

Response ID BHLF-PA1N-7G3T-N

Submitted on 2015-08-05 10:04:46.205650

Evidence

Questions about you: In order for the evidence to be analysed and taken forward by the Inquiry we will need some further information about you and / or your organisation. Please note that all evidence submitted to the Inquiry may be published at any point during the Inquiry or when the Inquiry Report is issued. If you are responding as an organisation your full details will be published. If you are responding as an individual your name will be published, but your address will only be published if the Inquiry considers this to be relevant to the evidence submitted.

Organisation Name (if applicable):

Living Streets Scotland

Surname:

Thompson

Forename:

Chris

Postal Address:

[REDACTED]

Postcode:

[REDACTED]

Phone:

[REDACTED]

Email:

chris.thompson@livingstreets.org.uk

Are you responding as an organisation or an individual?

Organisation

Does your evidence relate to a particular period of time?

Not Answered

If yes, what period?:

Does your evidence relate to a particular event or activity?

Not Answered

If yes, please explain what the event / activity was.:

We are particularly interested in:• How you found out about what was happening, and how informed you were throughout the project• What did you think would happen• What actually happened• What were the effects if any, on you (or your organisation) at the time of the project• What if any, were the on-going or longer-term effects on you (or your organisation). Please write your evidence here.

We are particularly interested in:

Invariably a scheme of this scale and duration will have impacts on people using the city centre, particularly on foot. In terms of extent we reiterate that the scheme should, from the outset, have focused on transforming and improving the public realm and integrating the tram with walking journeys. Key stakeholders, including Living Streets Scotland, were not engaged in a meaningful way. Sadly there are significant, easily anticipated, and avoidable failures that have been carried through from the design stage. Each failure will now be technically challenging and expensive to rectify. These relate to:

1. Poor crossing facilities, using out-dated concepts such as barrier islands with inadequate space for volume of pedestrians (example York Place)
2. Unnecessary controlled crossings, not justified by the volume of traffic – which needlessly hinder pedestrian movement (example St Andrews Square)
3. Significant impacts on existing signalised crossings, causing extensive delays for pedestrians and dangerous crowding at junctions. This has led to risky crossing behaviour due to frustration (example Princes Street)
4. Conflicts with cyclists through poorly designed shared space (St. Andrews Square, / North St. Andrews Street)
5. Poor routes and integration between the tram route stops and major destinations and interchanges, creating indirect and diversionary routes to major facilities (Examples include: Gyle Shopping Centre / Edinburgh College / Bankhead Stop and Waverley railway station / St. Andrews Square)
6. Generally, worse conditions for walkers and cyclists in terms of safety, convenience and comfort (example Haymarket)

Do you have any documents which you think it would be useful for the Inquiry to see?

Yes

Details of documents:

Letter - Introduction & Conclusion

Upload documents:

Living Streets Scotland - Reponse Tram Inquiry.pdf was uploaded

Upload documents:

No file was uploaded

Upload documents:

No file was uploaded

Upload documents:

No file was uploaded