

Musselburgh Active Town


Consultation Summary Report

East Lothian Council

Project number: 60625808

August 2021

Quality information

Prepared by

Dmitrijs Stepanovs
Consultant

Checked by

William Prentice
Senior Engineer

Verified by

Paul Matthews
Associate Director

Approved by

Paul Matthews
Associate Director

Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Name	Position
1	19/08/2021	Working Draft for Review	PM	Paul Matthews	Associate Director
2	13/09/2021	Revised working draft	PM	Paul Matthews	Associate Director
3	16/09/2021	Final issue	PM	Paul Matthews	Associate Director

Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name
-	Yes	East Lothian Council

Prepared for:

East Lothian Council
John Muir House, Brewery Park, Haddington, East Lothian, EH41 3HA

Prepared by:

Dmitrijs Stepanovs

AECOM Limited
1 Tanfield
Edinburgh EH3 5DA
United Kingdom

T: +44 131 301 8600
aecom.com

© 2021 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.

This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	7
1. Introduction	10
2. Proposals	13
2.1 Route 1 West	14
2.2 Route 2	16
2.2.1 New Street, James Street and Millhill	17
2.2.2 A199 Linkfield Road	17
2.2.3 A199 Haddington Road	18
2.3 Route 5	20
2.3.1 Route through development site	21
2.3.2 Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace (QMU to Eskview Terrace)	22
2.3.3 Haugh Park and Station Road (Eskview Terrace to Olive Bank Road)	23
2.3.4 Olive Bank Road to Goose Green	23
3. Engagement Methods	24
4. Engagement Activities	26
4.1 Stakeholders	26
4.2 Local Groups	27
4.3 Residents	28
5. Online Survey Responses	29
5.1 Overall Level of Project Support	29
5.1.1 Introductory Questions	29
5.1.2 Responses in Opposition	31
5.1.3 Local Residents	32
5.1.4 Respondents with Disabilities	33
5.1.5 Business Responses	34
5.2 Route 1 West	35
5.2.1 Route 1 West Responses	35
5.2.2 Responses in Opposition	40
5.2.3 Local Residents	42
5.2.4 Respondents with Disabilities	44
5.2.5 Business Responses	44
5.3 Route 2	46
5.3.1 Route 2 Responses	46
5.3.2 Responses in Opposition	54
5.3.3 Local Residents	56
5.3.4 Respondents with Disabilities	58
5.3.5 Business Responses	58
5.4 Route 5	60
5.4.1 Route 5 Responses	60
5.4.2 Responses in Opposition	64
5.4.3 Local Residents	65
5.4.4 Respondents with Disabilities	67
5.4.5 Business Responses	67
5.5 Demographics	69
5.6 Postcode Analysis	76
6. Website Comments	78
6.1 Route 1 West	78
6.2 Route 2	79
6.2.1 Section 1 (New Street, James Street, Millhill)	79

6.2.2	Section 2 (Linkfield Road)	80
6.2.3	Section 3 (Haddington Road)	81
6.3	Route 5	81
6.3.1	Section 1 (Craighall Development Site)	82
6.3.2	Section 2 (Whitehill Farm Road, Stoneybank Terrace)	82
6.3.3	Section 3 (Haugh Park, Station Road, Olive Bank Road)	82
6.3.4	Section 4 (Link to Goose Green and Town Centre along River Esk)	83
7.	Feedback Received by Letter, Email and Live Chat	84
7.1	Feedback Received by Letter	84
7.2	Feedback Received via Email	84
7.3	Live Chat discussions	87
8.	Summary and Next Steps	89
8.1	Summary	89
8.2	Next Steps	91
	Appendix A Leaflet	92
	Appendix B Stakeholders	95
	Appendix C Local Groups	99
	Appendix D Residents	105
	Appendix E Online Survey Questions	111

Figures

Figure 2-1:	Route overview map	13
Figure 2-2:	Route 1 West alignment	14
Figure 2-3:	Route 1 West Option A - Example of intervention (two-way separate cycle lane)	15
Figure 2-4:	Route 1 West Option B - Example of intervention (one-way separate cycle lanes)	15
Figure 2-5:	Route 2 alignment	16
Figure 2-6:	Option A and B - Example of intervention (quiet streets)	17
Figure 2-7:	Route 2 Option A - Example of intervention (two-way separate cycle lane)	17
Figure 2-8:	Route 2 Option B - Example of intervention (one-way separate cycle lanes)	18
Figure 2-9:	Route 2 Option A - Example of intervention (two-way separate cycle lane)	18
Figure 2-10:	Route 2 Option B - Example of intervention (one-way separate cycle lanes)	19
Figure 2-11:	Route 5 alignment	20
Figure 2-12:	Route 5 Option A and B - Example of intervention (3m wide walking and cycling path)	21
Figure 2-13:	Route 5 Option A - Example of intervention (quiet street)	22
Figure 2-14:	Route 5 Option B - Example of intervention (two-way separate cycle lane)	22
Figure 2-15:	Route 5 Option A and B - Example of intervention (4m wide walking and cycling path on retaining wall in Haugh Park, new crossing across Olive Bank Road)	23
Figure 5-1:	Percentage of support for separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road	29
Figure 5-2:	To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling?	30
Figure 5-3:	Level of support for statement that making it easier to travel on foot, by wheeling or by bike can help to reduce the impacts of climate change	31
Figure 5-4:	Percentage of support for separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road	35
Figure 5-5:	Percentage of support for the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street for people walking, wheeling and cycling	36
Figure 5-6:	Percentage of support for the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and Edinburgh	37
Figure 5-7:	Percentage of support for Option A	38
Figure 5-8:	Percentage of support for Option B	39
Figure 5-9:	Route 1 West local residents	43
Figure 5-10:	Percentage of support for separate cycle lanes on A199	46
Figure 5-11:	Percentage of support for quiet street section	47
Figure 5-12:	Percentage of support for Option A on Linkfield Road	48
Figure 5-13:	Percentage of support for Option B on Linkfield Road	49

Figure 5-14: Percentage of support for Option A and Option B at Levenhall Roundabout	51
Figure 5-15: Percentage of support for Option A on Haddington Road	52
Figure 5-16: Percentage of support for Option B on Haddington Road	53
Figure 5-17: Route 2 local residents	57
Figure 5-18: Percentage of support for southern section through development site	60
Figure 5-19: Percentage of support for Option A on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace	61
Figure 5-20: Percentage of support for Option B on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace	62
Figure 5-21: Percentage of support for section through Haugh Park	63
Figure 5-22: Route 5 local residents	66
Figure 5-23: Response from business or individual	69
Figure 5-24: Percentage of respondents' working status	69
Figure 5-25: Percentage of respondents' travel mode to work	70
Figure 5-26: Percentage of respondents' travel mode to place of education	71
Figure 5-27: Percentage of respondents' travel mode for local journeys	71
Figure 5-28: Percentage of respondents' preferred mode of travel if opportunities and conditions to do so	72
Figure 5-29: Ranking of travelling mode for local journeys	73
Figure 5-30: Age of respondents	74
Figure 5-31: Gender of respondents	74
Figure 5-32: Percentage of respondents having a long term illness or disability	75
Figure 5-33: Percentage of respondents being parents or guardian of children under the age of 16	75
Figure 5-34: Ethnicity of respondents	76
Figure 5-35: Postcode analysis of online survey displayed by data zone	77

Tables

Table 2.1: Route 1 West - Options presented during consultation	14
Table 2.2: Route 2 - Options presented during consultation	16
Table 2.3: Route 5 - Options presented during consultation	21
Table 3.1: Forms of engagement	24
Table 4.1: Stakeholders attended consultation meeting	26
Table 5.1: Route 1 West – Summary of Options A and B	38
Table 5.2: Route 2 – Summary of Options A and B on A199 Linkfield Road	48
Table 5.3: Route 2 – Summary of Options A and B at Levenhall Roundabout	50
Table 5.4: Route 2 – Summary of Options A and B on A199 Haddington Road	52
Table 5.5: Route 5 – Summary of Options A and B on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace	61
Table 8.1: Actions for Concept Design following consultation	89

Executive Summary

Musselburgh is the fastest growing town in East Lothian and an ever-increasing commuter town for the City of Edinburgh. East Lothian Council has expressed its willingness to improve and transform the transport network in a sustainable manner and bring economic growth to the town and its communities.

The Musselburgh Active Toun (MAT) project is integral to a range of other plans and strategies for Musselburgh and beyond, and aims to provide safe routes for people walking, wheeling, cycling and travelling sustainably in and around Musselburgh. Moreover, the project aspires to help reduce noise and emissions, support people to choose healthier, affordable journeys and make the Toun nicer for everyone.

MAT is comprised of a network of 6 strategic routes that aim to provide key connections for people walking, cycling and wheeling. The first stage of the project focuses on three main routes:

- Route 1 West – Milton Road East to New Street;
- Route 2 – A199 to Wallyford Roundabout; and
- Route 5 – Old Craighall to Goose Green.

The proposed routes connect the key spaces in the town, like the town centre, River Esk, Musselburgh railway station and Queen Margaret University. Each route has two options that are presented in the consultation materials, labelled 'Option A' and 'Option B'. The proposals for the routes include:

- Separate cycle lanes (from traffic and pedestrians), either two-way or one-way;
- Quiet-street interventions (where traffic speeds and volumes are reduced);
- Improved pedestrian infrastructure, such as continuous footways / raised tables and new crossings; and
- New walking and cycling paths.

Consultation with local groups, stakeholders and members of the public was undertaken on the three routes listed above between May and July 2021. This report summarises the consultation exercise results. Consultation on the eastern section of Route 1 (New Street to Millhill) will be undertaken later in 2021, once more work has been carried out to understand potential impacts on local businesses and town centre resident.

The methods of engagement used included the following: virtual meetings with stakeholders and local groups, a virtual consultation room where members of the public could talk to a member of the project team, a dedicated project website with the option to leave comments, an online survey, leaflets, email notifications and social media posts.

It was found that the majority of consultees were generally supportive of the Musselburgh Active Toun project. In the online survey of 309 responses, on average 63% of respondents either strongly support or support the aim of improving conditions for people walking and wheeling in Musselburgh, with the equivalent figure for cycling being 59%. 64% of respondents agreed that making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle can help reduce the impacts of climate change.

59% of respondents support the introduction of separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road and 50% supported them on Haddington Road. Feedback was requested on various design options, and the level of support that each route received, alongside the comments, will be fed into the development of the Concept Design for each route.

Feedback was also received through comments on the project website, of which 277 were received, through the Live Chat function in the virtual consultation room, by letter and by email. All the feedback that was received has been collated and will be used in developing the designs.

The following table summarises the key comments that were obtained from the engagement activities with the stakeholders, local groups, residents and local residents that will be considered in the next stage of design work:

Route	Actions	Timescales
General / Actions applicable to all routes or wider project	Impact on parking to be quantified during development of the Concept Design. Parking proposals to be developed in parallel with a separate parking review that is being undertaken in Musselburgh.	In current stage (Concept Design). Information from parking review to be fed into proposals (Developed Design)
	Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling	At subsequent stage (Developed Design)
	Concept designs to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements)	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate proposals where protected cycle lanes cross side roads and accesses	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to show dropped kerbs and uncontrolled crossings	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Consider forming an advisory / steering group made up of local people (including community representatives with specific accessibility needs and those with an interest in walking, wheeling and cycling)	At subsequent stage (Developed Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate measures for cyclists to transition between protected cycle lanes and side roads, and how cyclists can make all manoeuvres at junctions	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate traffic calming measures that are proposed	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Impact on emergency service, delivery and refuse vehicles to be investigated and strategy to be developed	In current stage (Concept Design)
	'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs	In current stage (Concept Design)
	'Floating' parking bays to be reviewed in the Concept Designs	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate how access to residential properties will be retained	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Investigate potential for street trial	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Disabled parking bays to be shown in Concept Design plans	In current stage (Concept Design). Information from parking review to be fed into proposals (Developed Design)
	Dropped kerbs to be included in the design where appropriate	In current stage (Concept Design)
Route 1 West	East Lothian Council to further engage with City of Edinburgh Council on connection into Edinburgh	Ongoing
	Junctions of New Street / A199 and A199 / Milton Road East to be looked at in more detail at Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
Route 2	Review traffic volumes on Millhill at peak times and review designs accordingly	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Junction of Windsor Gardens and Linkfield Road to be reviewed	In current stage (Concept Design)

Route	Actions	Timescales
	Possibility of reducing speed limit on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road to be reviewed against Council policy	Action to be passed to Council officers responsible for Speed Limit Policy and evaluating suggested changes
	Possible additional improvements at Wallyford Toll Roundabout to be reviewed against wider Council plans at this location	Separate study to be undertaken to look at link between The Loan, Wallyford, and Wallyford Toll Roundabout, to tie into existing infrastructure between Wallyford Toll and Strawberry Corner
	Visibility at side road junctions on New Street to be reviewed during development of Route 2 Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Pedestrian infrastructure at junction of Eskside West and New Street to be reviewed during development of Route 2 Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
Route 5	Impact on trees to be quantified when designs have been developed, in collaboration with the Flood Protection Scheme	Ongoing collaboration with Musselburgh Flood Protection Scheme. Impact likely to be quantified between Stage 2 (Concept Design) and Stage 3 (Developed Design)
	Pedestrian infrastructure at bridge over East Coast Mainline to be reviewed during development of Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Link to Tesco to be explored	To be investigated separately as a local link
	Additional improvements at Whitehill Farm Road roundabout to be explored	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Review traffic volumes on Stoneybank Terrace at peak times and review designs accordingly	In current stage (Concept Design)

Following the completion of the consultation, a preferred design for each of the routes will be identified, which will then be progressed through the next design stages (Developed Design and Technical Design). At each stage there will be further consultation with the public, local businesses, community groups and stakeholders. Those who asked to be kept informed of the consultation will be notified when the next stage of consultation is going live.

It should be noted that the preferred designs will consider the consistency of infrastructure provision within Musselburgh.

Construction of the project aims to begin in 2023 and be completed in 2024-25.

1. Introduction

The Musselburgh Active Toun (MAT) project is part of an ambitious vision to imagine a new Musselburgh, which has sustainability, resilience and local communities at its heart. With high levels of new development and investment happening across Musselburgh, MAT is a unique opportunity to combine these elements and create an accessible and thriving town for future generations.

The project includes a network of 6 strategic routes for walking, cycling and wheeling, supported by a network of local routes. The strategic routes will form the arteries of the network, with the local routes being the veins. These routes will provide key connections for people walking, wheeling and cycling, and will link the key trip attractors in Musselburgh, as well as providing wider cross-boundary connections. The project also includes the development of improved public spaces, for local residents and visitors to enjoy.

The first phase of the project includes three routes:

- Route 1 – Milton Road East to Millhill;
- Route 2 – A199 to Wallyford Roundabout; and
- Route 5 – Old Craighall to Goose Green.

This report summarises the consultation exercise that was undertaken during the Concept Design stage of Route 2, Route 5 and the western half of Route 1 (Milton Road East to New Street). The consultation lasted 8 weeks, taking place between Monday 24 May and Friday 16 July 2021.

Consultation on the eastern section of Route 1 (New Street to Millhill) will be undertaken later in 2021.

Action:

Comments noted within a green box indicate changes and actions that have been taken as a result of the feedback received. A summary of these are provided in section 8.

An overview of the reach and results of the consultation are displayed graphically overleaf.

The remainder of this report is structured as follows:

- Section 2 – Proposals

In section 2 of this report, the proposals that were consulted on are presented.

- Section 3 – Engagement methods

The methods that were utilised to engage with local residents, groups and stakeholders are presented in section 3.

- Section 4 – Engagement activities

Section 4 contains detail on the various engagement activities that were undertaken with stakeholders, local groups and residents.

- Section 5 – Online survey responses

The responses that were received to the online survey are detailed and explained in section 5.

- Section 6 – Website comments

In section 6, the comments that were received through the dedicated project website, musselburghactivetoun.info, are summarised.

- Section 7 – Feedback received by letter, email and Live Chat

Section 7 summarises the comments that were received through the project email address, via written correspondence and through the Live Chat from the virtual consultation room.

- Section 8 – Summary and next steps


The final section of the report provides a summary of the engagement, the actions that will be taken forward, along with details on the next steps for the project.

Social media hits:

- **12,131** number of people reached via Facebook
- Over **4,526** impressions on Twitter

**Engagement events:**

- Live Chat available throughout consultation
- Events held with stakeholders and local groups
- Dedicated on-site meetings held with local residents

**309**

Online survey responses received

**63% and
59%**

Overall level of support from Online Survey responses for aim of improving walking / wheeling and cycling conditions respectively

“

One of the greatest barriers to cycling is the perceived and actual lack of safety of shared cycle routes, at least in my family. Segregated cycle lanes would remove that perception of danger. I can only assume this is true of many other people.

”*Respondent to online survey*

Comments received via website



Hits on project website

2. Proposals

The MAT project aims to provide safe routes for people walking, wheeling, cycling and travelling sustainably in and around Musselburgh. The routes will be safe and free from busy or fast-moving traffic.

As mentioned in section 1, the consultation that took place between Monday 24 May and Friday 16 July 2021 covered three routes:

- Route 1 West (Milton Road East to New Street);
- Route 2 (A199 Edinburgh Road to Wallyford Toll Roundabout, via New Street and Linkfield Road)
- Route 5 (Old Craighall to Goose Green, via Musselburgh town centre, Musselburgh railway station and Queen Margaret University).

The location of these routes with respect to Musselburgh and the surrounding area is shown in Figure 2-1.




Figure 2-1: Route overview map

The consultation materials presented two options for each route, labelled 'Option A' and 'Option B'. These were informed by appraisals that were undertaken following the 'Future Proofing Musselburgh's Infrastructure for Sustainable Modes of Travel' study, which was published in 2018. The options presented different designs that were considered to be feasible for each route. These included the introduction of improved cycle infrastructure and improved public spaces, alongside improvements for pedestrians.

Further detail on the options that were presented as part of the consultation is provided in section 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 for Routes 1 West, 2 and 5 respectively.

2.1 Route 1 West

The alignment of Route 1 West (Milton Road East to New Street) is shown in Figure 2-2.




Figure 2-2: Route 1 West alignment

The options that were presented to the public were as follows:

Table 2.1: Route 1 West - Options presented during consultation

Section / Option	A	B
Edinburgh Road (Milton Road East to New Street)	Two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road. This included allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops	One-way separate cycle lanes. This included limited allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops

Images showing examples of the interventions for Option A and Option B are shown in Figure 2-3 and Figure 2-4 respectively.




Figure 2-3: Route 1 West Option A - Example of intervention (two-way separate cycle lane)




Figure 2-4: Route 1 West Option B - Example of intervention (one-way separate cycle lanes)

2.2 Route 2

The alignment of Route 2 (A199 Edinburgh Road to Wallyford Toll Roundabout) is shown in Figure 2-5.




Figure 2-5: Route 2 alignment

The options that were presented to the public were as follows:

Table 2.2: Route 2 - Options presented during consultation

Section / Option	A	B
New Street, James Street and Millhill (A199 Edinburgh Road to A199 Linkfield Road)	Quiet-street intervention (streets where the traffic speed and volume are reduced)	As Option A
A199 Linkfield Road (Millhill to Levenhall Roundabout)	Two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road. This included allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops	One-way separate cycle lanes. This included allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops
A199 Haddington Road (Levenhall Roundabout to Wallyford Toll Roundabout)	Two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road. This included the provision of floating bus stops	One-way separate cycle lanes. This included the provision of floating bus stops

Images showing examples of these interventions are presented in sections 2.2.1 to 2.2.3.

2.2.1 New Street, James Street and Millhill

An example image of the intervention for Option A and Option B for this section is shown in Figure 2-6.





Figure 2-6: Option A and B - Example of intervention (quiet streets)

2.2.2 A199 Linkfield Road

Images showing examples of the interventions for Option A and Option B are shown in Figure 2-7 and Figure 2-8 respectively.






Figure 2-8: Route 2 Option B - Example of intervention (one-way separate cycle lanes)

2.2.3 A199 Haddington Road

Images showing examples of the interventions for Option A and Option B are shown in Figure 2-9 and Figure 2-10 respectively.




Figure 2-9: Route 2 Option A - Example of intervention (two-way separate cycle lane)




Figure 2-10: Route 2 Option B - Example of intervention (one-way separate cycle lanes)

2.3 Route 5

The alignment of Route 5 (Old Craighall to Goose Green, via Musselburgh town centre) is shown in Figure 2-11.




Figure 2-11: Route 5 alignment

The options that were presented to the public were as follows:

Table 2.3: Route 5 - Options presented during consultation

Section / Option	A	B
Route through development site	3m wide walking and cycling path	As Option A
Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace (QMU to Eskview Terrace)	Quiet-street intervention (streets where the traffic speed and volume are reduced)	Two-way separate cycle lane on the south-east side of the road. This included the provision of floating bus stops and would require the removal of parking on both sides of the road
Haugh Park and Station Road (Eskview Terrace to Olive Bank Road)	4m wide walking and cycling path on a retaining wall in Haugh Park, a new 4m wide crossing of the River Esk to the south of Olive Bank Road, a connection to Olive Bank Road and a new signalised Toucan crossing across Olive Bank Road	As Option A
Olive Bank Road to Goose Green	4m wide walking and cycling path along River Esk	As Option A

Images showing examples of these interventions are presented in sections 2.3.1 to 2.3.4.

2.3.1 Route through development site

An example image of the intervention for Option A and Option B for this section is shown in Figure 2-12.




Figure 2-12: Route 5 Option A and B - Example of intervention (3m wide walking and cycling path)

2.3.2 Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace (QMU to Eskview Terrace)

Images showing examples of the interventions for Option A and Option B are shown in Figure 2-13 and Figure 2-14 respectively.




Figure 2-13: Route 5 Option A - Example of intervention (quiet street)




Figure 2-14: Route 5 Option B - Example of intervention (two-way separate cycle lane)

2.3.3 Haugh Park and Station Road (Eskview Terrace to Olive Bank Road)

An example image of the intervention for Option A and Option B for this section is shown in Figure 2-15.




Figure 2-15: Route 5 Option A and B - Example of intervention (4m wide walking and cycling path on retaining wall in Haugh Park, new crossing across Olive Bank Road)

2.3.4 Olive Bank Road to Goose Green

As the proposed intervention is to be designed and provided as part of the Musselburgh Flood Protection Scheme and this has not yet been undertaken, no materials were presented on this section as part of the consultation.

3. Engagement Methods

The following forms of engagement were used at this stage:

Table 3.1: Forms of engagement

Meeting with stakeholders	✓	Stakeholders, including community councils, were invited to a virtual meeting where an online presentation was given following by a question and answer session.
Meeting with local groups	✓	Local groups, including representatives from local schools and other educational establishments, were invited to a virtual meeting where an online presentation was given following by a question and answer session. Representatives also met with local residents who requested a meeting. Two such meetings took place.
Virtual consultation	✓	As the COVID-19 pandemic meant that in-person events were not possible, an online virtual consultation room was developed, which provided the opportunity to browse all of the materials in a virtual environment and included the option to live chat with representatives from the project team. The live chat was manned during the working week, between the hours of 9am and 5pm.
Project website (comments)	✓	A dedicated project website was created and launched to coincide with the start of the consultation period. This included the option to leave comments on the various sections of each route. A total of 277 comments were received.
Online Survey	✓	A total of 309 responses were received through the online survey over the consultation period.
Leaflets	✓	Around 12,300 leaflets were distributed to all postal addresses across Musselburgh, Old Craighall and Wallyford. These were distributed to coincide with the launch of the project. A copy of the leaflet is provided in 0.
Social Media	✓	Social media posts were created on Facebook and Twitter using East Lothian Council's accounts.
Email Notifications	✓	Email notifications were issued to all stakeholders and those who have registered an interest in the project, and a dedicated project email address was set up. A total of 15 emails were received from individuals / organisations.

As the engagement phase of this project took place during the COVID-19 pandemic, engagement methods were tailored to suit this. This meant that all meetings were carried out virtually, with the exception of the meetings that were held with local residents who specifically requested an on-site meeting. It is worth noting that engaging with people virtually presents shortcomings, as it requires that respondents know how to use the technology, have access to the internet, and have access to a computer / smartphone. Whilst there were alternative methods to provide feedback (such as by letter), some people may have been unable to participate in the consultation given the lack of face-to-face meetings.

The total number of responses that were received from the online survey, website comments and by email (601) is around 5% of the number of households that received a leaflet (around 12,300).

It was planned that there would be engagement with three local schools. Due to the launch date of the consultation and the school summer holidays, this could not be arranged during the consultation period. This will be undertaken post-consultation period, when the schools return.

Queen Margaret University shared information on the project through their staff mailer and social media. Details about the consultation were shared by other groups, including Sustrans.

Detail on the outcomes of the various engagement methods are detailed in sections 4 to 7.

4. Engagement Activities

This section gathers and summarises all feedback from the engagement activities with stakeholders, local groups and local residents. This does not include the online survey responses or website comments. These are analysed separately in section 5 and 6 respectively.

Engagement activities undertaken with stakeholders, local groups and residents are detailed in section 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 respectively.

4.1 Stakeholders

The meeting with stakeholders was held on Tuesday 8 June 2021 from 7pm-8.30pm via a Microsoft Teams meeting. The purpose of this meeting was to introduce the stakeholders to the project and scope, outline the typical features and benefits of the project and use the time as an opportunity for initial information gathering and to respond to questions. The stakeholders that attended meeting can be found in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Stakeholders attended consultation meeting

Inveresk Village Society, Musselburgh Conservation Society	Sustaining Musselburgh	Musselburgh & Inveresk Community Council
East Lothian Council, Musselburgh Area Partnership	Wallyford Community Council	

The stakeholders in attendance provided feedback on specific aspects of the project for further consideration. The full meeting note can be found in Appendix B. A summary of the key points that relate to the routes that were consulted on is presented below:

- Musselburgh Promenade and New Street are busy paths and roads and some cyclists and drivers travel at inappropriate speeds;
- It was noted that the design of the proposed cycle infrastructure of Route 1 in Musselburgh must be consistent and align well with what is proposed across the Local Authority boundary in Edinburgh;
- The safety of two-way cycle routes at side road junctions and accesses was discussed. Some concerns were raised, whilst potential mitigation measures were also discussed;
- The importance of providing cycle parking was discussed;
- The advantages and disadvantages of one-way and two-way separate cycle lanes were discussed.
- Design details were discussed, although it was noted that the project was at a high-level. This included segregation of shared / dual use paths, the bridge over the East Coast Mainline on Whitehill Farm Road and the proposals within Haugh Park; and
- The importance of the design considering the needs of wheelchair users and other users with reduced mobility was discussed.

Action:

Council to further engage with City of Edinburgh Council on connection into Edinburgh.

Concept designs to illustrate proposals where protected cycle lanes cross side roads and accesses.

Concept designs to show dropped kerbs and uncontrolled crossings.

4.2 Local Groups

Local groups were invited to virtual discussion sessions with representatives of the project team. As for the session arranged with stakeholders, the purpose of the meeting was to introduce the representatives to the project and scope, outline the typical features and benefits of the project and use the time as an opportunity for initial information gathering and to respond to questions. The meeting was held on Thursday 10 June 2021 from 7pm-8.30pm via a Microsoft Teams meeting. The local groups that attended meeting are listed below:

- Queen Margaret University; and
- Changes.

Due to the fact that representatives from the Musselburgh Business Partnership were unable to attend the session on 10 June, a dedicated meeting was held with them on Monday 21 June 2021 from 10am-10.50am via a Microsoft Teams meeting.

Feedback on specific design aspects of the project was received from attendees. The full meeting notes can be found in Appendix C. A summary of the key points that relate to the routes that were consulted on is presented below:

- It was noted that a network is only as strong as their weakest part and that the design must make every day cycling comfortable for inexperienced cyclists;
- The importance of the design considering all possible manoeuvres was discussed;
- It was highlighted that Queen Margaret University students like the existing traffic-free path between Edinburgh and Musselburgh;
- Whitehill Farm Road and the junction at the Ship Inn (Edinburgh Road / Newhailes Road / North High Street / Harbour Road junction) were named as uncomfortable to cycle on-road;
- The importance of engaging with schools was discussed;
- The possibility of forming an advisory / steering group made up of local people was highlighted as a potential opportunity;
- It was noted that the existing speed cushions on New Street encourage cyclists to weave, and that an alternative form of traffic calming should be considered;
- It was noted that some of the streets that are being considered for quiet street-type treatments are currently not quiet. Millhill was the primary street noted. It was noted that there can be high volumes of vehicles during school drop off and pick up times, and on race days;
- Importance of sharing the results of the consultation was noted.

Action:

Consider forming an advisory / steering group made up of local people.

Review traffic volumes on Millhill at peak times and review designs accordingly.

Concept designs to illustrate measures for cyclists to transition between protected cycle lanes and side roads, and how cyclists can make all manoeuvres at junctions.

Concept designs to illustrate traffic calming measures that are proposed.

4.3 Residents

Two meetings with residents of Edinburgh Road were held during the consultation period. These were held following a request from two separate groups of residents, with the meetings taking place on Tuesday 15 June 2021 and Thursday 15 July 2021. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss the project with the residents and to listen and record the concerns that they had. The full meeting notes can be found in Appendix D. A summary of the key responses is included below:

- Residents felt the proposed routes will cause more congestion and air pollution;
- Residents felt that the existing cycle infrastructure is sufficient and that the proposed routes will not encourage more people to use bikes or to walk;
- Residents felt that the route should be on a different alignment (along the coast or through Newhailes);
- It was stated that the cycle lanes, especially two-way cycle lanes, will be too narrow for some cyclists, as it will not allow overtaking of slower cyclists;
- The residents stated that the proposals must allow on street parking along the routes;
- It was felt that the proposals do not allow emergency or delivery vehicles to access some buildings on Edinburgh Road;
- It was stated that the proposals don't have safe road crossings for pedestrians and wheelchair users;
- Residents expressed concern over pedestrian safety using "floating" bus stops and parking bays;
- Residents expressed concern over the impact of two-way cycle lanes on property access and egress;
- Residents felt a street trial of the designs prior to construction is imperative.

Action:

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated by traffic modelling.

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact on emergency service, delivery and refuse vehicles to be investigated and strategy to be developed.

Concept design to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

'Floating' parking bays to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

Concept designs to illustrate proposals where protected cycle lanes cross side roads and accesses.

Concept designs to illustrate how access to residential properties will be retained.

Investigate potential for street trial.

It should be noted that a route along the coast is being investigated as part of a separate project.

5. Online Survey Responses

There were 309 responses to the online survey, which was live for a period of 8 weeks from Monday 24 May to Friday 16 July 2021. The responses are summarised in sections 5.1 to 5.6, with the responses associated with Route 1 West, Route 2 and Route 5 provided in sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4 respectively. The online survey questions are provided in Appendix E. Further details are provided about respondents in opposition with the proposals, local residents, local businesses and respondents with disabilities.

5.1 Overall Level of Project Support

Sections 5.1.1 to 5.1.5 present the level of general support from the respondents and describes the key themes that were raised by the public.

5.1.1 Introductory Questions

Q1: To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling?




Figure 5-1: Percentage of support for separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road

Most of the respondents (67%) either strongly supported or supported measures that will ease walking and wheeling around Musselburgh.

20% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed this aim, with the remaining 13% of respondents neither supporting nor opposing making walking and wheeling easier around Musselburgh.

An analysis of the responses by mode that the respondent generally uses to travel to their place of work or education, or to make local journeys, was undertaken (see section 5.5 for further details). 100% of people who responded that they travel by wheelchair or mobility aid, 100 % of those that travel with another mode that wasn't listed and 97% of those who travel by bike supported this aim. 57% of those who travel by bus and 50% of those who travel as a car driver were least likely to support the aim.

Q1a: Could you briefly explain your views?

45 respondents supporting this aim named the current congestion level as the main issue in Musselburgh and said that making walking and wheeling easier will promote mode shift and will help to reduce congestion in the future. 31 respondents said that walking and wheeling will help to tackle air pollution and 28 respondents named improved health and fitness of Musselburgh residents as the main benefit of the scheme.

On the other hand, 32 respondents expressed general negative comments about the proposals. 20 respondents expressed concerns over the detriment to drivers and said that it will lead to increased congestion in Musselburgh. 5 respondents named a detrimental impact on pedestrian safety as their main reason for opposing the aim.


Q2: To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling?

Figure 5-2: To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling?

58% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported measures that will make cycling easier around Musselburgh.

27% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed this aim, with the remaining 15% of respondents neither supporting nor opposing making cycling around Musselburgh easier.

An analysis of the responses by mode that the respondent generally uses to travel to their place of work or education, or to make local journeys, was undertaken (see section 5.5 for further details). 95% of people who responded that they travel by bike and 67% of those who travel by wheelchair or mobility aid were those who supported this aim in greatest percentages. 20% of those who travel by car as a passenger 44% of those who travel as a car driver were least likely to support the aim.

Q2a: Could you briefly explain your views?

36 respondents supporting the aim named improved safety for cyclists as their reason for supporting the aim. 29 respondents said that the current congestion level is the main issue in Musselburgh and said that making cycling easier will promote modal shift and will help to reduce congestion in the future. 28 respondents said easier cycling will help to tackle air pollution and 24 respondents named improved health and fitness of Musselburgh residents as a benefit if conditions for cycling were to be improved.

On the other hand, 37 respondents expressed general negative comments about the proposals. 27 respondents said that cyclists are dangerous for pedestrians and highlighted that some cyclists ignore the Highway Code. 10 respondents expressed concerns over the detriment to drivers and said that it will lead to increased congestion in Musselburgh. 6 respondents named a detrimental impact on pedestrian safety as the main reason of opposing new measures.

Q3: To what extent do you agree that making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle can help reduce the impacts of climate change?




Figure 5-3: Level of support for statement that making it easier to travel on foot, by wheeling or by bike can help to reduce the impacts of climate change

Most of the respondents (64%) either strongly agreed or agreed that making walking, wheeling and cycling easier can help to reduce impacts of climate change.

19% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, and the remaining 16% of respondents were neutral.

An analysis of the responses by mode that the respondent generally uses to travel to their place of work or education, or to make local journeys, was undertaken (see section 5.5 for further details). 92% of people who responded that they travel by bike, 75% of those who travel by train and 71% of those who travel by walking were those who supported this statement the most. 50% of those who travel as a car driver, 50% of those who travel by taxi and by 52% of those who travel by bus were least likely to support this statement.

Action:

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

5.1.2 Responses in Opposition

As noted in section 5.1.1, 20% of respondents opposed the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling and 27% respondents opposed the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by bicycle. The free text responses to these questions were analysed in more detail in order to understand the reasons why people opposed these aims.

Question 1 – To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling?

72 respondents provided a free text response to the question about the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Comment regarding the impact of the proposals on other transport modes (including increased congestion) – 20 responses;

- Issues regarding accessibility (including for those with disabilities or visual or mobility impairments) – 5 responses;
- Parking – 5 responses;
- Antisocial behaviour of cyclists – 5 responses;
- Safety for pedestrians – 5 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 32 responses.

Of the 72 comments that were received, 57% of responses (41) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (1%), 32% of the responses (23) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 25% of the responses (18) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (68%).

Question 2 – To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling?

78 respondents provided a free text response to the question about the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Antisocial behaviour of cyclists – 27 responses;
- Comment regarding the impact of the proposals on other transport modes (including increased congestion) – 10 responses;
- Parking – 5 responses;
- Safety for pedestrians – 4 responses;
- Issues regarding accessibility (including for those with disabilities or visual or mobility impairments) – 3 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 37 responses.

Of the 78 comments that were received, 44% of responses (34) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (1%), 33% of the responses (26) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 19% of the responses (15) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (63%).

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

Concept designs to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

5.1.3 Local Residents

Responses from local residents were summarised separately to better understand their views on the aims described in questions 1 to 2. A total of 107 respondents provided a postcode that indicated that they live within 100 metres of either Route 1 West, Route 2 or Route 5. The boundaries within which residents were considered as local to each route are shown in Figure 5-9, Figure 5-17 and Figure 5-22 in sections 5.2.3, 5.3.3 and 5.4.3.

Of the responses from people who were identified as local residents:

- 68% (73) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling;

- 61% (65) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling; and
- 64% (69) agreed or strongly agreed that making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle can help reduce the impacts of climate change.

32 responses from local residents who supported the aims named the current congestion level as the main issue in Musselburgh and said that making cycling easier will promote mode shift and will help to reduce congestion in the future. 20 responses from local respondents said that making walking, wheeling and cycling easier will help to tackle air pollution. 20 responses from local residents named improved safety for cyclists as the main reason for their support.

On the other hand, 24 responses from local residents who opposed the aims shared an opinion that walking and cycling conditions are satisfactory, leading to them questioning the potential benefits of the proposed schemes. 9 responses from local residents expressed concern over the impact of dangerous cycling on pedestrians as the main reason why they were against the aims. 8 responses from local residents opposed the aims due to the potential removal of existing parking spaces in the area.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

5.1.4 Respondents with Disabilities

53 respondents to the survey indicated that they have a long-term illness or disability.

Of the responses from people who indicated that they have a long-term illness or disability:

- 48% (19) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling;
- 40% (16) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling; and
- 40% (16) agreed or strongly agreed that making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle can help reduce the impacts of climate change.

Please note that the percentages above are based on the number of responses to each question. Some respondents did not provide a response to some of the questions.

12 responses from respondents with a long-term illness / disability supported the aims described in questions 1 to 2, as they felt it will ease access for wheelchair users.

8 responses from respondents with a long-term illness / disability opposed the aims, saying that proposed designs are primarily focused on cyclists and don't consider needs of other users. Respondents also opposed potential parking space removal, stating that existing parking spaces are used by disabled people.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Concept designs to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Disabled parking bays to be shown in Concept Design plans.

5.1.5 Business Responses

Responses from businesses were also summarised separately to better understand the views of business owners and representatives on the scheme. 4 respondents to the survey indicated that they were responding on behalf of a business, rather than as an individual.

Of the responses from people who responded on behalf of a business:

- 50% (2) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling;
- 75% (3) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling; and
- 75% (3) agreed or strongly agreed that making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle can help reduce the impacts of climate change.

3 business respondents supported the introduction of new schemes and stated that easier cycling will promote mode shift and will help to reduce congestion in the future. 2 business respondents also named improved health and fitness of Musselburgh residents as the main benefit.

On the other hand, 1 business respondent opposed the introduction of new schemes and said that walking, wheeling and cycling conditions are already satisfactory, leading to them questioning the potential benefits.

Few businesses will be affected by the proposals, which is likely impacted upon the overall number of responses from business owners. Consultation on Route 1 East, which runs along North High Street and High Street will have focused engagement with business owners.

5.2 Route 1 West

This section presents the level of support of the proposed designs for Route 1 West (Milton Road East to Millhill) and describes the key positive and negative themes that were raised by the public.

In total, there were 191 online survey respondents to Route 1.

5.2.1 Route 1 West Responses

The online survey questions that related specifically to Route 1 West included the following:

- Q5) the level of support for introducing separate cycle lanes on the A199;
- Q6) the level of support for the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street for people walking, wheeling and cycling;
- Q7) the level of support for the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh;
- Q8) & Q9) the level of support for the two different options that were presented on Edinburgh Road; and
- Q10) any other feedback or general comments about Route 1 West.

The results and analysis of the responses to these questions is provided below:

Q5: To what extent do you support the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 Edinburgh Road, between Milton Road East and New Street?




Figure 5-4: Percentage of support for separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road

59% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the introduction of separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road.

33% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of cycle lanes. The remaining 8% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed measures.

Q5a: Could you briefly explain your views?

49 respondents named the improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the introduction of separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road. 16 respondents said that separate cycle lanes are required as it might encourage more people to cycle and 13 respondents complained about parked vehicles on existing cycle lanes, which obstruct cyclists from cycling in the existing cycle lanes.

20 respondents expressed their opposition to the proposals with general comments, saying for example that the proposals are not needed, or that the current infrastructure is good enough. 7 respondents expressed concerns over pedestrian safety, as people would have to cross the cycle lane to access parking spaces. 6 respondents

highlighted that some cyclists are dangerous as they ignore the Highway Code, and 6 respondents said that further road narrowing will lead to increased congestion in the area.

Action:

'Floating' parking spaces to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

Q6: To what extent do you support the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street for people walking, wheeling and cycling?




Figure 5-5: Percentage of support for the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street for people walking, wheeling and cycling

61% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street by walking, wheeling and cycling.

24% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed easier access to the High Street by walking, wheeling and cycling, and 15% of respondents neither support nor oppose the proposed measures.

Q6a: Could you briefly explain your views?

23 respondents supporting the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street by walking, wheeling and cycling named the current congestion level as the main issue on the High Street and said that making walking, wheeling and cycling easier will promote mode shift and will help to reduce congestion in the future. 15 respondents said that walking and cycling will help to tackle air pollution and 13 respondents named community benefits, such as support of local shops and businesses as the reason for their support of this aim. 12 respondents expressed general support for this aim as they find that, at the moment, the High Street gives more priority to vehicles, rather than pedestrians and cyclists.

On the other hand, 21 respondents expressed their opposition to the proposals using general negative comments. 11 respondents expressed concerns over the detriment to drivers and said that measures associated with this aim will lead to increased congestion on the High Street. 4 respondents named the potential for increased pollution as the main reason of opposing this aim.

Q7: To what extent do you support the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh?




Figure 5-6: Percentage of support for the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh

67% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh.

On the other hand, 22% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh. The remaining 12% of respondents neither supported nor opposed this aim.



Q7a: Could you briefly explain your views?

21 respondents supporting the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of this aim, and said that it will help less experienced cyclists to cycle more comfortably. 20 respondents expressed general support for the aim, as it is a popular commuter and leisure route for cyclists, wheelers and walkers. 13 respondents named the current congestion level as the main issue between Musselburgh and Edinburgh and said that making walking, wheeling and cycling easier will promote mode shift and will help to reduce congestion in the future. 8 respondents named better linked paths as the main benefit of the aim.

23 respondents opposing this aim and 6 respondents who neither supported nor opposed the aim expressed their opposition to the proposals using general comments, stating that the existing conditions are good enough or that the scheme is not needed.

Questions 8 and 9 related to the level of support for different options on the A199 Edinburgh Road. These are described in detail in section 2. To summarise, the two options were as follows:

Table 5.1: Route 1 West – Summary of Options A and B

Option	Description	Example image
A	Two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road. This included allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops	
B	One-way separate cycle lanes. This included limited allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops	

Q8: To what extent do you support Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of Edinburgh Road)?




Figure 5-7: Percentage of support for Option A

42% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option A design (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of Edinburgh Road).

On the other hand, 46% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed Option A on Edinburgh Road. The remaining 12% of respondents neither supported nor opposed this option.

Q8a: Could you briefly explain your views?

19 respondents supporting the new measures expressed general support for the Option A design, as they believe it is easier to understand for inexperienced cyclists and that it takes less road space. 16 respondents named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the scheme and said that it will help less experienced cyclists to cycle more comfortably. 6 respondents supporting the Option A design highlighted benefits of a wider two-way cycle lane, as it allows cyclists to overtake slower cyclists.

On the other hand, 18 respondents opposing the Option A design said that they believe that two-way cycle lanes are less safe and have a higher risk of collision. For example, respondents living on Edinburgh Road said that crossing a two-way cycle lane to access their cars will lead to more collisions with cyclists. In total, 14 respondents said that out of the two options, their preferred design is Option B but that they don't see how the proposed cycle route will benefit residents. 9 respondents said that the introduction of the cycle lane will slow vehicles and buses along the route. 8 respondents said that they oppose the introduction of floating bus stops, as they think they are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. 11 respondents opposing the Option A design made general negative comments or questioned the benefit of the proposal.

Q9: To what extent do you support Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road)?




Figure 5-8: Percentage of support for Option B

45% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option B design (one-way separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road).

On the other hand, 41% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of Option B on Edinburgh Road. The remaining 14% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed measures.

Q9a: Could you briefly explain your views?

23 respondents supporting the option expressed general support for Option B as they find that it reduces the risk of collision for cyclists. 19 respondents expressed general support of Option B, as they find it the most logical and believe there is less potential for confusion when compared to Option A.

On the other hand, 13 respondents opposed the Option B design as they preferred the Option A design. 11 respondents said that the introduction of the cycle lane will slow vehicles and buses along the route and cause more congestion. 8 respondents expressed concern over the detrimental impact on cycling safety as the cycle lane will be located between the footway and parking spaces at some locations. 6 respondents expressed concern over pedestrian safety, as people would have to cross the cycle lane to access the parking spaces. 6 respondents said that they oppose the introduction of floating bus stops, as they think they are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. 12 respondents opposing the Option B design made general negative comments or questioned the potential benefits of the design.

Action:

‘Floating’ parking spaces to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

‘Floating’ bus stops to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

Q10: Do you have any more feedback or general comments about Route 1 West?

The following additional suggestions were received from respondents:

- 4 respondents suggested that design of the proposed routes in Musselburgh must be consistent and align well with what is proposed / present in Edinburgh;
- 2 respondents expressed concern over the safety of cyclists at the New Street / A199 junction and at the A199 / Milton Road junction;
- 1 respondent asked for additional information about the proposed designs as they are interested in how the proposed cycle lanes will be accommodated;
- 1 respondent proposed installing informative signage with estimated timings to destination points to attract more people.

Action:

Council to further engage with City of Edinburgh Council on connection into Edinburgh.

Junctions of New Street / A199 and A199 / Milton Road East to be looked at in more detail at Concept Design.

‘Floating’ bus stops to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

5.2.2 Responses in Opposition

The free text responses to questions relating to Route 1 were analysed in more detail in order to understand the reasons why people opposed the aims / options that were presented.

Question 5 – To what extent do you support the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 Edinburgh Road, between Milton Road East and New Street?

54 respondents provided a free text response to the question about the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 Edinburgh Road between Milton Road and New Street that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Safety for pedestrians – 7 responses;
- Anti-social behaviour of cyclists – 6 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 6 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 20 responses.

Of the 54 comments received, 31% of responses (17) were from people who travel by car and 31% of responses (17) were from people who travel by bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (2%), 13% of the responses (7) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 24% of the responses (13) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (78%).

Question 6 - To what extent do you support the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street for people walking, wheeling and cycling?

35 respondents provided a free text response to the question about the aim of making it easier for people to access Musselburgh High Street by walking, wheeling and cycling that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 11 responses
- Pollution – 4 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 24 responses.

Of the 35 comments received, 40% of responses (14) were from people who travel by car and 34% of responses (12) were from people who travel by bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (3%), 14% of the responses (5) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 11% of the responses (4) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (86%).

Question 7 – To what extent do you support the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh?

25 respondents provided a free text response to the question about the aim of making it easier for people to access Musselburgh, Portobello and Edinburgh by walking, wheeling and cycling that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 3 responses
- Consequences of the project on parking – 2 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 23 responses.

Of the 25 comments received, 44% of responses (11) were from people who travel by bus and 28% of responses (7) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (4%), 20% of the responses (5) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 28% of the responses (7) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (76%).

Question 8 – To what extent do you support Option A?

80 respondents provided a free text response to the question about supporting Option A that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Safety for cyclists – 18 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 9 responses;
- Opposition to floating bus stops – 8 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 25 responses.

Of the 80 comments received, 34% of responses (27) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 20% of responses (16) were from people who travel by bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips, and 20% (16) were from people who cycle. 2 comments were received from people responding on behalf of a business (3%), 13% of the responses (10) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 15% of the responses (12) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (83%).

Question 9 – To what extent do you support Option B?

62 respondents provided a free text response to the question about supporting Option B that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 11 responses;
- Safety for cyclists – 8 responses;
- Safety for pedestrians – 6 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 25 responses.

Of the 62 comments received, 32% of responses (20) were from people who travel by car and 23% of responses (14) were from people who travel by bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 2 comments were received from people responding on behalf of a business (3%), 10% of the responses (6) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 18% of the responses (11) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (81%).

Action:

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

'Floating' parking spaces to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

5.2.3 Local Residents

Responses from local residents were analysed separately to better understand their views on the proposed interventions. A total of 12 respondents provided a postcode indicating that they live within 100 metres of Route 1 West. These respondents were considered as residents local to the route.

Figure 5-9 shows the boundary within which residents were considered to be local to the route.




Figure 5-9: Route 1 West local residents

Of the responses from people who were identified as local residents:

- 67% (8) opposed or strongly opposed the introduction of separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road;
- 50% (6) opposed or strongly opposed the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street by walking, wheeling and cycling; and
- 59% (7) opposed or strongly opposed the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh.

Regarding the level of support for Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road), 83% (10) of local residents strongly opposed this option. For Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road), the equivalent figure for the level of opposition was 58% (7).

5 comments from local residents named improved cycle safety as the main benefit of the proposed scheme.

13 respondents expressed general negative comments about the scheme, stating, for example, that the proposals were not needed or that the infrastructure currently in place is sufficient. 11 comments were received in which there was opposition to the introduction of the cycle lane between footway and parking spaces, as the respondent felt it would reduce the safety of cyclists due to people having to cross the cycle lane to access the parking spaces. 6 comments expressed concerns over pedestrian safety for the same reason.

Action:

'Floating' parking spaces to be reviewed in the Concept Design.

5.2.4 Respondents with Disabilities

27 respondents to the Route 1 survey questions indicated that they have a long-term illness or disability.

Of the responses from people who stated that they have a long-term illness or disability:

- 56%(15) opposed or strongly opposed the introduction of separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road;
- 44% (12) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street by walking, wheeling and cycling; and
- 48% (13) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh.

Regarding the level of support for Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road), 22% (6) of respondents who have a long-term illness or disability supported or strongly supported this option, with 67% (18) opposing or strongly opposing. For Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road), the equivalent figure for the level of support was also 22% (6), with 63% (17) opposing.

9 comments from people who responded stating that they have a long-term illness or disability gave a general positive comment about the proposals

On the other hand, 5 comments from respondents with a long-term illness or disability expressed opposition as they felt the designs will have a detrimental impact on the existing parking spaces, which are required for people with reduced mobility.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 1 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

'Floating' parking spaces to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

Concept design to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Disabled parking bays to be shown in Route 1 Concept Design plans.

5.2.5 Business Responses

4 respondents to the Route 1 survey questions indicated that they were responding on behalf of a business, rather than as an individual.

Of the responses from people who responded on behalf of a business:

- 75%(3) supported or strongly supported the introduction of separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road;
- 75% (3) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street by walking, wheeling and cycling; and
- 75% (3) supported or strongly supported the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh.

For both Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road) and Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road), 2 respondents answered that they are neutral and 2 respondents stated they strongly oppose the options.

4 comments were received from these respondents that named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the scheme.

3 responses were received from these respondents that expressed opposition to the introduction of floating bus stops, as they felt that they are dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

Action:

'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

5.3 Route 2

This section presents the level of support for the proposed designs for Route 2 (A199 to Wallyford Roundabout) and describes the key positive and negative themes that were raised by the public.

In total, there were 225 online survey respondents to Route 2.

5.3.1 Route 2 Responses

The online survey questions that related specifically to Route 2 included the following:

- Q11) the level of support for introducing separate cycle lanes on the A199;
- Q12) the level of support for turning New Street, James Street and Millhill into quiet streets;
- Q13 & Q14) the level of support for the two different options that were presented on Linkfield Road;
- Q15) the level of support for the two different options that were presented at Levenhall Roundabout;
- Q16) & Q17) the level of support for the two different options that were presented on Haddington Road; and
- Q18) any other feedback or general comments about Route 2.

The results and analysis of the responses to these questions is provided below:

Q11: To what extent do you support the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 at Linkfield Road and Haddington Road?




Figure 5-10: Percentage of support for separate cycle lanes on A199

Half of the respondents (50%) either strongly supported or supported the introduction of a separate cycle lane / lanes on the A199 (Linkfield Road and Haddington Road).

On the other hand, 40% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of a separate cycle lane / lanes. The remaining 10% of respondents neither support nor oppose the proposed measures.

Q11a: Could you briefly explain your views?

37 respondents named the improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the separate cycle lanes on the A199 Linkfield Road and Haddington Road. 9 respondents expressed general support for the introduction of a separate cycle lane / lanes on the A199. 7 respondents named fast moving traffic as the main reason why they support the introduction of a separate cycling lane / lanes. 5 respondents said that separate cycle lanes are required to make less experienced cyclists feel more comfortable cycling.

27 respondents opposed the introduction of the separate cycle lanes on the A199, as they expressed concern over the reduction of existing parking spaces. 16 respondents said that further road narrowing will lead to increased congestion in the area. 8 respondents said that some cyclists are dangerous to pedestrians and

highlighted that some cyclists ignore the Highway Code. 19 respondents opposed the introduction of the separate cycle lanes on the A199 and made a general negative comment / questioned the benefit of the proposals.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of the Route 2 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

Question 12 asked respondents about the proposal to turn New Street, James Street and Millhill into quiet streets. An image showing an example of what is proposed can be found in section 2.2.1.

Q12: Both Option A and Option B propose turning New Street, James Street and Millhill into quiet streets. To what extent do you agree that what we are proposing is sufficient?




Figure 5-11: Percentage of support for quiet street section

48% of the respondents either strongly agreed or agreed with the proposal of turning New Street, James Street and Millhill into quiet streets.

On the other hand, 27% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposed conversion of the streets to quiet streets. 25% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed measures.



Q12a: Could you briefly explain your views?

26 respondents expressed general support for turning the streets into quiet streets. 12 respondents named fast moving traffic as the main reason why they support the introduction of the proposed measures. 8 respondents named improved safety for pedestrians and 7 respondents named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the proposed scheme.

27 respondents expressed their opposition to the proposals using general negative comments. 7 respondents expressed general opposition to the proposed measures, as they find New Street, James Street and Millhill already quiet. 6 respondents questioned where they would park.

Questions 13 and 14 related to the level of support for different options on the A199 Linkfield Road. These are described in detail in section 2.2. To summarise, the two options were as follows:

Table 5.2: Route 2 – Summary of Options A and B on A199 Linkfield Road

Option	Description	Example image
A	Two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road. This included allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops	
B	One-way separate cycle lanes. This included allowance for parking and the provision of floating bus stops	

Q13: Option A is to have a two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of Linkfield Road, with parking being kept on the south side. To what extent do you support this option?




Figure 5-12: Percentage of support for Option A on Linkfield Road

49% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option A design of a two-way separate cycle lane on Linkfield Road.

37% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of the Option A design. 14% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed measures.

Q13a: Could you briefly explain your views?

33 respondents supporting the new measures expressed support for the Option A design as it retains parking on the south side of the road. 16 respondents named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the scheme and said that it will promote cycling. 14 respondents expressed general support for the Option A design.

On the other hand, 12 respondents said that further road narrowing will lead to increased congestion in the area. 11 respondents expressed concern over the detrimental impact on cycle safety due to the higher risk of collision cyclists would be exposed to, in the opinion of the respondents, on a two-way cycle lane. 9 respondents queried the alignment of the proposed cycling lane, as there are alternative routes available along the sea. 18 respondents opposed the Option A design and made a general negative comment or questioned the potential benefits of the scheme.


Q14: Option B is to have one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of Linkfield Road, with parking being removed on both sides. To what extent do you support this option?

Figure 5-13: Percentage of support for Option B on Linkfield Road

Only 30% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option B design (one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of Linkfield Road).

On the other hand, most of the respondents (61%) strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of the Option B design. 9% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed measures.

Q14a: Could you briefly explain your views?

17 respondents supporting the new measures expressed general support for the Option B design, as they find that it reduces the risk of collision for cyclists. 7 respondents supported removal of parking spaces as it discourages car use.

On the other hand, 71 respondents opposed the Option B design as it removes existing parking spaces. 13 respondents opposed the introduction of separate cycle lanes, as they find existing conditions for cycling satisfactory and question the benefits of the option. 11 respondents expressed general opposition to the proposed measures, as they felt it will generally worsen traffic conditions in the area. 10 respondents expressed concern over the detrimental impact on accessibility to residential properties along the route. 8 respondents said that they feel that the introduction of the cycle lanes will slow vehicles and buses along the route and cause more congestion.

Action:



Impact on parking to be quantified during development of the Route 2 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.


Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

Concept designs to illustrate how access to residential properties will be retained.

Question 15 asked respondents about two possible interventions at Levenhall Roundabout. The two options that were presented are as follows:

Table 5.3: Route 2 – Summary of Options A and B at Levenhall Roundabout

Option	Description	Example image
A	Two-way separate cycle lane with crossing across Ravensheugh Road, with the roundabout remaining otherwise unchanged	
B	“Dutch”-style roundabout, which includes separate cycle lanes around the roundabout and new crossings across each approach to the roundabout. Pedestrians and cyclists would have priority over vehicles, and it would be easier and safer to cross the road at this location	

Q15: Which of the proposed options for Levenhall Roundabout do you prefer, if any?**Figure 5-14: Percentage of support for Option A and Option B at Levenhall Roundabout**

33 % of the respondents supported the Option A design of Levenhall Roundabout (two-way separate cycle lane crossing Ravensheugh Road) and 31% supported the Option B design (“Dutch”-style roundabout, which includes separate cycle lanes around the roundabout and new crossings across each approach to the roundabout).

31% of the respondents either opposed both designs or suggested other improvements, and 5% of respondents supported both options.

Q15a: Could you briefly explain your views?

11 respondents expressed general support for the Option A design, as they find this option was safer and easier to understand than Option B. 9 respondents named improved safety for cyclists and 5 respondents named improved pedestrian safety as the main benefit of this option.

28 respondents supporting Option B design named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the proposed scheme, stating that Option B is safer for cyclists than Option A. 15 respondents named improved pedestrian safety as the main benefit of Option B. 8 respondents expressed general support for the Option B design, saying that a “Dutch” style roundabout is a proven design that works well for cyclists.

11 respondents opposed the introduction of both design options, as further road narrowing will lead to increased congestion in the area. 11 respondents said that the introduction of either design option would lead to more collisions, in their opinion, and said that cycle safety would be negatively impacted by the designs. 9 respondents made a general negative comment or questioned the potential benefits of the scheme.

Action:

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

Questions 16 and 17 related to the level of support for different options on the A199 Haddington Road. These are described in detail in section 2.2. To summarise, the two options were as follows:

Table 5.4: Route 2 – Summary of Options A and B on A199 Haddington Road

Option	Description	Example image
A	Two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road. This included the provision of floating bus stops	
B	One-way separate cycle lanes. This included the provision of floating bus stops	

Q16: Option A is to have a two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of Haddington Road, with limited space for parking on the south side of the road. To what extent do you support this option?




Figure 5-15: Percentage of support for Option A on Haddington Road

42% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option A design of a two-way separate cycle lane on Haddington Road.

On the other hand, 31% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of the Option A design. 28% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed design.

Q16a: Could you briefly explain your views?

15 respondents supporting the new measures expressed general support for the Option A design as it is their preferred option. 13 respondents named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the scheme and said that it integrates better with the existing infrastructure. 8 respondents expressed support for the Option A design, and referenced parking.

On the other hand, 11 respondents who opposed the Option A design said that they prefer the Option B design (separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road). 8 respondents opposed the Option A design making a general negative comment or questioning the potential benefits of the scheme. 8 respondents expressed concern over the detrimental impact on cycling safety due to the higher risk of collision as cyclists would be exposed to, in their opinion, on a two-way cycle lane. 5 respondents said that, in their opinion, further road narrowing would lead to increased congestion in the area.

Q17: Option B is to have one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of Haddington Road, with no space for parking on both sides of the road. To what extent do you support this option?




Figure 5-16: Percentage of support for Option B on Haddington Road

36% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option B design of one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of Haddington Road.

On the other hand, 45% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the Option B design. 20% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed design.

Q17a: Could you briefly explain your views?

14 respondents supporting the proposed design expressed general support for Option B as it is their preferred design option. 10 respondents named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the scheme and said that the introduction of one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road will benefit inexperienced cyclists. 5 respondents expressed support for the Option B design, as they find existing parking spaces underutilised.

On the other hand, 15 respondents opposed the Option B design as they questioned the potential benefits of the scheme. 15 respondents expressed concern over a perceived detrimental impact of the cycle lane on available parking spaces. 10 respondents opposed the Option B design as they prefer the Option A design.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 2 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Concept designs to illustrate proposals where protected cycle lanes cross side roads and accesses.

Q18: Do you have any more feedback or general comments about Route 2?

The following additional suggestions were received from respondents:

- 2 respondents suggested having separate cycle routes from Musselburgh to Prestonpans and from Musselburgh to North Berwick;
- 1 respondent suggested having a 3.5m two-way separate cycle lane for Route 2;
- 1 respondent suggested opening the Electric Bridge to cyclists permanently; and
- 1 respondent suggest extending Route 2 from Wallyford Toll Roundabout to the Strawberry Corner Roundabout.

Action:

Possible additional improvements at Wallyford Toll Roundabout to be reviewed against wider Council plans at this location.

5.3.2 Responses in Opposition**Section 1 – New Street, James Street, Millhill**

57 respondents provided a free text response to the question about turning New Street, James Street and Millhill into quiet streets that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Consequences of the project on parking – 6 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 4 responses;
- All users accessibility – 4 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 34 responses.

Of the 57 comments received, 40% of responses (23) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 28% of the responses (16) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes and 7% of the responses (4) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (81%).

Levenhall Roundabout

49 respondents provided a free text response to Question 15 about the proposed options for Levenhall roundabout that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Safety for cyclists – 12 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 12 responses;
- Safety for pedestrians – 8 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 19 responses.

Of the 49 comments received, 37% of responses (18) were from people who travel by car and 22% of responses (11) were from people who travel by bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1

comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (2%), 29% of the responses (14) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 8% of the responses (4) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (71%).

Introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 at Linkfield Road and Haddington Road

78 respondents provided a free text response to Question 11 about the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 at Linkfield Road and Haddington Road that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Consequences of the project on parking – 27 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 16 responses;
- Anti-social behaviour by cyclists – 8 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 26 responses.

Of the 78 comments received, 46% of responses (36) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (1%), 45% of the responses (35) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 10% of the responses (8) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (71%).

Sections 2 and 3 (Linkfield Road and Haddington Road) – Option A

This groups questions 13 and 16 together. 101 respondents provided a free text response to Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on north side of road) on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Safety for cyclists – 19 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 17 responses;
- Comment querying the route alignment – 11 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 42 responses.

Of the 101 comments received, 36% of responses (36) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 4 comments were received from someone responding on behalf of a business (4%), 29% of the responses (29) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 5% of the responses (5) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (77%).

Sections 2 and 3 (Linkfield Road and Haddington Road) – Option B

This groups questions 14 and 17 together. 155 respondents provided a free text response to Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes on the north side of the road) on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Consequences of the project on parking – 86 responses
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 12 responses;
- Impact on access to property – 11 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 49 responses;

Of the 155 comments received, 43% of responses (67) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 2 comments were received from someone responding on behalf of a business (1%), 46% of the responses (71) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 5% of the responses (7) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (74%).

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

Concept designs to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Concept designs to illustrate how access to residential properties will be retained.

5.3.3 Local Residents

Responses from local residents were analysed separately to better understand their views on the proposed interventions. A total of 78 respondents provided a postcode indicating that they live within 100 metres of Route 2. These respondents were considered as residents local to the route.

Figure 5-17 shows the boundary within which residents were considered to be local to the route.



Figure 5-17: Route 2 local residents

Of the responses from people who were identified as local residents, 37% (25) supported or strongly supported the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199. 52% (35) opposed or strongly opposed this.

31% of local residents (46) responded that they agree or strongly agree that the proposals on New Street, James Street and Millhill are sufficient. 19% (13) disagreed or strongly disagreed.

58% of local residents (39) supported or strongly supported Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road) on Linkfield Road, while the equivalent figure for Haddington Road was 46% (31).

Option B received much lower levels of support and higher levels of opposition from local residents, with 82% (55) opposing or strongly opposing Option B on Linkfield Road, and the equivalent figure on Haddington Road being 56% (38).

Regarding the proposals for Levenhall Roundabout, 43% of local residents (29) preferred Option A (crossing across Ravensheugh Road, with the roundabout remaining otherwise unchanged), 19% (13) preferred Option B ("Dutch"-style roundabout), and 31% (21) would prefer something else. 6% (4) responded that either Option A or Option B would work.

49 responses received from local respondents supporting the introduction of Route 2 named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the proposed scheme. 26 responses received from local residents expressed general positive comments for the proposals. 22 responses from local residents supported the introduction of a two-way separate cycle lane, as it retains existing parking spaces in the area.

On the other hand, 93 responses received from local residents opposed the introduction of one-way separate cycle lanes due to the detrimental impact on existing parking spaces. 23 responses received from local residents expressed general negative comments regarding the proposals. 24 responses from local residents stated that they feel the proposals will generally worsen traffic conditions in the area. 93 people mentioned the consequences on parking, should parking spaces be removed.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of the Route 2 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

5.3.4 Respondents with Disabilities

23 respondents to the Route 2 survey questions indicated that they have a long-term illness or disability.

Of the responses from people who stated that they have a long-term illness or disability, 35% (8) supported or strongly supported the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199, with 52% (12) opposing or strongly opposing.

39% of respondents with a disability / long-term illness (9) responded that they agree or strongly agree that the proposals on New Street, James Street and Millhill are sufficient, with 30% (7) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

39% of respondents (9) supported or strongly supported Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road) on Linkfield Road, while the equivalent figure for Haddington Road was 35% (8).

Option B received lower levels of support and higher levels of opposition, with 70% (16) opposing or strongly opposing Option B on Linkfield Road, and the equivalent figure on Haddington Road being 44% (10).

Regarding the proposals for Levenhall Roundabout, 22% of respondents with a long-term illness or disability (5) preferred Option A (crossing across Ravensheugh Road, with the roundabout remaining otherwise unchanged), 35% (8) preferred Option B ("Dutch"-style roundabout), and 39% (9) would prefer something else. 6% (5) responded that either Option A or Option B would work.

12 comments from respondents who have a long-term illness or disability gave general positive comments about the proposals.

On the other hand, 5 comments from respondents with a long-term illness or disability expressed opposition to any detrimental impact on existing parking spaces, which are required for people with reduced mobility.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 2 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Concept design to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Disabled parking bays to be shown in Route 2 Concept Design plans.

5.3.5 Business Responses

4 respondents to the Route 2 survey questions indicated that they were responding on behalf of a business, rather than as an individual.

Of the responses on behalf of a business, 75% (3) supported or strongly supported the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199, with 25% (1) opposing or strongly opposing. Regarding the proposals for New Street, James Street and Millhill, all of the responses on behalf of businesses (100%) were 'Neither agree nor disagree'.

50% of respondents (2) opposed or strongly opposed Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road) on Linkfield Road, with 1 respondent supporting or strongly supporting this option. On Haddington Road, 50% of respondents also opposed or strongly opposed Option A, with the remaining 2 respondents neither supporting nor opposing this option.

50% of respondents (2) opposed or strongly opposed Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes on both side of the road) on Linkfield Road, with 1 respondent supporting or strongly supporting this option. On Haddington Road, 50% of respondents neither supported nor opposed Option B, while 1 respondent supported the option and another opposed it.

Regarding the proposals for Levenhall Roundabout, responses were equally split across Option A (crossing across Ravensheugh Road, with the roundabout remaining otherwise unchanged), Option B ("Dutch"-style roundabout), something else and 'Both options work'.

4 responses from respondents who responded on behalf of a business generally supported the introduction of Route 2, and 1 respondent out of the 4 highlighted that they would like to retain the existing parking spaces.

On the other hand, 5 respondents who responded on behalf of a business and expressed general opposition to the designs.

Action:

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

5.4 Route 5

This section presents the level of support of the proposed designs of Route 5 (Old Craighall to Goose Green) and describes the key positive and negative themes that were raised by the public.

In total, there were 175 online survey respondents to Route 5.

5.4.1 Route 5 Responses

The online survey questions that related specifically to Route 5 included the following:

- Q19) the level of support for the southern section of the route through the Craighall development site;
- Q20) & Q21) the level of support for the two different options that were presented on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace;
- Q22) the level of support for the option that was presented in Haugh Park;
- Q23) any other feedback or general comments about Route 5.

The results and analysis of the responses to these questions is provided below:

Question 19 asked respondents about the proposed section of the route through the development site at Craighall, linking to Whitehill Farm Road, Queen Margaret University and Musselburgh railway station. An image showing an example of what is proposed can be found in section 2.3.1.

Q19: To what extent do you agree that what we are proposing through the development site is sufficient?




Figure 5-18: Percentage of support for southern section through development site

The vast majority of the respondents (69%) either strongly agreed or agreed that the proposed design (a shared path / footway) is sufficient.

On the other hand, 20% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposed design. 12% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed design.

Q19a: Could you briefly explain your views?



25 respondents expressed general support for the introduction of a shared path through the development. 12 respondents named the improved safety for cyclists and 8 respondents named the improved safety for pedestrians as the main benefit of the proposed scheme. 5 respondents supporting the scheme highlighted the potential to link the proposed path with existing paths in the future as a positive impact of the infrastructure. 5 respondents named the 3 metre path width as acceptable, but that they would prefer to have a wider path if possible.

12 respondents disagreed with the proposed design and expressed their opposition to the proposals using general negative comments, saying that this is not needed, or that the current infrastructure is good enough, for

example. 6 respondents expressed concern over the winding route alignment and would prefer a more direct route.

Questions 20 and 21 related to the level of support for different options on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace. These are described in detail in section 2.3. To summarise, the two options were as follows:

Table 5.5: Route 5 – Summary of Options A and B on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace

Option	Description	Example image
A	Quiet-street intervention (streets where the traffic speed and volume are reduced)	
B	Two-way separate cycle lane on the south-east side of the road. This included the provision of floating bus stops and would require the removal of parking on both sides of the road	

Q20: Option A is to turn Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace into quiet streets, with parking being kept on both sides of the road. To what extent do you support this option?




Figure 5-19: Percentage of support for Option A on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace

49% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option A design (turning Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace into quiet streets).

30% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of the Option A design. 22% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed design.

Q20a: Could you briefly explain your views?

10 respondents supporting the new measures expressed support for the Option A design, as it retains parking on the road. 8 respondents expressed general support for the Option A design as it is their preferred option.

On the other hand, 22 respondents opposed the Option A design as they question the potential benefits of the scheme, saying that the proposed measures might not significantly improve the safety of cyclists. 7 respondents complained about parked vehicles in the cycle lanes, which obstruct cyclists from cycling in cycle lanes.

Q21: Option B is to have a two-way separate cycle lane on the south side of Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace, with parking being removed on both sides. To what extent do you support this option?




Figure 5-20: Percentage of support for Option B on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace

Only 39% of the respondents either strongly supported or supported the Option B design (a two-way separate cycle lane on the south side of Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace).

45% of respondents strongly opposed or opposed the introduction of the Option B design, while 17% of respondents neither supported nor opposed the proposed design.

Q21a: Could you briefly explain your views?

18 respondents supporting the new measures named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the scheme and said that it will benefit inexperienced cyclists. 5 respondents expressed support for the Option B design, as they find parked vehicles dangerous for cyclists and think that reduced number of parking spaces will discourage car ownership in the future. 5 respondents expressed general support for the Option B design, as they prefer to have dedicated cycle lanes for cyclists.

33 respondents opposed the Option B design as they have concerns over the detrimental impact on available parking spaces. 12 respondents questioned the potential benefits of the scheme, stating that the proposed scheme is not currently required. 6 respondents were generally against the introduction of the Option B design.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of the Route 5 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Question 22 asked respondents about the proposed section of the route through Haugh Park. An image showing an example of what is proposed can be found in section 2.3.3.

Q22: To what extent do you agree that what we are proposing through Haugh Park is sufficient?




Figure 5-21: Percentage of support for section through Haugh Park

Most of the respondents (55%) either strongly agreed or agreed with the design of a shared path on a retaining wall in Haugh Park.

27% of respondents strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposed design, while 18% of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposed design.

Q22a: Could you briefly explain your views?

13 respondents expressed support for the introduction of a shared path in Haugh Park, providing any trees that would have to be removed will be replaced. 10 respondents named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the proposed scheme. 8 respondents expressed general support for the new path.

22 respondents opposed the introduction of a shared path in Haugh Park, as it likely requires tree removal. 9 respondents questioned the potential benefits of the scheme, stating that the proposed scheme is not currently required.

Action:

Impact on trees to be quantified when designs have been developed, in collaboration with the Flood Protection Scheme.

Q23: Do you have any more feedback or general comments about Route 5?

The following additional suggestions were received from respondents:

- 1 respondent highlighted the narrow pavements at the bridge over the East Coast Mainline next to Musselburgh railway station;
- 1 respondent suggested connecting proposed routes with the schools in the area;
- 1 respondent suggested adding a cycle lane on Olive Bank Road as part of Route 5; and
- 1 respondent asked for drawings showing what the new flood defences will look like.

Action:

Pedestrian infrastructure at bridge over East Coast Mainline to be reviewed during development of Concept Design.

5.4.2 Responses in Opposition

Section 1 – Craighall Development Site

28 respondents provided a free text response to Question 19 about the proposals for Craighall Development site that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Comment querying the route alignment – 6 responses;
- Anti-social behaviour from cyclists – 4 responses;
- Wider pavements – 4 responses; and
- Detrimental impact on green space – 2 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 12 responses.

Of the 28 comments received, 32% of responses (9) were from people who travel by car and 18% of responses (5) were from people who travel by bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 7% of the responses (2) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 18% of the responses (5) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (68%).

Section 2 (Whitehill Farm Road, Stoneybank Terrace) – Option A

43 respondents provided a free text response to Question 20 about the proposed Option A (Quiet-street intervention) for Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Existing parking causing problems to cyclists – 7 responses;
- Safety for cyclists –4 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 4 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 48 responses.

Of the 43 comments received, 30% of responses (13) were from people who travel by car as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 19% of responses (8) were from people who cycle as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips, and 19% (8) who walk. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (2%), 12% of the responses (5) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 14% of the responses (6) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (63%).

Section 2 (Whitehill Farm Road, Stoneybank Terrace) – Option B

57 respondents provided a free text response to Question 21 about the proposed Option B (two-way separate cycle lane on the south-east side of the road) for Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Consequences of project on parking – 33 responses;
- Safety for cyclists – 4 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 18 responses.

Of the 57 comments received, 40% of responses (23) were from people who travel by car and 21% of responses (12) were from people who use the bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (2%), 7% of the responses (4) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 12% of the responses (7) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (77%).

Section 3 – Haugh Park, Station Road, Olive Bank Road

38 respondents provided a free text response to Question 22 about the proposed plans for Haugh Park that had a negative aspect. The primary themes that of these comments were as follows:

- Detrimental impact on greenspace – 22 responses;
- Integration with other types of travel modes (causes more congestion in the future) – 3 responses;
- Consequences of project on parking – 2 responses;
- Safety for cyclists – 2 responses;
- Safety for pedestrians – 2 responses; and
- General negative comment / Questioning benefit or point of scheme – 9 responses.

Of the 38 comments received, 21% of responses (8) were from people who travel by car and 26% of responses (10) were from people who use the bus as their primary mode to travel to work / study or to make local trips. 1 comment was received from someone responding on behalf of a business (3%), 8% of the responses (3) were from people who were identified as a local resident to one of the routes, and 13% of the responses (5) were from people with a disability or long-term health condition. The majority of the responses came from people aged between 35 and 64 (74%).

Action:

Impact on trees to be quantified when designs have been developed, in collaboration with the Flood Protection Scheme.

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of the Route 5 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

5.4.3 Local Residents

Responses from local residents were analysed separately to better understand their views on the proposed infrastructure improvements. A total of 22 respondents provided a postcode indicating that they live within 100 metres of Route 5. These respondents were considered as residents local to the route.

Figure 5-22 shows the boundary within which residents were considered to be local to the route.




Figure 5-22: Route 5 local residents

69% of local residents (11) responded that they agree or strongly agree that the proposals through the development site are sufficient.

38% of local residents (6) supported or strongly supported Option A (quiet-street intervention) on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace, with 38% (6) opposing or strongly opposing this option. The equivalent figures for Option B (two-way separate cycle lane on the south-east side of the road) were 51% supporting or strongly supporting (8) and 44% opposing or strongly opposing (7).

Regarding the proposals for Haugh Park, 63% of local residents (10) responded that they support or strongly support the proposal.

Please note that the percentages above are based on the number of responses to each question. Some respondents did not provide a response to some of the questions.

4 responses were received from local residents who supported the proposed measures, naming improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the proposed scheme. 3 responses were received from local residents who support the introduction of shared path in Haugh Park, providing any trees that would have to be removed will be replaced.

3 responses expressed concern over the potential detrimental impact of the scheme on existing parking spaces. 3 responses were received from local residents who expressed opposition due to the potential requirement for tree removal along the route.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 5 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact on trees to be quantified when designs have been developed, in collaboration with the Flood Protection Scheme.

5.4.4 Respondents with Disabilities

25 respondents to the Route 5 survey questions indicated that they have a long-term illness or disability.

40% of respondents with a long-term illness or disability (10) responded that they agree or strongly agree that the proposals through the development site are sufficient, with 44% (11) disagreeing or strongly disagreeing.

48% of respondents (12) supported or strongly supported Option A (quiet-street intervention) on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace, with 36% (9) opposing or strongly opposing this option. The equivalent figures for Option B (two-way separate cycle lane on the south-east side of the road) were 24% supporting or strongly supporting (6) and 56% opposing or strongly opposing (14).

Regarding the proposals for Haugh Park, 52% of respondents with a long-term illness or disability (13) responded that they oppose or strongly oppose the proposal.

3 comments from respondents who have a long-term illness or disability gave general positive comments about the proposals and highlighted the importance of having dropped kerbs along the route and keeping parking spaces for disabled users was highlighted.

6 comments from respondents who have a long-term illness or disability gave general negative comments about the proposals. 3 respondents mentioned the consequences of the proposals on parking.

Action:

Disabled parking bays to be shown in Route 5 Concept Design plans.

Dropped kerbs to be included in the design where appropriate.

5.4.5 Business Responses

4 respondents to the Route 5 survey questions indicated that they were responding on behalf of a business, rather than as an individual.

50% of respondents responding on behalf of a business (2) responded that they agree or strongly agree that the proposals through the development site are sufficient, with the other 50% (2) neither agreeing nor disagreeing.

All of the respondents (4) neither supported nor opposed Option A (quiet-street intervention) on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace. Regarding Option B (two-way separate cycle lane on the south-east side of the road), two respondents (50%) neither supported nor opposed this option, one respondent supported this option, and the remaining respondent strongly opposed Option B.

Regarding the proposals for Haugh Park, the same levels of support were received as were received for Option B on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace (2 respondents neither supported nor opposed, 1 respondent supported and 1 respondent strongly opposed).

1 response was received that supported the proposed measures and stated that the proposed scheme will improve traffic flow. 1 respondent also highlighted the importance of linking the proposed path with existing paths.

On the other hand, 2 responses were received from respondents responding on behalf of businesses in which the respondent expressed opposition and expressed concern over the reduced number of parking spaces.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 5 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

5.5 Demographics

The following questions relate to the demographics of respondents to the online survey.

Q26: Are you filling in this survey on behalf of a business or an individual?




Figure 5-23: Response from business or individual

With regards to the proportion of business and individual respondents, Figure 5-23 shows that 1% of respondents (4) responded on behalf of a business and 99% (305) responded as an individual.

Q27: In order to understand how you travel we need to ask you a few questions about your circumstances. Which of the following best reflects your current working status?




Figure 5-24: Percentage of respondents' working status

With regards to respondents' working status, Figure 5-24 shows that 64% of respondents (199) are in full time employment, 16% (48) are retired and 12% (36) are in part time employment. Less than 5% of respondents are either in full time education, volunteering, unemployment or other.

Please note that respondents to question 27 could only select one response – that which best reflects their working status. It is acknowledged that respondents may be retired and also be a volunteer, for example.

Depending on their response to question 27, respondents were then asked how they travel to their place of work (if they are in employment), their place of study (if they are in education) or to make local journeys (if they responded that they are retired or unemployed).

Q28a: How do you usually travel to your place of work?






Figure 5-25: Percentage of respondents' travel mode to work


Regarding the travel mode that respondents use to travel to work, Figure 5-25 shows that 43% of respondents (100) drive to work, 21% (48) cycle to work, 15% (35) take a bus, 10% (23) walk, 5% (12) take a train and less than 5% use one of the other transport modes.

Q28b: How do you usually travel to your place of education?**Figure 5-26: Percentage of respondents' travel mode to place of education**

Regarding the travel mode that respondents use to travel to their place of education, Figure 5-26 shows that 38% of respondents (3) cycle, 25% drive (2), 25% (2) take a bus, and 13% (1) use one of the other transport modes.

Q28c: How do you normally make local journeys?**Figure 5-27: Percentage of respondents' travel mode for local journeys**

Regarding the travel mode that respondents use for local journeys, Figure 5-27 shows that 38% of respondents (25) travel on foot, 32% (21) drive, 14% (9) cycle, 8% (5) take a bus, and less than 5% use another transport mode.

Q29: How would you like to travel there assuming you had the opportunities and conditions to do so?**Figure 5-28: Percentage of respondents' preferred mode of travel if opportunities and conditions to do so**

With regards to respondents preferred travel mode, Figure 5-28 shows that 54% of respondents (166) will continue to travel as they do now, 20% (61) would cycle, 11% (34) would drive a car, 6% (17) take a bus and less than 5% would use one of the other transport modes.

Of those who said that they generally drive a car to their place of work or study, or for local journeys, 60 respondents said that they would prefer to use a different mode, if they had the opportunities and conditions to do so. 21 said that they would prefer to cycle, 4 said that they would prefer to take a bus, 3 respondents said that they would prefer to walk and another 3 said that they would prefer to take the train. 2 said they would prefer to take another mode and 1 said that they would prefer to take the car but as a passenger.

Q30: What prevents you from travelling this way?

The most cited reasons preventing respondents from using their preferred transport mode are listed below, along with a tally:

1. Feeling of danger, not being safe while cycling: 29;
2. Long Distance: 19;
3. Don't want to / work from home: 15;
4. Lack of public transport services: 9;
5. Lack of dropped kerbs / infrastructure: 4.


Q31: Please rank which of the following ways you most often use to make local journeys**Figure 5-29: Ranking of travelling mode for local journeys**

Figure 5-29 shows that travelling on foot and by car (as a driver) are the most popular modes of travel. 46% of respondents (130) ranked walking and 31% (87) ranked driving a car (as driver) as the most often used transport mode. The proportion of respondents who most often cycle for local journeys as 13%. The equivalent figures for public transport are 2% for the train and 3% for the bus.

Q32: Do you have any further comments about walking, wheeling and cycling in Musselburgh?

21 respondents generally supporting the proposed plans said that the proposed improvements must benefit the whole community and promote walking and public transport as well as cycling. 8 respondents named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the proposed plans. 7 respondents expressed general support for all of the proposed plans.

18 respondents expressed concern over the existing congestion level in Musselburgh. Some of the respondents said that modal shift must be promoted by improving public transport services. However, other respondents expressed concern over the possible detrimental impact of the proposed measures on traffic, which they felt will increase congestion in Musselburgh.

23 respondents generally opposed the proposed plans, as they feel the proposed changes to the infrastructure are not needed. 18 respondents named the impact of dangerous cycling on pedestrians as the main reason why they are against the new measures. 9 respondents expressed concern over the detrimental impact on available parking spaces on Stoneybank Terrace and Linkfield Road.


Q34: Please tell us your age**Figure 5-30: Age of respondents**

Figure 5-30 shows the age grouping of the survey respondents. Most responses were received from people aged between 35 and 64, with 23% of respondents (72) being aged between 45 and 54, 22% (67) being aged between 55 and 64, and 21% (66) being aged between 35 and 44. 14% of respondents (43) were aged between 25 and 34, 10% (31) were aged between 65 and 74, 4% (13) were aged between 16 and 24, 2% (5) were 75 or over, and 4% (11) stated that they would 'Prefer not to say'.




Q35: Please tell us your gender**Figure 5-31: Gender of respondents**


Figure 5-31 shows that there was a fairly even split of male and female respondents. 49% of respondents (152) identified as 'Male', 46% (142) identified as 'Female', 1% (3) identified as 'Non-binary', and 4% (12) stated that they would 'Prefer not to say'.

Q36: Do you have a long-term illness or disability that limits your daily activities?**Figure 5-32: Percentage of respondents having a long term illness or disability**

Regarding the proportion of respondents having a long-term illness or disability, Figure 5-32 shows that 13% of respondents (40) said 'Yes', 79% (243) said 'No', and 8% of respondents (26) would 'Prefer not to say'.

Q37: Are you the parent or guardian of children under the age of 16?**Figure 5-33: Percentage of respondents being parents or guardian of children under the age of 16**

With regards to the proportion of respondents being a parent or guardian of a child under the age of 16, Figure 5-33 shows that 36% of respondents (112) said 'Yes', 60% (185) said 'No', and 4% (12) of respondents would 'Prefer not to say'.

Q38: What is your ethnicity?**Figure 5-34: Ethnicity of respondents**

Regarding the ethnicity of respondents, Figure 5-34 shows that 67% of respondents (207) identify as 'White Scottish', 20% (62) identify as 'White other British', 6% (18) preferred not to say, 4% (12) identify as "White Other", 2% (6) identify as "White Irish" and 1% (2) identify as "Indian, Indian Scottish, Indian British".

5.6 Postcode Analysis

Figure 5-35 shows the number and location of respondents that answered the online survey by data zone.¹ Respondents were given the option of provided their post code or street name in Q33 of the online survey. These have been displayed within data zones to maximise privacy.

The postcode analysis shows that the highest number of respondents are located in Musselburgh and surrounding towns, with some respondents living on the outskirts of Edinburgh, in Stirling, in North Berwick and in Dunbar.

¹ Data zones are the key geography for dissemination of small area statistics in Scotland and are widely used across the public and private sector. Composed of aggregates of Census Output Areas, data zones are large enough that statistics can be presented accurately without fear of disclosure and yet small enough that they can be used to represent communities.




Figure 5-35: Postcode analysis of online survey displayed by data zone

6. Website Comments

As well as being able to complete an online survey, people engaging in the consultation process had the option to leave comments on the project website (<https://musselburghactivetoun.info>).

Overall, a total of 277 comments were received to the project website.

The following section presents key positive and negative themes that were raised by the public in the comments section on the website.

6.1 Route 1 West

Of those who expressed a preference (41), 68% of responses (28) were in support of Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes), while 32% of responses (13) were in support of Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road).

Comments have been grouped by theme and are presented below:

Safety

12 responses supporting the introduction of Route 1 West named improved safety for cyclists as the main benefit of the proposed scheme.

2 respondents mentioned that the Milton Road junction is a key junction for cycle safety, as it is currently dangerous due to traffic.

1 respondent mentioned that it is their opinion that having cycle lanes inside parking bays for residents is highly dangerous for both residents and cyclists.

4 responses who expressed opposition to the proposals named a perceived detrimental impact on pedestrian safety as the main reason for opposing the new measures.

Cycle Infrastructure

9 responses highlighted the importance of linking the proposed route with existing paths. 3 responses said that they would like the proposed route to have links to the Brunstane Path and highlighted the importance of continuing the proposed route into Portobello.

8 responses supported the potential introduction of a separate cycle lane, stating that, in the opinion of the respondent, it will improve safety for pedestrians and cyclists and will benefit inexperienced cyclists.

Traffic / Congestion

4 responses stated that the introduction of Route 1 will lead to increased congestion in Musselburgh, in the opinion of the respondent.

5 responses in which the respondent neither expressed support nor opposition the new measures supported the introduction of separate cycle lanes, as they felt it would allow inexperienced cyclists to feel more confident.

Floating bus stops

1 respondent expressed support for floating bus stops. On the other hand, 3 respondents are against the idea, due to the potential conflicts between cyclists and pedestrians boarding and alighting buses.

Parking

1 respondent mentioned that the cycle lanes should be enforced as non-parking areas to prevent vehicles from parking in them.

Other suggestions

1 respondent mentioned that some of the transitions and corners seemed quite tight on Option B and asked if they could be smoothed.

1 respondent suggested that a Toucan crossing or 'repeater traffic lights' be provided at the junction between New Street and Edinburgh Road.

Action:

'Floating' parking spaces to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

Concept design to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Council to further engage with City of Edinburgh Council on connection into Edinburgh.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling.

6.2 Route 2

The number of responses in which a respondent expressed a preference for either Option A or B on Linkfield Road (32) was fairly even, with 53% of responses (17) in support of Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes), and 47% of responses (15) in support of Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road). There was a greater difference on Haddington Road (16 respondents who expressed a preference), with 75% of responses (12) in support of Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes), and 25% of responses (4) in support of Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road).

On the website, Route 2 was broken into three sections:

1. Section 1 – New Street, James Street, Millhill;
2. Section 2 – Linkfield Road; and
3. Section 3 – Haddington Road.

The comments that were received for each section are presented in sections 6.2.1 to 6.2.3. Comments have been grouped by theme.

6.2.1 Section 1 (New Street, James Street, Millhill)

Safety

3 respondents mentioned that the scheme improves safety for cyclists.

8 respondents queried the route alignment, with 1 respondent mentioning that this section of the route isn't workable as an accessible space for pedestrians and cyclists through delivery of a 'quiet road' cycle route. New Street is busy with residential traffic and the harbour end has a lot of visitor traffic. 2 respondents suggested having the route go along the promenade, while another suggested that the High Street and Bridge Street would be a better alignment. It should be noted that a route along the coast is being investigated as part of a separate project.

1 respondent mentioned the constrained visibility that drivers / riders have when pulling out of the corner of the former Quay building and the harbour.

1 respondent mentioned that they do not currently feel safe when turning right from Linkfield Road onto Millhill (when heading west) and when turning right from Linkfield Road onto Ashgrove (when heading east).

Pedestrian infrastructure

7 respondents expressed opposition to raised tables, expressing uncertainty as to how raised tables help cyclists and pedestrians.

Out of the 3 respondents who expressed support for raised tables as a traffic calming measure, 1 respondent asked why a raised table was not also provided at the Balcarres Road / Millhill junction.

1 respondent highlighted that, at the junction with New Street, pedestrians travelling north on Eskside West find themselves having to navigate a path that ends in the middle of an often muddy patch of ground and either have to walk on the road or step down a high kerb on the other side to get to the Bridge or the front. This person adds that anyone with mobility issues is essentially excluded from navigating this area.

Parking

3 respondents mentioned parking as a potential issue in the scheme, with 1 respondent asking if parking spaces will be removed. Another respondent mentions that parking on both sides is already problematic and results in access challenges for larger vehicles, including emergency vehicles.

Other suggestions

1 respondent suggested keeping the Electric Bridge as a cycle bridge.

1 respondent would like to see improvements to the traffic operations around Fisherrow Harbour, as they consider it to be unsafe, especially at weekends.

1 respondent is against having a cycle lane in Levenhall Roundabout, as they think it will be dangerous for cyclists.

6.2.2 Section 2 (Linkfield Road)

Safety

5 respondents stated that they think safety will improve for cyclists.

Cycle infrastructure

8 respondents approved of the segregated cycle lanes. 4 out of the 8 responses favoured Option A (two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road), 5 favoured Option B (one-way separate cycle lanes).

1 respondent was against both options, saying that it was a waste of money.

8 respondents supported the proposals for Levenhall Roundabout, with 3 respondents having a preference for Option A and 5 respondents having a preference for Option B. 1 respondent mentioned that the Dutch style roundabout might cause issues as drivers are not familiar with this type of layout and thus might not give way to cyclists.

1 respondent suggested removing the pavement on the racecourse side of Linkfield Road to free up space for a protected cycle lane.

4 respondents queried how to join the protected cycle lane, especially for Option A, which has the two-way protected cycle lane, from Pinkie Road or Ashgrove for example.

Pedestrian infrastructure

12 respondents expressed opposition to the removal of the islands along Linkfield Road as they feel it makes it harder for people to safely cross what currently a busy road. It was also stated that it limits accessibility for older people and people with disabilities.

2 respondents suggested adding pedestrian crossings to make it safer for people to cross Linkfield Road

Parking

8 respondents expressed opposition to the removal of parking spaces along Linkfield Road, as it risks putting extra pressure on surrounding streets. 1 respondent mentioned that the pressure will be exacerbated during race days.

Suggestions

1 respondent suggested better street lighting on Linkfield Road.

1 respondent suggested pedestrianising the town centre.

6.2.3 Section 3 (Haddington Road)

Safety

3 respondents expressed opposition to floating bus stops, as they deem them to be too dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists.

Cycle infrastructure

1 respondent mentioned that separate cycle lanes are often full of debris that make them unusable for road bikes, which results in punctures and ultimately forces cyclists to use the road. Having narrower roads then makes drivers frustrated and more dangerous for cyclists.

1 respondent mentioned that cycle lanes on the roundabout will be dangerous for both cyclists and drivers and result in more delays.

Action:

Visibility at side road junctions on New Street to be reviewed during development of Route 2 Concept Design.

Concept designs to illustrate measures for cyclists to transition between protected cycle lanes and side roads, and how cyclists can make all manoeuvres at junctions.

Pedestrian infrastructure at junction of Eskside West and New Street to be reviewed during development of Route 2 Concept Design.

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 2 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Concept design to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

6.3 Route 5

Regarding the two proposals for Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace that were presented during the consultation period, 48% (11) of those who expressed a preference (23) were in support of Option A (quiet-street intervention), while 52% of responses (12) were in support of Option B (two-way separate cycle lane on the south-east side of the road).

On the website, Route 5 was broken into four sections:

1. Section 1 – Craighall Development Site;
2. Section 2 – Whitehill Farm Road, Stoneybank Terrace;
3. Section 3 – Haugh Park, Station Road, Olive Bank Road; and
4. Section 4 – Link to Goose Green and Town Centre along River Esk.

The comments that were received for each section are presented in sections 6.3.1 to 6.3.4. Comments have been grouped by theme

6.3.1 Section 1 (Craighall Development Site)

Cycle infrastructure

1 respondent wondered how well lit and maintained the path will be, and doesn't want to see it overgrown, like the path next to the A1 / Newcraighall park.

1 respondent queried how this proposal will link with the River Esk path and cycle lane from the river to Queen Margaret University.

3 respondents mentioned that they think the proposed route is not very direct and too winding. 1 of the 3 respondents suggests the route could follow the railway line.

1 respondent mentioned that there is no need for this, as the roads are already well connected, and the pavements are more than functional.

1 respondent asked why the cycle route on the north side of Queen Margaret University is not used instead.

Suggestions

1 respondent suggested continuing the route to Shawfair,

1 respondent suggested that the cycle infrastructure should be 4m wide.

6.3.2 Section 2 (Whitehill Farm Road, Stoneybank Terrace)

Cycle infrastructure

4 respondents mentioned that protected cycle lanes improve safety for cyclists

Parking

15 respondents expressed opposition to the removal of parking, as it will make it worse for the residents to find a parking space and will also push the problem to side streets such as Eskview Terrace.

Traffic operations

2 respondents supported the scheme, as they feel it will slow traffic down.

1 respondent mentioned that Stoneybank Terrace is not a quiet street.

1 respondent expressed opposition to the idea of Whitehall Farm Road becoming a cycle route.

1 respondent mentioned that there is already a segregated walk / cycle route to Musselburgh behind the Denholm houses and one around the golf course down to Inveresk.

6.3.3 Section 3 (Haugh Park, Station Road, Olive Bank Road)

Green space

2 respondents mentioned that the proposals will mean the removal of trees and limited green space.

Cycle Infrastructure

9 respondents stated that they are in favour of the proposals, as a cycle path and walking path are much needed.
1 respondent mentioned that the use of the bridge is a good idea.

2 respondents expressed opposition to the Toucan crossing on Olive Bank Road.

Suggestions

1 respondent suggested that Routes 1 and 5 could be connected at the foot of Eskview Terrace by a two-way protected cycle lane along Olive Bank Road between Aldi and Tesco.

1 respondent suggested a bridge over the Esk from Stoneybank Terrace to Station Road.

6.3.4 Section 4 (Link to Goose Green and Town Centre along River Esk)

9 respondents supported the proposals, and 3 mentioned that they think that the use of the flood defences to create a route away from the main roads is a great idea.

Cycle infrastructure

1 respondent suggested that the route could be extended further.

2 respondents suggested adding more cycle parking (near pharmacies, banks and food shops) and wondered how the proposals will link with other cycle routes.

1 respondent expressed concern about the route going under the low bridge.

Safety

1 respondent mentioned that walkers and cyclists don't often mix well, as there are some cyclists who are disrespectful / antisocial.

Greenspace

2 respondents mentioned that this section of the route will remove strips of grass from Goose Green, which could impact upon wildlife.

Suggestions

1 respondent suggested widening existing paths slightly and maintaining them so they aren't a hazard, instead of having them on the grass.

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 5 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Review traffic volumes on Stoneybank Terrace at peak times and review designs accordingly.

Impact on trees to be quantified when designs have been developed, in collaboration with the Flood Protection Scheme.

7. Feedback Received by Letter, Email and Live Chat

In addition to the feedback received from the online survey and website comments (outlined in section 5 and 6 respectively), correspondence relating to the consultation was also received by letter, email and through the Live Chat function, available via the virtual consultation room. This correspondence is summarised in sections 7.1 to 7.3. In each section, the number in brackets after the comment relates to how many times the themes were raised in the type of correspondence being summarised.

7.1 Feedback Received by Letter

Key themes from the feedback that was received via written correspondence has been summarised below:

- Objection to any loss of parking on Linkfield Road (1);
- Objection to introduction of floating bus stops on Linkfield Road (1);
- Concern about impact on congestion of proposals on Linkfield Road (1);
- Concern that cyclists may not use separate cycle lanes (1); and
- Suggestion of alternative route alignment for section on Linkfield Road (in the verge to the north of the road) [1].

Action:

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Concept Designs. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated by traffic modelling.

‘Floating’ bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

7.2 Feedback Received via Email

Feedback that was received via email has been summarised below. Feedback has been grouped by route, while general comments have been provided together.

General

- Objection to ‘floating’ bus stops (2);
- Objection to routes based on view that they would lead to increased congestion or air pollution (2);
- General preference for one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road (2);
- Musselburgh Flood Protection Scheme and Musselburgh Active Toun projects need to be integrated (2);
- The routes need to connect to form a coherent network (2);
- Designs need to consider users with visual impairments or disabilities, and those who are young, and provide appropriate crossing points (2);
- As part of the wider project, there is the opportunity to improve access to Pinkie playing fields (1);
- General objection to two-way separate cycle lanes (1);
- Money would be better spent on repairing potholes (1);
- Project needs to avoid mistakes of other projects, by neglecting to consider users other than cyclists (1);
- Project needs to consider the conservation area in Musselburgh and use materials and infrastructure that are compatible with this (1);
- Routes need to connect to the proposed journey hubs in the town (1);
- Street clutter needs to be considered, particularly in the conservation area (1);

- Importance of improving signage and road surfaces, on both existing and proposed routes (1);
- Need for segregating feature between cycle lane and carriageway (1);
- Need to consider new, inexperienced or less-confident cyclists in the consideration of one-way separate lanes and two-way separate cycle lanes (1);
- Clear markings are required wherever a cycle lane crosses a side road (1);
- General support for improving walking and cycling in Musselburgh (1);
- On any shared paths, signage needs to be provided to highlight to cyclists that they should not speed and that they should use their bell to alert pedestrians (1); and
- There should be a safe and convenient connection between Fisherrow Harbour and Portobello (1).

Action:

Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated by traffic modelling.

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Concept Designs. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

Concept designs to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Route 1 West

- Concern about impact on emergency service vehicles, delivery vehicles and refuse vehicles on Edinburgh Road / General concerns about reducing carriageway width (3);
- Objection to possibility of bus stop relocation / removal in Route 1 West proposals (2);
- Safety concern regarding potential conflict between residents accessing / egressing properties (2);
- Safety concern regarding 'floating' bus stops and 'floating' parking bays, and view that these should be in their current position, at the kerb (2);
- Need to retain traffic islands on Edinburgh Road (2);
- Objection to alignment of Route 1 West (1);
- Concern about road geometry of Edinburgh Road and impact on safety (1);
- Objection to any loss of parking on Edinburgh Road (1);
- Query about whether there is enough space on Edinburgh Road to accommodate the proposals (1);
- Need to consider how cyclists will access separate cycle lane from North High Street (1);
- Designs need to consider how vehicles will cross cycle lanes at side roads and should seek to reduce instances of vehicles blocking the cycle lane (1);
- General query regarding who would be the beneficiaries of the proposals (1);
- Money would be better spent on providing better access to the existing cycle lanes and providing better signage (1);
- Money would be better spent on highlighting the existing cycle lanes (1);
- Objection to both Option A and B (1);
- Kerb segregation is not necessary (1); and
- Need to consider residents parking on Edinburgh Road (1).

Action:

Impact on emergency service, delivery and refuse vehicles to be investigated and strategy to be developed.

Concept designs to illustrate proposals where protected cycle lanes cross side roads and accesses.

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 1 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

'Floating' bus stops and parking spaces to be reviewed in the Route 1 Concept Design.

Concept design to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Route 2

- Retention of parking on Linkfield Road is necessary / objection to Option B due to loss of parking (2);
- Junction of Windsor Gardens and Linkfield Road is currently unsafe and needs to be upgraded (1);
- Traffic islands need to be retained / provided on Linkfield Road (1);
- Speed limit on Linkfield Road should be reduced to 20mph (1);
- General preference for Option A on Linkfield Road (1);
- General preference for Option A at Levenhall Roundabout (1);
- General feeling that a "Dutch"-style roundabout is too much of a culture change (1);
- Feeling that a "Dutch"-style roundabout would need to be monitored, if it was to be introduced (1);
- Cyclists should be permitted to use the Electric Bridge until any new bridge is constructed (1);
- New, inexperienced or less-confident cyclists may be uncomfortable on the proposed on-road section on New Street, and a traffic-free route along the coast should be developed alongside the existing proposals (1). It should be noted that a route along the coast is being investigated as part of a separate project;
- If New Street proposals are taken forward, then use of promenade by cyclists should be reviewed (1);
- Signalised crossings for pedestrians and cyclists are required at the junction of Millhill and Linkfield Road (1);
- Any future development on Haddington Road should be made to contribute to a future widening of the proposed cycle lanes, to mitigate against possible pinch points in the current proposals (1);
- Speed limit on Haddington Road should be reduced to 30mph (1);
- A link to the housing developments in Wallyford should be provided (1); and
- A crossing across Salters Road, at Wallyford Toll Roundabout, is required (1).

Action:

Junction of Windsor Gardens and Linkfield Road to be reviewed.

Possibility of reducing speed limit on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road to be reviewed against Council policy.

Impact on parking to be quantified during development of Route 2 Concept Design. Parking to be retained wherever possible.

Concept design to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements).

Possible additional improvements at Wallyford Toll Roundabout to be reviewed against wider Council plans at this location.

Route 5

- Preference to improve the existing route from the town centre to Queen Margaret University / Musselburgh railway station (1);
- Objection to removal of any trees (1);
- General preference for Option B on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace (1);
- At locations where any proposed cycle lane crosses a minor road on Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace, the cycle lane should have priority (1);
- Route through development site is indirect and it would be better if the route followed the railway line (1);
- Link between Route 5 and Tesco should be explored (1); and
- Measures should be considered to enhance cycle safety at the roundabout on Whitehill Farm Road (junction of Whitehill Farm Road and Clayknowes Road) [1].

Action:

Link to Tesco to be explored.

Additional improvements at Whitehill Farm Road roundabout to be explored.

7.3 Live Chat discussions

Feedback that was received during discussions with visitors to the virtual consultation room is presented below:

- Concern about floating bus stops (1);
- Junction of Edinburgh Road, Newhailes Road, North High Street and Harbour Road being unsuitable for cycling (under current conditions) [1];
- Concern about cyclists using pavements (1);
- Comment that proposals would not be used by club cyclists and that the money would be better spent on repairing road surfaces, so that club cyclists do not have to swerve to avoid them (1); and
- Concern about behaviours of some cyclists (1).

Additional comments were received that did not directly related to the routes being consulted upon. These have been presented below:

- Suggestion that there should be some online training available regarding how to use the e-bikes in Musselburgh (1); and
- Concern about parking next to bus lanes on Musselburgh High Street (1).

Action:

'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs.

8. Summary and Next Steps

8.1 Summary

This report has summarised the consultation exercise that was undertaken during the Concept Design stage of the first phase of the MAT project. The consultation was focused on Route 2 (A199 to Wallyford Roundabout), Route 5 (Old Craighall to Goose Green) and the western half of Route 1 (Milton Road East to New Street). The consultation lasted 8 weeks, taking place between Monday 24 May and Friday 16 July 2021.

Interested parties were given a variety of ways to respond, including meetings with stakeholders, local groups, and local residents, an online survey, website comments, written and electronic correspondence, and by live chatting with representatives of the project team.

It was found that the majority of consultees were generally supportive of the Musselburgh Active Toun project. In the online survey of 309 responses, on average 63% of respondents either strongly support or support the aim of improving conditions for people walking and wheeling in Musselburgh, with the equivalent figure for cycling being 59%. 64% of respondents agreed that making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle can help reduce the impacts of climate change.

59% of respondents support the introduction of separate cycle lanes on Edinburgh Road and 50% supported them on the A199.

Feedback was requested on various design options, and this will be used to develop a preferred Concept Design for each of the routes. The feedback that was received by each of these methods is summarised in sections 4 to 7 of this report. The agreed actions are listed below:

Table 8.1: Actions for Concept Design following consultation

Route	Actions	Timescales
General / Actions applicable to all routes or wider project	Impact on parking to be quantified during development of the Concept Design. Parking proposals to be developed in parallel with a separate parking review that is being undertaken in Musselburgh.	In current stage (Concept Design). Information from parking review to be fed into proposals (Developed Design)
	Impact of proposals on traffic operations to be evaluated through traffic modelling	At subsequent stage (Developed Design)
	Concept designs to show pedestrian infrastructure (both existing and proposed improvements)	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate proposals where protected cycle lanes cross side roads and accesses	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to show dropped kerbs and uncontrolled crossings	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Consider forming an advisory / steering group made up of local people (including community representatives with specific accessibility needs and those with an interest in walking, wheeling and cycling)	At subsequent stage (Developed Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate measures for cyclists to transition between protected cycle lanes and side roads, and how cyclists can make all manoeuvres at junctions	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate traffic calming measures that are proposed	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Impact on emergency service, delivery and refuse vehicles to be investigated and strategy to be developed	In current stage (Concept Design)

Route	Actions	Timescales
	'Floating' bus stops to be reviewed in the Concept Designs	In current stage (Concept Design)
	'Floating' parking bays to be reviewed in the Concept Designs	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Concept designs to illustrate how access to residential properties will be retained	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Investigate potential for street trial	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Disabled parking bays to be shown in Concept Design plans	In current stage (Concept Design). Information from parking review to be fed into proposals (Developed Design)
	Dropped kerbs to be included in the design where appropriate	In current stage (Concept Design)
Route 1 West	East Lothian Council to further engage with City of Edinburgh Council on connection into Edinburgh	Ongoing
	Junctions of New Street / A199 and A199 / Milton Road East to be looked at in more detail at Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
Route 2	Review traffic volumes on Millhill at peak times and review designs accordingly	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Junction of Windsor Gardens and Linkfield Road to be reviewed	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Possibility of reducing speed limit on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road to be reviewed against Council policy	Action to be passed to Council officers responsible for Speed Limit Policy and evaluating suggested changes
	Possible additional improvements at Wallyford Toll Roundabout to be reviewed against wider Council plans at this location	Separate study to be undertaken to look at link between The Loan, Wallyford, and Wallyford Toll Roundabout, to tie into existing infrastructure between Wallyford Toll and Strawberry Corner
	Visibility at side road junctions on New Street to be reviewed during development of Route 2 Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Pedestrian infrastructure at junction of Eskside West and New Street to be reviewed during development of Route 2 Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
Route 5	Impact on trees to be quantified when designs have been developed, in collaboration with the Flood Protection Scheme	Ongoing collaboration with Musselburgh Flood Protection Scheme. Impact likely to be quantified between Stage 2 (Concept Design) and Stage 3 (Developed Design)
	Pedestrian infrastructure at bridge over East Coast Mainline to be reviewed during development of Concept Design	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Link to Tesco to be explored	To be investigated separately as a local link
	Additional improvements at Whitehill Farm Road roundabout to be explored	In current stage (Concept Design)
	Review traffic volumes on Stoneybank Terrace at peak times and review designs accordingly	In current stage (Concept Design)

8.2 Next Steps

Following the completion of the consultation, we will identify a preferred design for each of the routes, which will be progressed through the next design stages (Developed Design and Technical Design). At each stage there will be further consultation with the public, local businesses and community groups. Those who asked to be kept informed of the consultation will be notified when the next stage of consultation is going live.

It should be noted that the preferred designs will consider the consistency of infrastructure provision within Musselburgh.

Consultation on Route 1 East will take place later in 2021, once we have done more work to understand potential impacts on local businesses and town centre residents.

Construction of the project aims to begin in 2023 and be completed in 2024-25.

Appendix A Leaflet

Musselburgh Active Town



Online Consultation

View the proposals and let us know your thoughts via the following channels:

Website (including online survey,
detailed comments and live chat):

musselburghactivetoun.info

Contact us:

musselburghactivetoun@eastlothian.gov.uk

**Musselburgh Active Town,
Transport Planning, John Muir House,
Brewery Park, Haddington EH41 3HA**



HAVE YOUR SAY


Musselburgh is a great place to live, work and visit but we want to make it even better!

We'd like to introduce new and improved spaces for walking, wheeling and cycling so that making these choices is safer and more comfortable. The spaces could help reduce noise and emissions, support people to choose healthier journeys and so make the Toun nicer for everyone.


Look at the proposals, let us know your thoughts and help us make Musselburgh a vibrant town which you can travel around easily and affordably.

Following government guidance regarding COVID-19, our consultation will be taking place online for now. We will be following up with face-to-face meetings with local people and businesses when it is safe to do so.

musselburghactivetoun.info



Versions of this leaflet are available on request on audiotape, in Braille or in your own language.

 01620 827199



Appendix B Stakeholders

Meeting Notes

Project	Musselburgh Active Toun	Job No:	60625808
Subject	Virtual meeting with Stakeholders		
Prepared by:	William Prentice	Date:	09/06/2021
Checked by:	Paul Matthews	Date:	09/06/2021

Review / Revision History:

Revision No.	Date of Revision:	Description of Revision:	Revision Made By:	Approved by:
0	09/06/2021	Draft	WP	PM
1	10/06/2021	Issue to attendees	WP	PM

Date:	Tuesday 8 June 2021
Time:	19:00 to 20:30
Location:	Virtual meeting (Microsoft Teams)
Purpose:	Online discussion session with stakeholders

Attendees

Name	Organisation
	Inveresk Village Society, Musselburgh Conservation Society
	Musselburgh & Inveresk Community Council
	Sustaining Musselburgh
	Wallyford Community Council
	Musselburgh & Inveresk Community Council
	Musselburgh & Inveresk Community Council
Stuart Baxter (SB)	East Lothian Council, Musselburgh Area Partnership
Paul Matthews (PM)	AECOM
William Prentice (WP)	AECOM
Michael Naysmith (MN)	East Lothian Council

Meeting Notes

AECOM gave a short presentation on the project, the current stage and the materials that are available online.

Following the presentation there was the opportunity for attendees to ask questions. The notes below are the key points that were raised during this discussion session.

It was highlighted that Musselburgh Promenade is very busy and that some cyclists travel at inappropriate speeds along it. The route along New Street is also very busy with cyclists, and both vehicles and cyclists can travel along New Street at inappropriate speeds. It was queried whether both a route along New Street (Route 2) and the Promenade should be available to cyclists. Similar concerns regarding the promenade and behaviours of some cyclists was also raised.

One of the attendees spoke about Portobello Promenade and how they would cycle on the road at periods where they knew the promenade would be busy. The signage ('share with care' / 'welcome considerate cyclists'-type signage) was also highlighted as being used on Portobello Promenade and how this could be used in Musselburgh too.

The different types of users who are likely to be using each facility was mentioned: those wanting to travel quickly from A to B (MAT Route 2) and those out for a more leisurely cycle (Promenade). It was suggested that ensuring there is a safe, attractive on-road facility to cater for those traveling through the area (A to B) would alleviate some of the issues on the promenade.

The differences between the promenades in Portobello and Musselburgh were highlighted, primarily that Portobello is much wider. Portobello Promenade is a lot wider, but it is so busy that cycle speeds are 'self-enforcing'. There are also objects (such as café tables and chairs) that narrow the path at various locations.

There is a need for consistency of treatment for Route 1 West between what is proposed in East Lothian and what is proposed in Edinburgh, if the route were to be continued to Portobello. It was also highlighted that it will also be important to ensure consistency with Route 1 East at North High Street. Junctions provide the opportunity to transition users between different types of infrastructure, but the aim would be to provide a coherent and consistent treatment.

It was questioned how locations where a protected cycle lane crosses a side road could be made safe. It was suggested that there are various options, which could include 'bending-in' the cycle lane to the side road (to allow vehicles more time to react to cyclists crossing), raising the crossing with ramps to slow traffic, using coloured surfacing and providing signage. It was noted that this risk is heightened if the separate cycle lane were to be two-way, as cyclists would be coming from both directions. The aim is to provide high-quality, safe infrastructure.

A question was asked about cycle parking and whether this would be considered. The answer was that this will be considered as part of the project, that parking would be provided at key locations, and that making this feel safe and secure would be important. The presence of cycle hire points within the project extents was noted and it was suggested that opportunities to enhance this could be explored too.

A question was asked about social media and it was suggested that Musselburgh Area Partnership could be tagged in posts in future. They would be happy to re-tweet or quote the posts.

The pros and cons of one-way and two-way protected cycle lanes were mentioned. A member of the project team answered that they were not aware of any study that had looked at collisions at one-way and two-way protected cycle lanes. AECOM took an action to research whether any such study had been undertaken. A member of AECOM gave an overview of the pros and cons.

The segregation of shared use / dual use paths was questioned and whether this was something that had been considered. AECOM advised that this is something that could be considered, but it would depend on the environment and 'purpose' of the path. The concepts are still high-level but there are various options for segregation of shared-use / dual-use paths, if this was desired.

A question was asked about how the bridge over the East Coast Mainline on Whitehill Farm Road would be treated and highlighted previous proposals to improve the roundabout at Whitehill Farm Road / Clayknowes Road. It was suggested that the replacement of the bridge could have been made a requirement of planning permission for the new developments in this area. It was advised that cost likely made the replacement of the bridge prohibitive due to the likelihood that the railway line would have to be closed. It was noted that the existing pedestrian environment is sub-standard too and suggested that possible solutions could be using traffic signals or considering making alterations to the existing traffic operations. The difficulty in restricting access for certain vehicles was highlighted, due to the fact that it is a bus route and that vehicle access is required for access to Musselburgh railway station.

The importance of ensuring all changes cater for those with mobility needs and wheelchair users was highlighted, in particular the length of distances they can travel, and this should be improved as far as possible as part of the project.

A question about the Drift Path and when it will be completed was asked. An action to investigate this and to follow up was taken by the Council. It was advised that a section of the Segregated Active Travel Corridor (SATC) path, of which the Drift Path is a component, had recently been completed adjacent to Queen Margaret University.

The proposed journey hub at The Brunton in Musselburgh was mentioned, and how / whether the MAT proposals would integrate with this. It was advised that the footprint for Route 1 East had been considered in the design of the journey hub in order to future-proof it. It was noted that providing safe cycle links to the journey hub are vital.

A member questioned what was proposed in Haugh Park and how it would look. It was advised that the designs are still at a very high level, but that the alignment was chosen due to the existing constraints on Eskview Terrace (road width and parking). It was explained that this section would likely require a retaining wall and some trees may need to be removed, although this would depend on the alignment and any trees that were lost would be replaced nearby. It was highlighted that the alignment will depend on the proposals for the Flood Protection Scheme, due to the proposed bridge replacement. In response, it was highlighted that the ramps would need to be gentle enough for use by all users. It was advised that all infrastructure will be designed to be accessible to everyone, and that the gradient of any ramp would be shallow enough to be able to be enjoyed by everyone and that any ramp would include landings.

The importance of engaging with public transport operators was highlighted. They have been notified of the scheme going live and operators will be key partners in the project moving forwards.

Appendix C Local Groups

Meeting Notes

Project	Musselburgh Active Toun	Job No:	60625808
Subject	Virtual meeting with local groups		
Prepared by:	William Prentice	Date:	15/06/2021
Checked by:	Paul Matthews	Date:	15/06/2021

Review / Revision History:

Revision No.	Date of Revision:	Description of Revision:	Revision Made By:	Approved by:
0	15/06/2021	Draft	WP	PM
1	21/06/2021	Issue	WP	PM
2	29/06/2021	Revised following receipt of comments from attendees	WP	PM

Date:	Thursday 10 June 2021
Time:	19:00 to 20:00
Location:	Virtual meeting (Microsoft Teams)
Purpose:	Online discussion session with local groups

Attendees

Name	Organisation
	Queen Margaret University (QMU)
	Changes
Daniel Prince (DP)	Sustrans
Paul Matthews (PM)	AECOM
William Prentice (WP)	AECOM
Michael Naysmith (MN)	East Lothian Council

Meeting Notes

AECOM gave a short presentation on the project, the current stage and the materials that are available online.

Following the presentation there was the opportunity for attendees to ask questions. The notes overleaf are the key points that were raised during this discussion session.

A member noted that they didn't think they had received a leaflet. AECOM took an action to follow up with the printing and delivery company.

Post-meeting note – The member later confirmed that they had received a leaflet. AECOM to follow up with the printing and delivery company for avoidance of doubt.

Excitement at the proposals was expressed and the member was keen to look over the detail. They highlighted that, in their view, something 'big' needs to be done to achieve a significant modal shift. In their experience they find that inexperienced cyclists are happy to travel on traffic-free paths, but cycling on the road is a big step and one that many feel uncomfortable making. It is important to have a network that would allow people to cycle as part of day-to-day journeys. It was highlighted that networks and routes are only as strong as their weakest part, and that a sub-standard section can put users off using the whole route / network.

It was noted that compromises will likely be required, particularly with regards to parking and the 'car lobby', and the importance of having political backing was highlighted. It was noted that Elected Members have been engaged on the project and ELC have done a lot of work to build political support.

The details at the junction of Milton Road East and the A199 and the route along Linkfield Road were mentioned. In both cases the need to consider all manoeuvres that cyclists would undertake as highlighted, and not just along the primary route corridor. It was also said that a two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of Linkfield Road would seem to be the most obvious solution. It was noted that the plans are at a high level at this stage and that the detail will be developed in due course, however these are all points that will be considered in the design.

It was highlighted that students at the university like the traffic-free path between Edinburgh and Musselburgh. It was noted that cyclists are not as comfortable cycling on the roads and in a few areas in particular:

- Whitehill Farm Road – where there is parking on both sides of the road and cyclists tend to travel close to the parked vehicles to provide some space to traffic. This risks them being struck by the door of a vehicle.
- Junction at the Ship Inn

It was noted that NCN route 76 is very convoluted and people find it difficult to find and follow. It was said that providing more direct and visible infrastructure would be beneficial. The existing speed cushions on New Street were highlighted and how these encourage cyclists to weave to avoid them (from the primary riding position to the secondary riding position). An alternative traffic calming should be considered in future. These comments were noted and it was suggested that there may be a general preference towards raised tables as these also provide a benefit for crossing pedestrians.

It was noted that engaging with schools is key and that the engagement and new infrastructure could encourage more pupils to cycle to school.

A general preference towards two-way separate cycle lanes was expressed, as this provides a bit more space for overtaking and for longer types of bicycle, such as adapted and recumbent bikes.

The attendees discussed the possibility of forming an advisory group of local people / community steering group who could be engaged to consider and develop ideas. An interest in this was expressed and it was suggested that there could be local Spokes members who could provide a cyclist's perspective. Two members suggested inviting a broader range of groups, such as including pedestrians, disabled users, and people scooting or using adapted bikes. It was noted that there may be staff or students at the university who could provide some of these perspectives and they could try to contact them via the Student's Union.

It was highlighted that some of the streets being considered for quiet street-type treatments are currently not very quiet. Millhill was the primary street that was noted. It was explained that on race days and at school drop-off and pick-up times the street can be busy and there can be vehicles idling. In response, it was noted that it is recognised that not all of the streets where a quiet street-type intervention has been offered as an option would currently meet the criteria. Some of these streets would require some measures to reduce traffic volumes and / or speeds to an acceptable level. Some possible interventions were suggested, such as raised tables and / or modal filters. It was highlighted that the infrastructure needs to be suitable for all users, including young or inexperienced cyclists, and that the designs will be developed with this in mind.

A question regarding whether QMU currently have access to any adapted bikes was asked. The member responded that they don't currently have access to any, and that they had applied for funding for some but were not successful. QMU have funding to put in cycle parking suitable for adapted bikes.

Meeting Notes

Project	Musselburgh Active Toun	Job No:	60625808
Subject	Discussion with representative from Musselburgh Business Partnership		
Prepared by:	William Prentice	Date:	29/06/2021

Review / Revision History:

Revision No.	Date of Revision:	Description of Revision:	Revision Made By:	Approved by:
0	29/06/2021	Draft	WP	PM

Date:	Monday 21 June 2021
Time:	10:00 to 10:50
Location:	Virtual meeting (Microsoft Teams)
Purpose:	Online discussion with representative from Musselburgh Business Partnership

Attendees

Name	Organisation
	Musselburgh Business Partnership
Liz Hunter (LH)	East Lothian Council
William Prentice (WP)	AECOM

Meeting Notes

AECOM provided a summary of the project and the materials that are currently online.

A member stated that it is their opinion that cyclists should be kept off the High Street. They feel that the environment is currently not conducive to cycling. It was suggested that the High Street is a destination for cyclists and that the project, along with other measures, could make the High Street a more pleasant place to travel to and through.

The importance of sharing the consultation results and articulating why decisions have been made was highlighted. The recent addition of new bus stops on the High Street was noted, and how people haven't been advised why these have been introduced.

There was a discussion around notifying the public of the consultation. It was asked whether there has been enough publicity and the response was that they felt that there could have been more. The potential to put up plans in vacant

units was mentioned. It was advised that this was considered, and could be explored further during the consultation on Route 1 East.

It was advised that the consultation link was shared with the Business Partnership. It was said that the project would be discussed with the other members of the Business Partnership at the end of the month. It was suggested sharing it on Facebook on some of the bigger local groups, such as Musselburgh Folk. An action to explore this and discuss this was taken.

Appendix D Residents

Musselburgh – Active Toun - Meeting Summary	
Meeting	Meeting with Residents of Edinburgh Road and surrounding area
Meeting Date	15/06/2021
Meeting Time	18:30
Meeting Location	Edinburgh Road

Attendees	Organisation
Liz Hunter Edinburgh Road Residents	East Lothian Council

Item	Summary	Actions Led By
1.	Background	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The meeting was called at the request of residents and arranged by [REDACTED]. 6 attendees were anticipated; approximately 12 attended. Residents provided feedback on active travel schemes and the Route 1 West proposals generally and then specifically in relation to the section between the ELC / CEC boundary and Murdoch Green. 	
2.	General Feedback	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposals will cause more congestion and air pollution as traffic will be forced into reduced roadspace. The proposals will not encourage more people to use bikes or to walk; traffic levels are now back to normal and you won't get people back out of their cars. The existing footways and cycle lanes are perfectly adequate; people need educating in how to use them properly. Cyclists need education on the highway code. Too many people cycle on the footway. Enforcement is needed to ensure people (cyclists) follow the highway code. The Edinburgh Road route will never be used by schoolchildren; parents will not let their kids use a cycle lane on a main road; society is too dangerous to let kids go to school unaccompanied in any event. The route should follow the coast or go through Newhailes, not a main road. The cycle lanes, especially if two way will be too narrow for sports cyclists; they will just use the road and so cause congestion. The road would be better split into 4 lanes; 2 for traffic and two for buses shared with cyclists. The money would be better spend on repairing the existing roads / funding care homes etc. 	

Item	Summary	Actions Led By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The online survey does not include motorcycles as a mode of transport. • The leaflet should not have been distributed as it was; it got lost in other junk mail. It should have been in an envelope addressed to the householder or included with other communications from the Council such as Council Tax notice. 	
3.	Edinburgh Road Proposals	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The junction of the lane between 33 and 35 Edinburgh Road and A199 Edinburgh Road has very poor visibility, especially to the right. An exiting driver has around 6 seconds to get out if the road to the right appears clear (based on sight distance for eastbound vehicles to the junction). Adding in a need to negotiate a two way cycle lane as well as two traffic lanes will create a significant road safety problem. • There is insufficient parking in the lane to accommodate residents; they compete with people parking to walk / walk dogs on the beach and one of the properties – 49c - operates as a bunkhouse for large numbers (<i>Google search suggests this has not been operating since 2019</i>). • The lane also serves the SW pumping station; parking in the lane can cause problems for SW vehicle access. • Refuse vehicles often have to reverse in to and along the lane as parked vehicles prevent them being able to turn. • Proposals will prevent residents parking outside their houses. Up to six cars can need to park outside the houses – they currently use the advisory cycle lane and footway. The proposals must allow parking on the A199 fronting the houses, especially as 4 of the residents are blue badge holders. • Proposals do not allow for emergency or delivery vehicles to access 37 to 59a Edinburgh Road. If vehicles stop on the main road they would completely block through traffic. • No provision made for pedestrians to cross – real issue now they will have to negotiate two lanes of traffic and cycle lanes. • Video indicates eastbound bus stop to east of lane will be removed (noted that plans do not). It is essential that the bus stop is retained. • The road is too narrow for what is proposed. There is not enough space for everything that's shown on the plans (two of them started pacing things out to prove the point). • Road drainage at alongside Murdoch Green a real problem now. How will this be addressed – the road floods every winter. • Two way cycle lane poses a real safety hazard. Drivers turning into the lane would not be able to see cyclists approaching from behind. There will be a fatality. 	
4.	Suggestions	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't progress scheme. • Education (for cyclists). 	

Item	Summary	Actions Led By
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement (of pavement cycling). • An off road cycle route should be provided instead, e.g. along coast or through Newhailes. • Introduce residents parking scheme. • Should this progress, before anything is constructed street trials must be conducted, especially of two way cycle lanes. It's no good to rely on how they work elsewhere. They must be tested here. 	

Author	Liz Hunter
Role	Project Manager
Date	16/06/2021

Meeting Notes

Project	Musselburgh Active Toun	Job No:	60625808
Subject	Meeting with Edinburgh Road residents (2021.07.15)		
Prepared by:	William Prentice	Date:	2021.07.16

Review / Revision History:

Revision No.	Date of Revision:	Description of Revision:	Revision Made By:	Approved by:
0	2021.07.16	DRAFT	WP	-

Date:	Thursday 15 July 2021
Time:	16:00 to 16:40
Location:	Edinburgh Road, at Musselburgh Shell
Purpose:	Meeting with Edinburgh Road residents

Attendees

Name	Organisation
Liz Hunter	East Lothian Council
William Prentice	AECOM
Around 10 local residents, residing on Edinburgh Road	

Meeting notes

Local residents made it clear that they felt the proposals were a road safety issue. Their main concerns were surrounding floating bus stops, 'floating' parking bays (parking bays on the offside of a cycle lane), and access to their properties (particularly across a bi-directional cycle lane).

Regarding floating bus stops, one local resident noted that they had an elderly family member who may have difficulties navigating using such an arrangement. There were also concerns surrounding the space available to implement such an arrangement. LH noted that the early design work has indicated that this is feasible, although further work will be done when we have a topographical survey, which is more accurate. WP explained that the plans are high-level and that alternative arrangements can be considered.

The local residents were not in favour of 'floating' parking bays, citing the fact that residents would have to cross the cycle lane to travel to and from their vehicles. There was also concern about visibility when emerging from their driveways, which could lead to them blocking the cycle lane and causing a collision. The residents advised that it can

take up to 5 minutes to emerge onto Edinburgh Road sometimes. The reason for the arrangement as shown on the drawings was explained – that it would mean vehicles parking would not have to cross the cycle lane. It was explained that an arrangement similar to the current arrangement could be considered. The local residents noted that they are not aware of there having been any collisions in the current arrangement. It was noted that we also need to consider what the situation will be like in the future, if there are more people cycling.

Access to properties was mentioned as a potential problem, particularly if the cycle lane was to be bi-directional. Residents were concerned that this could lead to a collision, particularly if they were to try to reverse into their driveway.

The local residents stated that they felt that the existing cycling provision is sufficient. It was noted that advisory cycle lanes are a low standard of provision and are less suited to enable unaccompanied children to use them. She also noted that much of the feedback that has been received is that users want segregated infrastructure. One local resident suggested that the fact that Cycling Proficiency is no longer being delivered in schools is a contributing factor to children not feeling comfortable cycling on the road. It was explained that the funding that the Council have been awarded cannot be spent on Cycling Proficiency. It was mentioned that there will be a programme of behaviour change associated with the project. One local resident stated that they felt that making the cycle lane more visible would be beneficial, such as through the use of coloured surfacing.

There was a question regarding pedestrian crossing provision and the removal of islands. It was explained that these are not shown on the drawings but that they will be retained wherever possible and the project will be seeking to make improvements for pedestrians too.

Residents questioned how the segregation would look in practice. It was explained that there are various options, with one option being having the cycle lane at road level. There was a question about how residents would access their properties in such an arrangement, and it was explained that there would be a gap in the kerb wherever there was parking or driveways / accesses.

There were questions about the next steps for the project. It was explained that consultation would take place at each design stage, and anyone who signed up to the mailing list would be notified. It was also explained that Road Safety Audits would be undertaken following the preliminary and detailed design stages.

A question was asked if the local residents could support an arrangement more similar to the existing arrangement, but with the cycle lanes being segregated. There appeared to be some consensus amongst the residents that this would be accessible. One resident noted that they would be happy, so long as their parking and access would not be affected.

Post-meeting note: In a follow-up email, the residents stated that the kerbs used to segregate the cycle path are unnecessary and would create an additional hazard.

Appendix E Online Survey Questions

<Page 1>

Welcome to our survey!

Why should I fill in this survey?

- We'd like your feedback on our designs for a new network of routes for people walking, wheeling, cycling and travelling sustainably in and around Musselburgh.
- We'll show you some simple design drawings and images and ask you a few questions.
- This should take up to 15 minutes.

What is this project about?

Musselburgh is a great place to live, work and visit but we want to make it even better!

We'd like to introduce new and improved spaces for walking, wheeling and cycling so that making these choices is safer and more comfortable. The spaces could help reduce noise and emissions, support people to choose healthier journeys and so make the Toun nicer for everyone.

Look at the proposals, let us know your thoughts and help us make Musselburgh a vibrant town which you can travel around easily and affordably.

At the moment the proposals are at an early stage and we'd like to hear your feedback and opinions.

The project team is made up of East Lothian Council with support by design consultants AECOM and funding from Sustrans Scotland, who are supported by Transport Scotland

.

<Page 2>

How will my data be used?

The information that you share with us will only be used by the project team to inform the development of this project. At the end of the project all records will be permanently removed. If you wish to be removed from the subscription list or have any of your details removed or amended, then please contact the Council's project manager using the contact details on the project webpage: musselburghactivetoun.info

The project team will feed back on the results of the survey to the public and stakeholders as the project is progressed. If you have any queries, please contact musselburghactivetoun@eastlothian.gov.uk

Thank you for taking part in our survey.

Introduction

1. To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by walking and wheeling?
 - Strongly support
 - Support
 - Neither support or oppose
 - Oppose
 - Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' the aim of improving walking and wheeling conditions - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:


2. To what extent would you like to make it easier for people to travel around Musselburgh by cycling?
 - Strongly support
 - Support
 - Neither support or oppose
 - Oppose
 - Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' the aim of improving cycling conditions - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:

<Page 4>

3. One way that the impacts of climate change can be reduced is by encouraging more people to walk, wheel or cycle instead of using a car for local journeys. To what extent do you agree that making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle can help reduce the impacts of climate change?
 - Strongly support
 - Support
 - Neither support or oppose
 - Oppose
 - Strongly oppose




The current stage of this project is looking at routes 1, 2 and 5.

- Route 1 (A199 Edinburgh Road to Millhill)
- Route 2 (A199 Edinburgh Road to Wallyford Toll Roundabout)
- Route 5 (Old Craighall to Goose Green, via Musselburgh town centre)

At this stage, we want to ask people in Musselburgh for feedback, views and opinions on the design options for Route 1 West, Route 2 and Route 5. We will use this to help us develop final designs for each route.

We will consult on Route 1 East, which runs through the town centre, later in the year once we have done more work to understand potential impacts on local businesses and town centre residents.



4. The following questions are about the proposals for Route 1 West, Route 2 and Route 5. Please select which area(s) you would like to comment on:

- Route 1 West (Milton Road East to New Street)
- Route 2 (A199 Edinburgh Road to Wallyford Toll Roundabout)
- Route 5 (Old Craighall to Goose Green, via Musselburgh town centre)
- All of the above


<IF RESPONDENT SELECTS "Route 1 West" OR "All of the above", DIRECT THEM TO PAGE 6.
IF RESPONDENT SELECTS "Route 2" BUT NOT ROUTE 1 WEST, DIRECT THEM TO PAGE 12. IF
RESPONDENT ANSWERS "Route 5" BUT NOT ROUTE 1 WEST OR ROUTE 2, DIRECT THEM TO
PAGE 19>

Route 1 West

Route 1 will go from Milton Road East in the west to Millhill in the east, via Musselburgh town centre.

We are currently consulting only on the west section route of this route, between Milton Road East and New Street.

We will consult on Route 1 East, which runs through the town centre, later in the year once we have done more work to understand potential impacts on local businesses and town centre residents.



This is the first step in providing an improved link into Musselburgh town centre and to link Musselburgh and Portobello. Route 1 West would connect into Route 2 at New Street, providing a safe link between Musselburgh and the Milton Road East junction.

Route 1 West and Route 1 East offer the potential to transform the heart of Musselburgh and create a destination for people walking, wheeling and cycling. A well-connected High Street will attract local people to it, as well as visitors. Connections with nearby City of Edinburgh Council cycle routes would encourage more local visitors from Edinburgh. The route aims to create a more vibrant and prosperous town centre for businesses and residents.

The options that we are proposing will be described in more detail in the following questions. Both of the options include separate cycle lanes and 'floating bus stops'. More information on separate cycle lanes is provided in the next question.

Floating bus stops are where a separate cycle lane runs behind the passenger boarding area at a bus stop, between the boarding area and the pavement. Cyclists have to give way to crossing pedestrians.

Floating bus stops reduce the risk of conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles by providing each group of users with their own dedicated space.

You can read more about the route on our website – musselburghactivetoun.info/route-1/

<Page 7>

We are proposing to build separate cycle lanes (a dedicated space for cyclists separated from the pavement and road by kerbs on either side) on Edinburgh Road.

This is what separate cycle lanes look like:



5. To what extent do you support the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 Edinburgh Road, between Milton Road East and New Street?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:

<Page 8>

6. To what extent do you support the aim of making it easier to access Musselburgh High Street for people walking, wheeling and cycling?
- Strongly support
 - Support
 - Neither support or oppose
 - Oppose
 - Strongly oppose

You said that you 'INSERT RESPONSE' – could you briefly explain your view?

<Page 9>

7. To what extent do you support the aim of making it easier to walk, wheel and cycle between Musselburgh, Portobello and onwards into Edinburgh?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you 'INSERT RESPONSE' – could you briefly explain your view?



8. Option A is to have a two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of the road. Parking would be provided at locations where vehicles currently park. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:

9. Option B is to have one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of the road. Parking would be provided at locations where vehicles currently park, where possible. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose

- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:


<Page 11>

10. Do you have any more feedback or general comments about Route 1 West?

Space for comments:

Route 2

Route 2 will go from the A199 Edinburgh Road in the west to Wallyford Toll Roundabout in the east, running along New Street, James Street, Millhill, A199 Linkfield Road and A199 Haddington Road.



We are proposing that New Street, James Street and Millhill would be turned into quiet streets (streets where the traffic speed and volume are reduced). This could include by providing raised crossings to make it easier for pedestrians to cross the road, as well as slow traffic.

Separate cycle lanes (dedicated spaces for cyclists separated from the pavement and road by kerbs) would be built on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road.

This route will provide a direct route for people who want to pass through the town quickly, but it will also link into the town centre. The route links up important destinations like; Fisherrow Harbour, Loretto School, Musselburgh Racecourse, Musselburgh East Community Centre, Wallyford Park & Ride, and the proposed housing developments in Wallyford.

The options that we are proposing will be described in more detail in the following questions. Both of the options include separate cycle lanes and 'floating bus stops' on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road. More information on separate cycle lanes is provided in the next question.

Floating bus stops are where a separate cycle lane runs behind the passenger boarding area at a bus stop, between the boarding area and the pavement. Cyclists have to give way to crossing pedestrians.

Floating bus stops reduce the risk of conflict between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles by providing each group of users with their own dedicated space.

You can read more about the route on our website – musselburghactivetoun.info/route-2/

<Page 13>

We are proposing to build separate cycle lanes (a dedicated space for cyclists separated from the pavement and road by kerbs on either side) on Linkfield Road and Haddington Road.

This is what separate cycle lanes look like:



11. To what extent do you support the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 at Linkfield Road and Haddington Road?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' the introduction of separate cycle lanes on the A199 - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:



Figure 1 – New Street to become a quiet street with raised tables (a raised section of road that's ramped on each side to make crossing easier) at junctions. All parking would be kept




Figure 2 – James Street and Millhill to become a quiet street with raised tables at junctions. All parking would be kept

Further detail about this section of the route can be viewed on our website:


musselburghactivetoun.info/route-2/

12. Both Option A and Option B propose turning New Street, James Street and Millhill into quiet streets. To what extent do you agree that what we are proposing is sufficient?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:



13. Option A is to have a two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of Linkfield Road, with parking being kept on the south side. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:


14. Option B is to have one-way separate cycle lanes on both sides of Linkfield Road, with parking being removed on both sides. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support

- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:



Option A is to have the two-way separate cycle lane crossing Ravensheugh Road, with the roundabout remaining otherwise unchanged.


Option B is a "Dutch"-style roundabout, which includes separate cycle lanes around the roundabout and new crossings across each approach to the roundabout. Pedestrians and cyclists would have priority over vehicles and it would be easier and safer to cross the road at this location. The roundabout would be narrowed, which would likely reduce speeds but could impact on queuing.

15. Which of the proposed options for Levenhall Roundabout do you prefer, if any?

- Option A
- Option B
- Something else
- Both options work

You said 'INSERT RESPONSE' – could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:



16. Option A is to have a two-way separate cycle lane on the north side of Haddington Road, with limited space for parking on the south side of the road. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:

17. Option B is to have one-way protected cycle lanes on both sides of Haddington Road, with no space for parking on both sides of the road. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:


<Page 18>

18. Do you have any more feedback or general comments about Route 2?

Space for comments:

Route 5

Route 5 will go from Old Craighall in the south to Goose Green in the north. It will run through the Craighall development site and past Queen Margaret University and Musselburgh railway station. It then travels along Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace and through Haugh Park. Finally, it crosses Olive Bank Road and runs to Goose Green alongside the River Esk.



We are proposing to build a 3m wide walking and cycling path through the Craighall development site and past QMU and Musselburgh railway station. Two options are proposed for Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace. The first turns them into quiet streets (streets where vehicle speeds and volumes are reduced). The second proposes separate cycle lanes (a dedicated space for cyclists separated from the pavement and road by kerbs).

The Flood Protection Scheme will design and build a 4m wide walking and cycling path on a retaining wall in Haugh Park, a new 4m wide crossing of the River Esk and a connection to Olive Bank Road. A new 4m wide walking and cycling path would be provided alongside the River Esk to Shorthope Street and on to Goose Green. This would also be designed and built as part of the Flood Protection Scheme.

This route will make it much easier for people working and studying at Queen Margaret University to get into Musselburgh town centre. It will link the settlements at Old Craighall, Eskview and Stoneybank to the town centre and to Musselburgh railway station. It will also provide an improved path next to the River Esk that could be enjoyed by all.

You can read more about the route on our website – musselburghactivetoun.info/route-5/



Figure 1 – Option A and Option B:
3m wide walking and cycling path
through Craighall development site





Figure 2 – Option A and Option B: 3m wide shared path
adjacent to Queen Margaret University and East Coast
Main Line

19. Both Option A and Option B propose a 3m wide walking and cycling path through the Craighall development site and linking to Whitehill Farm Road, Queen Margaret University and Musselburgh railway station. To what extent do you agree that what we are proposing is sufficient?
- Strongly agree
 - Agree
 - Neither agree nor disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly disagree

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:



20. Option A is to turn Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace into quiet streets, with parking being kept on both sides of the road. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?
Space for comments:

21. Option B is to have a two-way separate cycle lane on the south side of Whitehill Farm Road and Stoneybank Terrace, with parking being removed on both sides. To what extent do you support this option?

- Strongly support

- Support
- Neither support or oppose
- Oppose
- Strongly oppose

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:




Figure 1 – Option A and Option B: 4m wide walking and cycling path on a retaining wall in Haugh Park

Further detail about this section of the route can be viewed on our website: musselburghactivetoun.info/route-5/

The proposal is for a 4m wide walking and cycling path to be built on a retaining wall in Haugh Park. This would mean no parking needs to be removed from Eskview Terrace but it could mean removing some trees, depending on the alignment of the path. We will look at options for planting new trees to replace any that would be removed.

22. To what extent do you agree that what we are proposing is sufficient?

- Strongly agree
- Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly disagree

You said that you '*INSERT RESPONSE*' - could you briefly explain your view?

Space for comments:

<Page 23>

23. Do you have any more feedback or general comments about Route 5?

Space for comments:

<Page 24>

24. We have presented options on three different routes, what else should we be considering?

Space for comments:

25. We have told you our vision, what would you add?

Space for comments:

Questions about you

26. Are you filling in this survey on behalf of a business or an individual?

- Business
- Individual

<If respondent answers 'Business'> You said that you are responding on behalf of a business. If you wish, there is a space below to provide the name of the business that you are responding on behalf of:

Space for answer:

27. In order to understand how you travel we need to ask you a few questions about your circumstances.

Which of the following best reflects your current working status?

- In full time employment
- In part time employment (including semi-retired)
- In full / part time education
- Retired
- Volunteer
- Unemployed
- Other (please specify in the box below)

Space for comments:

28. *Depends on response for question 27*

- a. How do you usually travel to your place of work?
- b. How do you usually travel to your place of education?
- c. How do you usually make local journeys?

Please select all that apply

- Walk
- Wheelchair or other mobility aid
- Cycle
- Bus
- Car (as driver)
- Car (as passenger)
- Taxi
- Train
- Other mode not listed above (please specify in the box below)

Space for comments:

29. How would you prefer to travel there assuming you had the opportunities and conditions to do so?

Please select all that apply

- Continue to travel as I do now
- Walk
- Wheelchair or other mobility aid
- Cycle
- Bus
- Car (as driver)
- Car (as passenger)
- Taxi
- Tram
- Train
- Other mode not listed above (please specify in the box below)

Space for comments:

30. *If respondent selects continue to travel as I do now, move to question 31. If respondent selects any other response then ask:*

What prevents you from travelling this way?

Space for comments:

31. Please rank which of the following ways you most often use to make local journeys

(1 = most often, 7 = least often)

- Walk (including using a wheelchair and other mobility aids)
- Cycle
- Bus
- Car (as driver)
- Car (as passenger)
- Taxi
- Train
- Other mode not listed above (please specify in the box below)

Space for comments:

<Page 30>

32. Do you have any further comments about walking, wheeling and cycling in Musselburgh?
(Please provide as much detail as possible in the box below)

Space for comments:

<Page 31>

33. Please provide your postcode (the street name will help us if you don't know your postcode).

This will be used for mapping purposes only and will not be shared with any third party

Space for answer:

34. We're almost done...but before we conclude the survey, we would now like you to answer a few questions about yourself.

To which of these age groups do you belong?

- Under 16
- 16-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- 45-54
- 55-64
- 65-74
- 75+
- Prefer not to say

35. Please tell us your gender:

- Male
- Female
- Non-binary
- Prefer not to say

36. Do you have a long-term illness or disability that limits your daily activities?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

37. Are you the parent or guardian of children under the age of 16?

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to say

38. What is your ethnicity?

- White Scottish
- White other British
- White Irish
- White other
- Gypsy/Traveller
- Asian
- Chinese, Chinese Scottish or Chinese British
- Black African, African Scottish or African British
- Black Caribbean, Caribbean Scottish or Caribbean British
- Arab, Arab Scottish or Arab British
- Indian, Indian Scottish or Indian British
- Prefer not to say
- Any other or mixed background, please specify below:

Space for comments:

<Page 35>

39. How did you hear about this consultation?

- Leaflet received to my home
- Leaflet received to my business
- Friend or colleague
- Social media
- Newspaper advertisement or article
- Other (please specify below)

Space for comments:

<Page 35>

40. Would you like to be kept informed about the results of this consultation?

- Yes, I would like to be kept informed
- No, I would not like to be kept informed

<If no selected then end of survey, if yes selected then ask:>

If you would like us to keep you updated with the progress of the consultation please enter your e-mail address in the box below.

Space for answer:

We will only use this information to keep you informed about this consultation and to invite you to take part in further consultations on walking, wheeling and cycling improvements in Musselburgh.

Dmitrijs Stepanovs

AECOM Limited
1 Tanfield
Edinburgh EH3 5DA
United Kingdom

T: +44 131 301 8600
aecom.com