC's excellent practice of making cycle lanes *wider* at pinch points, unlike your neighbouring councils who make them disappear altogether.
28	Neither support or oppose	Better to have cycling segregated from cars
38	Neither support or oppose	These are OK. It's just the expense now that's causing issue. Quieter roads should be fine without a major investment.
43	Neither support or oppose	0
45	Neither support or oppose	See previous objection.
46	Neither support or oppose	Monktonhall road will be a problem. Best to keep cyclists away from it in my view. It will become completely clogged up when all the development around QMU is complete.
50	Neither support or oppose	0
51	Neither support or oppose	Unless properly constructed for pedestrian safety, this could be dangerous.
54	Neither support or oppose	Don't use it
63	Neither support or oppose	0

64	Neither support or oppose	Doesnt affect me
73	Neither support or oppose	Haven't had time to study this
82	Neither support or oppose	sections 1 and 3 are grand but section 2 along whitehill farm road has space for a segregated cycle way. Reducing the road slightly and using some of the verge would create enough space. There are also places where there are two pedestrian paths running parallel with eachother and could be utilised as a cycleway
87	Neither support or oppose	Useful to connect the town centre to the train station
88	Neither support or oppose	I don't know enough about this route
89	Neither support or oppose	I don't know this area at all.
96	Neither support or oppose	where does the go to outside of Musselburgh? good to link to university but where does it go past Old Craighall
102	Neither support or oppose	I don't know this route well enough to comment properly. In all cases however, while the emphasis on sustainable travel is welcome I would highlight the need to take into account the existing situation where many people do drive and need to use roads. While cycling should be encouraged this should not be by taking space out of already congested roads
103	Neither support or oppose	Again this would, however, this is not an area i tend to spend much time in.
106	Neither support or oppose	I am less keen on any plans that put cyclists on roads with cars.
111	Neither support or oppose	.
114	Neither support or oppose	I don't know that area and what existing conditions are like. However, it appears sensible to have a safe corridor from QMU and the station down to the town centre.
116	Neither support or oppose	Stoneybank Terrace narrow and busy with traffic
117	Neither support or oppose	Not familiar with the route
41	Oppose	Introduce segregated facilities in section two - it looks like there is enough room
70	Oppose	Again this involves cyclists and motorists on the same roads. If you have all this money then spend it upgrading what we already have and spent the rest of the money fixing potholes properly.
78	Oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
112	Oppose	0
10	Strongly oppose	0
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.
77	Strongly oppose	Waste of money
90	Strongly oppose	Don't like shared path with walkers and cyclists. Someone will be knocked over by careless cyclists.
91	Strongly oppose	Shared space just results in Cyclists abusing pedestrians.
108	Strongly oppose	0

10) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions between Fort Kinnaird and Musselburgh town centre?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
6	Strongly support	I would seldom consider cycling this way at the moment - the road is too narrow for some drivers and the number of close passes here has made me seek alternate routes whenever I can. These changes would mean you could use your bike here without thinking twice.
9	Strongly support	0
14	Strongly support	Please minimise areas of cyclist and traffic sharing.
16	Strongly support	This is horrendous to cycle right now. Any improvement would be welcomed, although a segregated cycleway would be the best option. On my experience of shared paths for cyclists and pedestrians, the pedestrians tend to walk on the cycle section and it can end up being like dodgems - with all users getting irritated with eachother.
17	Strongly support	Brilliant - you've made our day - we live on this stretch of road!
27	Strongly support	again, improved bike and pedestrian priority is good.
31	Strongly support	0
33	Strongly support	all looks like good suggestions to me.
36	Strongly support	0
42	Strongly support	0
43	Strongly support	0
47	Strongly support	answer as before
52	Strongly support	This will be good for cycling to Fort Kinnaird and for getting from Musselburgh train station to connect to the cycle path from Newcraighall to Brunstane.
53	Strongly support	0
55	Strongly support	Go for it not before time.
56	Strongly support	I think this would be well used by both cyclists and pedestrians
57	Strongly support	Great idea as this is a tough stretch for cyclists.
58	Strongly support	0
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling whilst addressing traffic requirements
61	Strongly support	Essential- an incredibly useful route which is not at all cycle friendly as it stands.
65	Strongly support	I always drive to Newcraighall, but a safer route would convince me to cycle and take the kids cycling there.
68	Strongly support	this is not a nice or pleasant route to walk or cycle along. Anything to improve will be great. The new developments at Newhailles might encourage families out - perhaps walking or cycling from the train station rather than taking a car? Fort Kinnaird and the area around are like a shrine to the car. I have seen people drive from one area to another despite it being a short distance.
72	Strongly support	0
76	Strongly support	Particularly interested in footpath between two stations
79	Strongly support	Something to improve the safety of pedestrians trying to cross the roads near the Fort shopping centre needs to be done.
80	Strongly support	0
83	Strongly support	0
85	Strongly support	0
89	Strongly support	Benefits for walkers and cyclists.
94	Strongly support	Whilst this is supported it is assumed that much of this route will be undertaken through a collaboration with the City of Edinburgh Council given much of the proposal is situated in that council area of responsibility. How will this be progressed?
97	Strongly support	Great for linking with shops and trains
101	Strongly support	0
105	Strongly support	0
107	Strongly support	0
109	Strongly support	0
113	Strongly support	This is the commuting route I used most often as it was the most direct. The cycle lane outside the fire station and the series of roundabouts were always and will continue to be hair-raising.

119	Strongly support	Must be one of the most-traveled routes and the least cycle-friendly. I've cycled it a few times and enjoyed it never.
1	Support	0
2	Support	Pleased to see the suggestion for underpass. 'scope for intervention' is not clear language which allows the general public to comment
4	Support	connecting fort kinnaird to musselburgh is good.
5	Support	More options for people.
7	Support	Improvement of safety along a busy route that will encourage users of the route to walk/cycle rather than take the trip in the car
11	Support	I would support but not strongly due to over reliance on shared use footpaths. You will find neither pedestrians nor cyclist would be happy with the arrangement.
13	Support	0
20	Support	0
23	Support	The section from Musselburgh Train Station to Newcraighall Road looks great. It would be even better if the bridge could be reinstated (I believe the supports are still there) to extend it to Brunstane Train Station. The rest looks somewhat lackluster. Isolated bits of shared use aren't all that useful. Section 3 being on carriageway is particularly disappointing. Given how wide the path is there it should be shared use and made continuous across the 2 ends of Bauld Drive.
26	Support	Shared space or a segregated cycle lane should be considered for section 3.
28	Support	0
30	Support	0
32	Support	I support this should traffic calming and the width of the carriageways not affect public transport
34	Support	This is where we need to be able to cycle and walk. But it is a very busy road and there are very few bikes at The Fort (are they even welcome?) Would be great to have an access under the track to Newcraighall station.
35	Support	0
37	Support	This bit of road can get sketchy with the speeds that cars drive. It'd be better if cyclists didn't have to share the road, but it's all better than what exists
39	Support	0
40	Support	Good to see parking bays included, to have specified areas for parking as cars are here with us
44	Support	This is a key route right across the area. We almost never go along here because of the dangerous nature of the road, but I can see how this will things right up from the coast to Fort Kinnaird. I think there may be issues still with the part of Newcraighall Road that is not segregated, and wonder if that could be revisited? Access to the station is important, has any consideration been given to increased cycle parking there?
48	Support	Sensible approach.
54	Support	Could make it safer
59	Support	No designated cycle path as suggested in other areas so can only be a good alternative
62	Support	i support the route but I think Newcraighall road is too narrow for a cycle land and will not be pleasant to use unless positioned off road. Essential to link with rail stations.including Newcraighall which is difficult to access from the Queen Margaret path and needs a bridge or tunnel.
66	Support	Underpass to Newcraighall platform would be hugely helpful.Traffic to Ft Kinnaird is heavy - any improvements for pedestrians and cyclists welcomed. Footpath passing the Bowling Clun at Newcraighall is very narrow and often has parked cars blocking it - any improvements welcomed!
67	Support	This would make cycling to the Fort a safer option, bus routes are not frequent or direct bus routes so many choose to take the car.
69	Support	0
70	Support	Using existing cycle lanes. Do worry about cyclists on the roads at The Fort. They are far to busy and would not be surprised if someone was seriously hurt or worse.
71	Support	The route would be of humongous benefit. But the designs lack ambition and are unlikely to have any effect. This route must have segregated cycle lanes. When we drive this route (too afraid to cycle it). It's always so congested particularly at weekends. People drive because they don't feel they have a choice. Give them that choice with fully segregated cycle lanes. If the cycle network is good enough people will leave their cars at home so you don't need all those parking spaces. Be more ambitious.
74	Support	0
81	Support	0
84	Support	0
86	Support	As previous answer
87	Support	Could be a useful connection between stations and key destinations
92	Support	again separating pedestrians and cyclists (even with paint) makes cycling a lot less stressful especially in busy areas.
95	Support	Again, you've thought about parking
96	Support	0
99	Support	0
102	Support	This seems sensible as long as it doesn't narrow the existing roads which are increasingly busy.
104	Support	agree this would add value
110	Support	0
114	Support	It is very unlikely that those who do not cycle regularly will choose to cycle between Musselburgh Town Centre and Fort Kinnaird - especially considering the gradient of the road between the two. The road through Newcraighall is already very narrow with traffic calming measures. It is developed on both sides of the road. Perhaps a cycle or walking route should be created away from the main road.
115	Support	As long as this didn't cause further conjection - it can take anywhere from 15-30 minutes for me to get to Fort Kinnaird depending on the time of day as I can be sitting in traffic and tailbacks for a very long time for such a short distance. And the road from Tesco roundabout into Musselburgh town centre is horrific at any time of the day! This should not be made worse.
118	Support	Need more information here, I think. Newcraighall a complete nightmare at the moment with narrow road, a lot of traffic (and doubtless more in the future because of all the development), pollution from A1, vast amounts of litter and lots of traffic lights if you're trying to get to Fort Kinnaird, and the Fort itself is not pedestrian-friendly (particularly if you're trying to get from B&Q area to main part of the Fort). I welcome any improvements but can't quite see from the picture how these will work, and of course it will require co-operation between East Lothian and Edinburgh.
120	Support	The route between persimmon house and Newhailes Road is long over due and whilst supported, again there ae parts of this route in another local authority area. Is there buy in to achieve this.
3	Neither support or oppose	Again, this route is easily accessed by most. New Craig hall does not have a wide enough road to sustain a dedicated cycle route.
8	Neither support or oppose	0
12	Neither support or oppose	0
15	Neither support or oppose	No segregation and looks like a lot of wasted soace
18	Neither support or oppose	0
19	Neither support or oppose	0
21	Neither support or oppose	Some form of segregation should be provided at Section 3 as well, so that there are no missing links. The A1 junction needs some very careful thought. It is horrendously unpleasant to cycle here at present.
24	Neither support or oppose	The proposals show more than sufficient space to seggregate pedestrians, motors and cycles at all sections, but at no point is proper cycle segregation shown. This part of the plan is deficient as the facilities will not enable a family to ride together to the fort.
29	Neither support or oppose	This route is currently terrible and needs more done than this. 20mph the whole length not the current 40! No non-residential parking.
41	Neither support or oppose	Section 1 and 4 - reduce carriageway width and introduce segregated cycling facility

45	Neither support or oppose	See previous objection
46	Neither support or oppose	There is too much dependence on existing roads which will become very busy with all the new development not just in Musselburgh but in Midlothian and the Edinburgh fringes. We need to get cyclists off the roads not simply try to accommodate them better on the roads.
50	Neither support or oppose	0
51	Neither support or oppose	Unless there is proper traffic control, it would be almost impossible for pedestrians to access Fort Kinnaird. A cyclist would simply join the main road.
63	Neither support or oppose	0
73	Neither support or oppose	As previously mentioned
82	Neither support or oppose	some decent ideas but section 3 goes past Newcraighall primary school and should definitely utilise safe cycle routes and not be on the road. the pavements are wide here and could easily be made shared use with on-path line marking delineation for clarity and safety. there should be a restriction for parking on the pavement here which is a problem
88	Neither support or oppose	don't know enough about this route, but if you are trying to encourage cyclists to use the trains, you need to get the rail providers to stop skipping stations when they run behind schedule
98	Neither support or oppose	0
100	Neither support or oppose	Existing provision is ok. Least necessary of any plan to be implemented
106	Neither support or oppose	Again, I am not keen on cyclists using roads, but linking up with Fort Kinnaird is very important.
111	Neither support or oppose	.
116	Neither support or oppose	Some merits but Newhailes Road very busy with traffic
49	Oppose	Shared use pathways on roadsides are a cop out. They put pedestrians and cyclists in conflict. The speed of traffic going up Newcraighall Road is atrocious. I avoid that road if I can because cars pass too close and too fast. Will cyclists be expected to give way when a shared use path crosses a side road? If so, cyclists won't use them because like most road users we want to get to our destination quickly and efficiently without having to stop at every side street.
78	Oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
93	Oppose	6.5m is not wide enough for 2 way opposing traffic in a bus route. not a great fan of shared use footways. newhailes road is in part 40mph - is anything proposed to reduce this speed limit.
103	Oppose	These streets are busy with cars, residents and parked cars. This is already a narrow section and is one of the main roads in to Musselburgh for cars. I would oppose any consideration for this.
112	Oppose	See earlier comments
117	Oppose	This route is already very busy and rather narrow.
25	Strongly oppose	the road in section 1 is wide enough to have a segregated cycle path on the road, avoid the need for a shared use footpath. section 4 similarly, and there is surely no need for parking along the road given the massive amount of parking at Fort Kinnaird. There could be a segregated cycle path down each side which would greatly ease the cycling route into the city
38	Strongly oppose	This is too busy a road. You cannot remove parking. Walking and cycling on the same path do not mix in my opinion. I can't believe you think that it isn't dangerous??
64	Strongly oppose	Who is paying
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.
77	Strongly oppose	Waste of money.
90	Strongly oppose	Don't like shared path with walkers and cyclists. Someone will be knocked over by careless cyclists.
91	Strongly oppose	Shared space just results in Cyclists abusing pedestrians
108	Strongly oppose	0
10	0	0
22	0	0

11) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions along Niddrie Mains Road, between Fort Kinnaird and Cameron Toll Roundabout?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
2	Strongly support	Would be delighted to see this. This is for me the most difficult area to cycle in the area covered by the plan and a main route to work in Edinburgh
6	Strongly support	currently This is another no go route for me, these changes would encourage me and others like me to rethink this.
9	Strongly support	Great idea as Niddrie mains road is a nightmare. However NMR road surface is currently shocking - is the new cycleway going to have a decent road surface and will it be swept regularly otherwise it will end up covered in glass?
11	Strongly support	This looks like a solid plan.
13	Strongly support	0
14	Strongly support	Busy commuter route so improvements will hopefully increase commuter cycling.
15	Strongly support	Excellent- looks like good use of existing space with proper segregation
16	Strongly support	This is a heavily populated area which is difficult to cycle due to parked cars and massive congestion at rush hour
17	Strongly support	0
21	Strongly support	Amazing stuff, please continue! If possible, the third carriageway lane at Section 6 (or two, I can't remember) should be removed as well, in order to reduce levels of motorised traffic.
22	Strongly support	0
23	Strongly support	Looks good. Much better use of the space than all that hatching.
24	Strongly support	Looks fantastic - continue these plans all the way to Musselburgh
25	Strongly support	great the have a segregated cycle path all the way into Cameron Toll
26	Strongly support	The minimum standard width requirements for the segregated cycle route are met.
27	Strongly support	really pleased with this. Road may be 20mph but always being overtaken when pushing on at the limit already.
28	Strongly support	0
36	Strongly support	0
37	Strongly support	Sure. Craigmillar... that was an area I preferred to drive through.
41	Strongly support	0
42	Strongly support	0
44	Strongly support	Am strongly supportive of cycling infrastructure and this looks pretty good.
47	Strongly support	benefits as mentioned before
49	Strongly support	I rarely cycle along Niddrie Mains Road anymore because it is so congested. Cameron Toll is awful too - one of the worst places on my commute for close passes and yet it remains to be a 30mph limit (should be 20mph in my opinion). Anything on that stretch that improves safety on that route would be supported by me as long as it doesn't create conflict with pedestrians.
53	Strongly support	0
56	Strongly support	I think this would be well used by both cyclists and pedestrians
57	Strongly support	Would make commuting much easier.
58	Strongly support	0
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling whilst addressing traffic requirements

65	Strongly support	Another cycling route into town from Musselburgh, Excellent!
66	Strongly support	This should feature the segregated cycle lanes used elsewhere in this plan. This could be an attractive route, useful for commuters and leisure cyclists.
68	Strongly support	I don't use this route but can see how it could be a great commuting link.
71	Strongly support	This was my commuting route, but I have stopped using it after too many awful experiences with speeding close passing cars. This has ample space for quality segregated cycle infrastructure on both sides of the road. Getting it built would be fantastic for the area. Improvements for cycling around Cameron Toll would be needed for cyclists too though. Its very confusing for cars at the moment and they're often in the wrong lane and pull in on to you as a bicycle.
72	Strongly support	0
76	Strongly support	Useful linkage
79	Strongly support	This would be good -
80	Strongly support	A safe route to get to Ft Kinnaird without mixing with traffic or using roundabouts would be welcome as at the moment it is a hairy ride!
82	Strongly support	it is an important route and definitely needs safe cycle route
83	Strongly support	at present a bad road to drive cycle and walk
85	Strongly support	0
89	Strongly support	Benefits walkers and cyclists.
92	Strongly support	THIS ROAD IS SO IMPORTANT!!!!
97	Strongly support	Great to travel between shopping centres safely and easily
99	Strongly support	Needs to be fully segregated and have no issues with cars parking on the route and not mixed with pedestrian walkway or snake behind bus stops. Really wide road so devote some space to users apart from cars please!
101	Strongly support	Anywhere where there is a dedicated cycle lane is an improvement
104	Strongly support	this would add value
105	Strongly support	0
106	Strongly support	Safe routes into Edinburgh are goig to be vital.
113	Strongly support	This is the most congested this route into Edinburgh in my experience. I use this route to connect with the Infirmary about once a month.
4	Support	my wife would cycle this way to work.
5	Support	Again, it would provide more transport options.
12	Support	0
20	Support	0
29	Support	Why the on street parking. It's a menace to us all.
30	Support	0
32	Support	I support the need for change on this road however congestion is terrible here and it looks like the width carriageway is being reduced, how will this help congestion? Also the biggest cause of congestion on this road is vehicles turning right on to Duddingston Road West, what plans are their to alleviate this?
34	Support	This fine if no off road route available.
35	Support	0
40	Support	This is a busy area to take cycling away from busy areas helpful. Busy at certain times with traffic would not need to slow down, needs to keeps the traffic flow through the busy times
45	Support	This is a narrow road in parts with some parking ... there is space to have a cycle lane.
51	Support	As long as this is done with various stopping points/seats for those not very fit it could work, but regular maintenance would be vital.
52	Support	This is not a route I would normally use, but it should be a useful alternative cycle route to the Innocent railway path.
61	Support	0
63	Support	0
69	Support	0
74	Support	0
81	Support	0
86	Support	As previous answer
87	Support	could be a useful direct link into Edinburgh
88	Support	I think there is sufficient space along much of this route to do something, and it would connect close to Edin Uni.
116	Support	Again busy route would need to see more detail
118	Support	Looks an interesting possibility if Fort Kinnaird traffic can be kept down.
3	Neither support or oppose	This route is easily accessible already
7	Neither support or oppose	What volume of use would this actually get?
18	Neither support or oppose	0
19	Neither support or oppose	0
31	Neither support or oppose	Brunstane Burn Path and Innocent Path are available
33	Neither support or oppose	there is a cycle route around this area from Asda to the innocent railway which surely would be preferable that having the bikes in traffic?
43	Neither support or oppose	The Innocent Railway already provides much of this route so better signage of that and some links to and from it would be a better use of funds.
46	Neither support or oppose	If it is along main roads same comment as before unless there is sufficient width for a good cycle way and little restriction on the flow of traffic. Buses have to move along these roads and they too deserve priority.
48	Neither support or oppose	This is not in Musselburgh.
50	Neither support or oppose	0
55	Neither support or oppose	N/A
59	Neither support or oppose	Would never use it
62	Neither support or oppose	The route is fine but it seems to be all on road rather than off road which I would support.
67	Neither support or oppose	It's not a route I use or know enough about to comment.
70	Neither support or oppose	0
73	Neither support or oppose	As previously mentioned
84	Neither support or oppose	0
91	Neither support or oppose	Hope this won't be shared space which is bad for pedestrians.
93	Neither support or oppose	0
94	Neither support or oppose	Given the location is out with East Lothian there is no information provided to state that the City of Edinburgh Council are providing this. Is this happening? Is it in their plan? Is it a vision for them?

95	Neither support or oppose	0
96	Neither support or oppose	0
100	Neither support or oppose	0
102	Neither support or oppose	hard to say without seeing how they propose to improve it.
109	Neither support or oppose	0
110	Neither support or oppose	don't know it well enough
111	Neither support or oppose	.
114	Neither support or oppose	0
115	Neither support or oppose	I can't comment because this does not effect me
119	Neither support or oppose	Isn't there already a route through Duddingston which covers most of this?
120	Neither support or oppose	I am not sure where this fits in with East Lothian Council in terms of responsibility as it all appears to be in other local authority areas. Whilst this is desirable, is it achievable through partnership working.
8	Oppose	0
39	Oppose	0
54	Oppose	Too much traffix
78	Oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
90	Oppose	Don't like shared path with walkers and cyclists. Someone will be knocked over by careless cyclists.
98	Oppose	Too much traffic
112	Oppose	See earlier comments
117	Oppose	This route is already heavily congested.
10	Strongly oppose	0
38	Strongly oppose	Too busy a road. Parking losses. Expense on public funds not viable.
64	Strongly oppose	Pavements already
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.
77	Strongly oppose	Waste of money.
103	Strongly oppose	These pavements are already very wide and the roads narrow with it difficult to pass buses. I would question why this would need to be considered.
108	Strongly oppose	0
1	0	0
107	0	0

12) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions between Musselburgh and Edinburgh Royal Infirmary?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
6	Strongly support	I was attending ERI last autumn as an outpatient. I declined to take the bike because the choice of routes were dangerous and there was no direct bus. I was left with no choice but to drive. Anything that opens up peoples options to use their bikes is a no-brainer for me.
9	Strongly support	0
13	Strongly support	0
14	Strongly support	As before.
16	Strongly support	Cycling to the Royal is far preferable to driving, especially at rush hours and currently the best option for me is via Craigmillar and a massive hill, this could be a huge improvement!
17	Strongly support	0
20	Strongly support	0
21	Strongly support	0
22	Strongly support	0
25	Strongly support	good proposal, nice off road link for walking and cycling
26	Strongly support	0
27	Strongly support	I hadn't thought of this route but it would be useful.
29	Strongly support	Looks great. Cyclist/pedestrian segregation markings (as on the Meadows) too please.
32	Strongly support	0
33	Strongly support	excellent route for staff working at the ERI especially!
34	Strongly support	This route is much needed but it is unclear how you get on to it from Musselburgh.
36	Strongly support	0
37	Strongly support	This is a no-brainer! Again, easy to install with minimal conflict and to great effect
41	Strongly support	0
42	Strongly support	0
43	Strongly support	0
44	Strongly support	Am strongly supportive of cycling infrastructure and this looks pretty good.
47	Strongly support	benefits as before
48	Strongly support	Cycle paths are an excellent option.
52	Strongly support	This will be a useful connecting route for cyclists.
55	Strongly support	Not before time.
56	Strongly support	I think this would be well used by both cyclists and pedestrians
58	Strongly support	0
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling
61	Strongly support	More routes to and from the hospital are essential, given the importance and scale of the RIE and the many staff and patients in Musselburgh.
62	Strongly support	I really support the use of off road or quiet roads so this looks very good and could allow an easy cycle to the hospital area. Seems a bit of a long way to Shawfair station though - could a more direct route not be able to be created using a bridge or level crossing for bikes and walkers over the freight railway instead?
63	Strongly support	0
65	Strongly support	Another cycling route in to Edinburgh is most welcome
66	Strongly support	Again, improvements open up commuting and leisure cycling routes.
68	Strongly support	this looks fabulous - dedicated walking and cycling. Great for commuters but might encourage others out for a stroll or children on their bikes. Please consider safety with lighting etc and provide bins.
71	Strongly support	0
72	Strongly support	0
76	Strongly support	0
79	Strongly support	Improving the route under the A1 from QM university would greatly enhance the use of that safe route.

80	Strongly support	0
82	Strongly support	all good, important link and not narrower than 4m
83	Strongly support	excellent
85	Strongly support	important for travel to rie
86	Strongly support	as previous answer
89	Strongly support	Benefits walkers and cyclists.
99	Strongly support	0
101	Strongly support	0
104	Strongly support	agree this would add value
105	Strongly support	0
106	Strongly support	Access to RIE would be excellent.
107	Strongly support	0
113	Strongly support	I have to attend various appointments in the Infirmary and always cycle. My usual route is through Fort Kinnaird and then cut through the Jack Kane Centre and use the new route through Pringle Drive. This route would be a big improvement.
119	Strongly support	I know plenty of people who work at the Infirmary and dislike cycling there.
2	Support	A little hard to envisage this route- it looks like it goes on or close to existing roads which are often congested. If segregation can be provided as per plan , great
3	Support	This would be beneficial to people working at the ERI.
7	Support	Good commuter links to the bio-quarter and RIE
8	Support	0
11	Support	Shared use unfortunately.
12	Support	0
15	Support	Less vegetation more segregation
19	Support	0
23	Support	Looks useful, though I'm not sure how you're going to fit 4m shared use along the narrower bits of Whitehill Road or The Wisp. They're certainly not roads I'd want to be cycling on (maybe Whitehill Road if it was closed off as a back route into Fort Kinnaird).
24	Support	The plans are great but suggest there is sufficient room to design a Dutch style 2m footpath and 3m cycleway that are kerb separated from each other at little additional cost.
28	Support	Prefer segregated cycling to shared space with pedestrian s
30	Support	0
31	Support	0
35	Support	0
38	Support	This one seems ok, apart from the cost. Its away from busy traffic and no loss of parking
40	Support	Good to have more areas around Musselburgh to walk and cycle
49	Support	Seems okay but will shared use paths be divided even by a line of paint? Much of my existing commuting route is on shared use paths and although I am a considerate path user, sometimes pedestrians block the path or even suggest I shouldn't be there. Clear signage or lanes on the path might help make it clear to all users that the space has to be shared.
53	Support	0
59	Support	Shared use path, the way forward everywhere ?
70	Support	0
74	Support	0
81	Support	0
84	Support	0
87	Support	could be a useful connection to the Royal Infirmary and beyond
88	Support	Iloks a good idea, don't know enough to comment further
92	Support	separate with paint please...
102	Support	Yes if it is off existing roads.
109	Support	0
115	Support	0
116	Support	It is difficult not to support these improvements but it is also difficult to determine if all of the route is segregated as per sketch or whether some remains on road and this is not highlighted well, need to see more detail
117	Support	pleasant environment for walkers and cyclists
118	Support	It might get me trying out routes in that direction.
4	Neither support or oppose	0
5	Neither support or oppose	0
18	Neither support or oppose	0
45	Neither support or oppose	Against shared cycle/pedestrian
46	Neither support or oppose	Not enough information about the route. I support tram line 3 between the NRI and Musselburgh station. A cycle route should be provided along this alignment.
50	Neither support or oppose	0
51	Neither support or oppose	Shared paths for pedestrians and cyclists could result in A&E being busier I suppose! Cyclists are not the most courteous road users in my e perience.
54	Neither support or oppose	Dont use the route
57	Neither support or oppose	Would not really use this one much.
64	Neither support or oppose	.
67	Neither support or oppose	It too long a route between destination to support walking travel, and unsure of target audience who would use it to cycle.
93	Neither support or oppose	0
94	Neither support or oppose	Again this route is not within the jurisdiction of East Lothian Council so the question is the same as the previous route in relation ownership, responsibility and desire by the City of Edinburgh Council.
95	Neither support or oppose	0
96	Neither support or oppose	0
97	Neither support or oppose	0
98	Neither support or oppose	0
100	Neither support or oppose	0
103	Neither support or oppose	I would tend to drive rather than walk/cycle due to the distance.
110	Neither support or oppose	don't know it well enough I'd question however given shift work at the ERI how many more would cycle if the route was opened to them.

111	Neither support or oppose	.
114	Neither support or oppose	0
120	Neither support or oppose	Again, same circumstances as previous route. Can East Lothian Council influence this???
73	Oppose	As previously mentioned
78	Oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
112	Oppose	See earlier foments
10	Strongly oppose	0
75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.
77	Strongly oppose	waste of money.
90	Strongly oppose	Don't like shared path with walkers and cyclists. Someone will be knocked over by careless cyclists.
91	Strongly oppose	Shared space just results in Cyclists abusing pedestrians
108	Strongly oppose	It's a better bus service we need here
1	0	0
39	0	0
69	0	0

13) To what extent do you support the proposals for improving walking and cycling conditions between Shawfair and Sheriffhall?

No.	Level of Support	Could you briefly explain your view?
6	Strongly support	Getting out to Midlothian has always been a bit of a risk or a long detour via Whitecraig/Dalkeith path. This would offer a safe direct route.
9	Strongly support	0
13	Strongly support	0
14	Strongly support	As before.
17	Strongly support	0
26	Strongly support	0
27	Strongly support	looks good but need to understand what the plan for Shawfair is now.
32	Strongly support	0
33	Strongly support	that would be a really good route for commuters to use especially
36	Strongly support	0
37	Strongly support	ditto previous comment
42	Strongly support	0
43	Strongly support	Shawfair Railway station is currently very isolated, so linking it to other places would be very beneficial
44	Strongly support	Am strongly supportive of cycling infrastructure and this looks pretty good.
47	Strongly support	as before
58	Strongly support	0
60	Strongly support	It makes best use of space to encourage walking and cycling whilst addressing traffic requirements
65	Strongly support	I support any improvements for cyclists as it makes commuting safer and more enjoyable for everyone
68	Strongly support	This looks great but what happens at Sherrifhall? I used to just get off and push the bike - will there be a new underpass or bridge?
72	Strongly support	0
76	Strongly support	0
79	Strongly support	In general improving all the cycle and walking route so that there are no sudden gaps - especially for pedestrians would be excellent.
80	Strongly support	0
83	Strongly support	0
85	Strongly support	0
89	Strongly support	Good for walkers and cyclists.
99	Strongly support	0
104	Strongly support	agree this would add vlaue
105	Strongly support	0
106	Strongly support	It would be great to be able to commute from Musselburgh to Dalkeith by bike.
107	Strongly support	0
113	Strongly support	Connects well with the new station at Shawfairs.
2	Support	Shawfair , and the traffic to the station will expand greatly in the next decade. I think efforts should be made to offer a pass which differentiates lanes for cycles and pedestrians in this area
7	Support	It links the area into the existing cycle network to the south into Midlothian
8	Support	0
15	Support	Verge looks potentially dangerous
16	Support	0
20	Support	0
21	Support	The carriageways at sections 2 and 3 are very wide, and could be narrowed to increase the width of the shared use path.
22	Support	0
23	Support	Again, looks good though not sure how some of it will fit.
25	Support	good
28	Support	0
30	Support	0
31	Support	0
34	Support	Are these routes linked to the previous route in Musselburgh - its not clear but they should be and that would make sense.
35	Support	0
39	Support	0
40	Support	0
41	Support	In general, I'm fully supportive of improving conditions for walking and cycling. However, introducing a 3m shared use path alongside a road is not good enough. In urban environments, segregated infrastructure for cyclists is required.
49	Support	Again, more shared paths! I would be interested to know how these connect up and if they are easily accessible and clearly signposted. I have found that some shared paths are not always obvious and it's not until I'm halfway along a road that I realise I could have been on a safe shared use path. The problem with many shared paths is that you are spat out at the end of them onto often dangerous roads. Space should be taken from roads where possible not from pedestrians.
51	Support	I could only support this if there are separate cycling and pedestrian lanes for the safety of all users.
52	Support	This could be quite useful for cyclists, but we really need action on improving Sheriffhall roundabout as it's not currently safe for cyclists.
53	Support	0
55	Support	Go for it
56	Support	Could be a bit tight in places but I think this would be well used by both cyclists and pedestrians
59	Support	No change to existing roadway
62	Support	Could be a good route but please put it off road alongside Oldcraighall Road as this a narrow and busy road and I wouldn't like to cycle on it.
66	Support	Good - but no scope for segregated cycle lane?

71	Support	Could the verge and or Lane be smaller, to widen the shared use path. Small gains in space make a huge difference on shared use paths in my experience
74	Support	0
81	Support	0
82	Support	it's fine. The road in section 2 could be narrowed to allow for 4m width for pedestrians and cyclists
86	Support	as previous answer
88	Support	looks a good idea, don't know enough to say more
92	Support	0
97	Support	0
100	Support	0
102	Support	again only supporting if not removing space from other road users.
109	Support	0
116	Support	as per previous comments and need to tie into Danderhall / Loanhead / Roslin
118	Support	As answer to previous question.
119	Support	Makes sense to link things up.
3	Neither support or oppose	I am unaware of this route.
4	Neither support or oppose	0
5	Neither support or oppose	0
11	Neither support or oppose	Don't know about this shared-use route which looks like a back-street diversion - I can't see it drawing in any people to active-travel that aren't already doing it.
12	Neither support or oppose	0
18	Neither support or oppose	0
19	Neither support or oppose	0
24	Neither support or oppose	Shared use paths adjacent to roads are objectively poor quality infrastructure and this plan is deficient
29	Neither support or oppose	Too much shared use cyclist/pedestrian routes.
38	Neither support or oppose	I am not sure what route this is. The map is too small and no road names. My format is give cycle tracks where it will not cause issues with traffic safety and parking.
45	Neither support or oppose	Keep people walking and cyclists separate!
46	Neither support or oppose	Not enough information about the route. It should be integrated with bus corridors through the new development areas.
48	Neither support or oppose	Outwith of Musselburgh.
50	Neither support or oppose	0
54	Neither support or oppose	Dont use the route
57	Neither support or oppose	0
61	Neither support or oppose	Not sure if useful; will depend on needs of the new housing developments
63	Neither support or oppose	0
64	Neither support or oppose	.
67	Neither support or oppose	Don't know enough of target audience who's benefit from this. It already had a park and ride.
70	Neither support or oppose	0
73	Neither support or oppose	As previously mentioned
84	Neither support or oppose	0
87	Neither support or oppose	0
93	Neither support or oppose	0
94	Neither support or oppose	Whilst links to Shawfair rail station will be welcomed by mainly, the route to Sherrifhall does not clearly show the onward links on such a busy roundabout junction. Potential onward link should be illustrated to highlight the potential benefits from that location
95	Neither support or oppose	0
96	Neither support or oppose	0
98	Neither support or oppose	0
101	Neither support or oppose	0
103	Neither support or oppose	0
110	Neither support or oppose	Most people going this way are heading to the bypass and beyond or perhaps to hospital. If you are travelling further beyond you are not going to do that on bike. But locals would be better informed.
111	Neither support or oppose	.
114	Neither support or oppose	0
115	Neither support or oppose	Doesn't impact me and I can't tell from the map where this is
120	Neither support or oppose	Again, same as previous route regarding responsibility and ownership.
78	Oppose	Walking & Cycling Routes incompatible. Pedestrians only suffer from them.
90	Oppose	Don't like shared path with walkers and cyclists. Someone will be knocked over by careless cyclists.
112	Oppose	See earlier comments
117	Oppose	Narrow pathways are not suitable for walkers and cyclists
10	Strongly oppose	0

75	Strongly oppose	Don't want segregated cycle paths. Very few cyclists use the roads and there are plenty of safe alternative paths (River Esk, Harbour, Lagoons) in Musselburgh. The council should not discourage car use or worsen the roads for cars. This is a popular travel option and it is for the public to decide.
77	Strongly oppose	Waste of money.
91	Strongly oppose	Shared space just results in Cyclists abusing pedestrians
108	Strongly oppose	0
1	0	You are getting £80k to repeat for numerous sections and can't spell - so not sure how robust and worthwhile a study this has been
69	0	0