

58895 Silverknowes Road - Follow-Up to Previous Request

Reference FOI request: 58335

Why is Silverknowes Road North referenced in this correspondence? This is not a listed road in Edinburgh and not included CoEC adopted roads?

The choice of wording in the approved motion from Councillor Lang at the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee was drafted by Elected Members rather than Council officers. As such, it is not possible for council officers to provide an explanation for this wording which would need to be provided by Cllr Lang. However, it is considered safe to assume that this refers to the section of Silverknowes Road north of the junction with Silverknowes Parkway, which is distinct in character from the section south of this junction.

Why is Silverknowes Road South referenced in your correspondence as no works on this road were include included in ETRO/21/30C?

The choice of wording in the approved motion from Councillor Lang at the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee was drafted by Elected Members rather than Council officers. As such, it is not possible for council officers to provide an explanation for this wording which would need to be provided by Cllr Lang. However, it is considered safe to assume that this refers to the section of Silverknowes Road south of the junction with Silverknowes Parkway, which is distinct in character from the section north of this junction.

What options were investigated and proposed prior to the preferred solution being implemented?

Provide evidence and layout plans of concept design proposals including their decision logs.

No other options were investigated or proposed.

What "ongoing residents' concerns" required to be addressed?

Provide evidence including:

- a) date recorded
- b) description of concern
- c) recorded as a material or non-material (i.e. relevant or non-relevant).

The choice of wording in the approved motion from Councillor Lang at the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee was drafted by Elected Members rather than Council officers. As such, it is not possible for council officers to provide an explanation for this wording which would need to be provided by Councillor Lang.

By way of background, consultation exercises **were** undertaken in relation to the Council's Travelling Safely Programme which included consideration of the previous route layout on Silverknowes Road whereby the road was closed to general traffic north of Silverknowes Parkway and a 'quiet route' arrangement was in place along Silverknowes Place, Silverknowes Court and a segregated cycleway on Silverknowes Road between Silverknowes Court and Silverknowes Road East.

Such consultation exercises included a public consultation during Spring 2021, the results of which were reported to Committee in [June 2021](#) and included [comments](#) suggesting that a

better solution would be a direct route “straight down to the roundabout”, as well as others suggesting that Silverknowes Road north of Silverknowes Parkway be re-opened to general traffic.

A further consultation for the initial ETROs was undertaken in winter 2021-2022. The results of this consultation were reported to Committee in [August 2022](#). The Consultation Report noted that the project on Silverknowes Road attracted the greatest number of responses within the ‘West’ area – 157, the majority of which were objections. The [Stakeholder Comments](#) from this consultation included concerns about the route via Silverknowes Place being indirect in comparison to a route along Silverknowes Road between Silverknowes Road East and Silverknowes Parkway.

Reference to “the path between Silverknowes and Cramond Road South” do not form any part of the Silverknowes Road scheme. Clarify why this misleading statement has been included in this response?

The choice of wording in the approved motion from Councillor Lang at the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee was drafted by Elected Members rather than Council officers. As such, it is not possible for council officers to provide an explanation for this wording which would need to be provided by Councillor Lang.

What evidence was there that “improving cyclist safety in Silverknowes” was a pressing priority. Provide evidence and justification records.

The choice of wording in the approved motion from Councillor Lang at the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee was drafted by Elected Members rather than Council officers. As such, it is not possible for council officers to provide an explanation for this wording which would need to be provided by Councillor Lang.

Additional Questions:

What specific evidence is documented to support the ETRO/21/30C Statement of Reasons document that this particular road, being Silverknowes Road, has “the perception of risk that pedestrians and cyclists face a major obstacle”?

No specific evidence is held in relation to the perception of risk on Silverknowes Road. The Council’s [City Mobility Plan](#) acknowledges that the perception of risk faced by pedestrians and cyclists is a barrier to greater uptake of active travel across the transport network.

What TRO has been approved for the vehicle priority signs now installed on Silverknowes Road?

Provide a copy of this please, as ETRO/21/30C only incorporates No Waiting at any time restrictions.

No TRO is required for these signs.