

A.2 Engagement Feedback

Source	Comment
Email	The existing 'quiet road' on NEW STREET (Route 2) seems better for active travel and in this economic environment there is no need to pour tons of concrete and waste tons of cash to develop a new bridge and path on route 3.
Email	The existing 'quiet road' on NEW STREET (Route 2) seems better for active travel. I would therefore suggest that we designate New Street and the Electric Bridge as the preferred cycle route.
Email	Route 5 proposal is the one which will have create significant changes for those living in these areas mentioned, in order to accommodate the apparently hundreds and hundreds of cyclists who want to cycle daily from QMU to Musselburgh Town centre. These changes will create real problems for both pedestrians and motorists. Vehicular access along Stoneybank Crescent is being limited. Monktonhall Terrace will become gridlocked as all vehicles from Mayfield etc will have to use it. Pedestrians will have to share the replacement Ivanhoe Bridge with cyclists while they try to push prams and shopping trolleys up the steep and long metal ramp design.
Email	As far as cycle routes go then the more investment in separating car/buses/lorries from cyclists the better. Cyclists and pedestrians share designed shared spaces very very well and this doesn't have to cost the earth. Walking and cycling improves health which in the long term can reduce a person's need for chronic health care which costs a fortune. And don't get me started on kids getting to school. Aside from storms kids should not be getting driven to school. At what point in the last forty years did we become so lazy.
Email	The cycle lanes are not cleaned and kept free of debris. At the moment for instance they are deep in leaves. Also in season snow. And all sorts of other debris. The crown of the road is largely debris free because of the passage of cars. The camber doesn't help. The lanes are narrow. It is not easy to see debris until you are on it and impossible to swerve where the lanes are lined with bollards.
Email	You are fortunate to have these options. I loved walking and learned to cycle as a child. My parents never owned a car. I didn't have access to a car until my thirties. My husband cycled to work throughout his life and still cycles in his seventies. I am in no way opposed to cycling and reducing car use but the needs of the whole community should be taken into account in transport planning.
Email	Another example of banning cars in the future, next will be no parking in the area's mentioned. This is being trailed in Norway right now. Nobody voted on these plans, should be put to the voters first not back door policy. Next will be ulez in musselburgh, banning cars from the area, remember what Edinburgh does, East Lothian follows.
Email	I really don't think they have thought this through. We may need something, but not what they are proposing. And shared path between cyclists and pedestrians is just so dangerous. I am partially deaf, how many times have got nearly ran over by cyclists on shared paths . It is scary. I don't understand why this is being promoted.
Email	This sounds great
Email	And what about pedestrians being injured by cyclists on shared routes? And there are plenty examples of that! Have you actually looked at the design of the proposed replacement Ivanhoe Bridge which includes a sharp bend, steep ramping & high sides providing no sightlines. Also, why are you assuming that I drive a car?
Email	I submitted feedback on the different options presented at the survey last year, have things changed since then or is it just the same again? I think some of the suggestions are great to make it safer for cyclists, but some suggestions were going too far and totally impractical.

Source	Comment
Email	The low bridge at Newcraighall means that Monktonhall Terrace and Eskview Terrace is the main route into Musselburgh from the bypass. It struggles as it is - to narrow it further to accommodate a cycle path is madness.
Email	There are two safe cycle routes from Musselburgh to QMU/Station that can be upgraded with lighting, safety measures and signage at a fraction of the cost - one from Campie School over the bridge and through the quiet streets in Stoneybank; the other up the Esk and over the Jooglie Brig.
Email	What I am concerned about is the mention of bus gates at Stoneybank Crescent. Does this mean only buses will be able to get up this Street meaning I have to literally double back to go down the already congested as hell Monktonhall Terrace? Since the no 30 no longer goes down this road does this mean the bus gates are there for the 1 bus an hour that now goes down this street? So confused!!!
Email	Apart from the question of the serious disruption to wildlife, especially during the construction period, there is also the simple fact that the distance from the mouth of the river to the electric bridge is short and adds a matter of a few minutes to a journey along the promenade and over to the east bank of the river.
Email	I would like to express my view that the online tool for getting feedback on Musselburgh Active Town (MAT) proposals is inadequate. Many people are not used to using a mapping tool of this sort and that will put people off from adding their feedback. What is the objective method for collating opinion from those who do respond and surmising something useful from this? It seems haphazard to go about a 'consultation' in this fashion. A conventional survey would have been far better in my view.
Email	As a daily cycling commuter from Musselburgh to Edinburgh living close to Goosegreen I would suggest the new Goosegreen bridge and route is entirely unnecessary and a foolish way of using scarce public monies. It beggars belief that, at a time when so many public services are being reduced and threatened, a proposal for an additional bridge at the mouth of the Esk is being seriously proposed.
Email	I also don't understand why there is not the usual planning regulations being followed for this new built infrastructure? Remember that there are valuable biodiversity assets at the mouth of the Esk. These come before cutting off a few minutes of travel time for cyclists.
Email	In short, the new route at the mouth of the Esk in Musselburgh appears to be solving a non-existent problem. As a taxpayer, I also object strongly to this wasteful use of public monies
Email	<p>I believe the existing shared cycle-pedestrian path along the coast at Fisherrow prom and Fisherrow links is sufficient:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o It does not require upgrade o Expanding the width of this path is a waste of money as the existing, newly laid path is sufficient.
Email	<p>The inclusion of a new bridge at Goosegreen(Mouth of the ESK) is inappropriate and unnecessary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o A bridge at this location will severely disrupt feeding birds at the river mouth. Do I need to mention the SSSI and how important this area is for feeding birds. o A large bridge at this location is visually objectionable.
Email	The idea in the Flood Scheme to place a cycle-path on top of a flood wall is unnecessary and if proposed I will strongly object

Source	Comment
Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing 'quiet road' on NEW STREET (Route 2) is better for active travel and in this economic environment, there is no need to pour tons of concrete and be completely unsustainable, no even mentioning the costs, to develop a new bridge and path on route 3.
Email	<p>Thanks for this. My main initial comment is that the site is unusable on a mobile device.</p> <p>Is there a way of just accessing the route design docs just as PDF files somewhere?</p>
Email	<p>The area comprising the shoreline and estuary is a beautiful, tranquil place where many people like to walk and enjoy the sights and sounds of nature. It is one of the few such places left in Musselburgh, with its increasing population and traffic. The idea of a tarmac cycleway being driven through it and a bridge being built over the estuary is appalling.</p>
Email	<p>I also struggle to understand the necessity for these developments as there is a surfaced path only yards away, currently used by cyclists, which runs from the harbour to the existing cycle bridge which is barely any distance from the proposed new bridge.</p>
Email	<p>While I agree that encouraging more people to cycle is good for health and the environment and that cyclists should have access to safe cycleways, the only outcome I can foresee from this unnecessary proposal is outrageous and gratuitous destruction of our natural environment.</p>
Email	<p>Firstly I support the aim of improving conditions for people walking, cycling and wheeling in Musselburgh.</p>
Email	<p>However, I want to raise my concerns at the proposal of removing four car parking places. Parking is very busy near to my house. There are three disabled parking bays in a very short space. There are not enough parking bays for the residents of Stoneybank Terrace from 28 to 58. The residents from 1 - 26 Stoneybank Terrace have to park in the road from 28 onwards as there is not enough places for them near to their homes. Also the students from QMU use this area to park when they use their cars. It was proposed that the residents in this area would be considered for parking permits to stop students parking in this area but that has never happened. Also this area is used by people using the hairdressers or dropping off children at the nursery. So once you move your car you are not guaranteed to get a place near to your house and often have to park some way off or in Stoneybank Gardens. I understand that there are plans to plant some trees which would be welcome.</p>
Email	<p>Stoneybank Terrace is often used by the emergency services as a quick way to get to Newhailes Road rather than going via Olive Bank Road.</p>
Email	<p>I understand that there will be raised areas to slow down the traffic and creating smaller lanes rather than two lanes and I am not sure how that will work, especially when buses have to pass each other - it may well create a back up down to the lights.</p>
Email	<p>I want to mention walking, especially in the winter months, from the station to my house. It is very dark on the street. The street lighting to my mind is inadequate. When I leave the station I walk down on the right hand side of the road and stay on the road at the roundabout and then cross the road so that I walk down the left side of the road (although I live on the right hand side of the street). The paths, on the right hand side of the road, are not lit and it is pitch black on the path near to the fence. Also in the winter the council fail to collect the fallen leaves and they are allowed to get very wet and become very slippery near to the post box and the cherry blossom trees.</p>

Source	Comment
Email	At the station there are ramps for approx 12 electric bikes which have been there for a couple of years. I have yet to see anyone get on one of these bikes.
Email	I am not sure I understand the reasoning for changing the roundabout to a T junction. It can be a busy roundabout with buses going into QMU or down to Stoneybank Terrace. I was told that would increase the green spaces but there is a lot of green space there already. If it was to be planted up with some decent shrubs or trees that might be okay.
Email	I walk on the path parallel to the Fisherrow Industrial Estate as part of my commute to QMU and find that there's inadequate lighting on both sides of the road. The pathway is dark and away from the road and street lights for most sections and feels dangerous. I'd be grateful if this could be considered.
Email	I use the track that runs from Carberry Road to the River Esk walkway almost daily. This is a lovely footpath with a rural character, greatly valued by many people who walk it.
Email	It is already possible to cycle it without difficulty, with room to push a bike up/down alongside the short flight of steps to reach the river Esk walkway.
Email	What systems would be in place to prevent access to the cycle path by trail bikes etc and their using it as an access for roaming into the adjacent fields? This already happens, but would likely get worse.
Email	The proposed crossing point(s) of the route across Carberry Road are at a dangerous place where there is constant speeding and impatient traffic.
Email	Descending from the fields to the river path will require a lengthy zig zag ramp, cutting into existing woodland.
StoryMap	Congested and contested space. Would better to keep the route of active freeway along the south side of the rail line and over the Esk given the existing NCR1 bridge is inadequate for large numbers of cycle users (along with pedestrians) - see further comments added.
Email	2. Change of character of The Inveresk Conservation Area. The proposed section of the route crossing Carberry Road lies in the Inveresk Conservation Area. Introducing a new tarmacked cycle path would significantly change the character of the area, and presumably would be a contravention of the conservation order.
Email	3. Cost: An adequate tarmacked cycle route already exists: there is already a tarmacked road which joins Crookston Road, to the River Esk Walkway cowpits entrance via Carberry Road, and Cowpits Road, and this is already used frequently by cyclists.
Email	4. 20 foot drop from the end of field path down to the River Esk Walkway. The end of the path across the field is 20 feet above the level of the River Esk Walkway, and is accessed via a set of steep steps. There is no gentle incline that could be used by cyclists without them having to dismount and carry their bicycle down the steep steps. The route using existing roads includes inclines appropriate for cycling, and would avoid the need for cyclists to dismount. Putting a cycling incline across the slope would be both costly, and have implications as this area is included in the Inveresk Conservation Area.
Email	5. Cyclist use and abuse of dual walking and cycling paths. Whilst a lot of cyclists are considerate to pedestrians, a significant minority (30% I have encountered) clearly view pedestrians as 'an irritating obstruction' – this is a common problem on the River Esk Walkway, where they cycle, without giving a bell warning, at more than 25mph, past walking pedestrians. This is both dangerous and intimidating for elderly walkers, those hard of hearing, and those with disabilities. The path across the field west of Carberry Road is the only remaining local track where pedestrians can walk without risk of this intimidation.

Source	Comment
StoryMap	Route 4 should retain level with railway along south side of tracks from QMU underpass. Thus it will speed journey times to Wallyford and also avoid steep gradients which would sever the link for many to Whitecraigs
StoryMap	Existing bridge is unsuitable for use as part of a freeway. Please consider a new bridge at higher level to avoid conflict with pedestrians etc here
StoryMap	There should be additional protections for cyclists at the roundabout where the route crosses the B6415 at Monktonhall Place
StoryMap	The big barrier at the end of Fergusson Drive is difficult to cycle around: access around it would need to be improved to give more space for pedestrians and people using non-standard cycles.s
StoryMap	The bridge over the Esk needs to be replaced with one that is much wider and without the steeper ramps.
StoryMap	It is important that the route is kept clear of parked cars here.
StoryMap	dangerous access/exit points onto this road.
StoryMap	very narrow bridge to be shared space for walkers and cyclists
StoryMap	dangerous junction point poor site lines, fast traffic
Email	As a resident of the effected Whitehill Farm Road, I have had no information shared with me or my neighbours of an equalities impact assessment on the impact the changes i believe are planned would have on the market value of our properties or the actual need for this change, given routes already available for green travel in the area and their current limited use.
Email	Information on the councils site is lacking detail of actual plans, proper engagement with those living in and around the route, or impact assessments on residents quality of life, house values, actual need or wider benefits to the town.
Email	The suggestion I believe, as I'm struggling to find an artist impression of what a quiet street actually would look like, is to put a protected cycle route in down what is already a heavily restricted street for residential parking. As a resident I'd like to remind the authority of the significant impact the QMU build has already brought to local residents. This includes parking restrictions to accomodate the so called green travel ethos of QMU. Yet every 'school' day sees our streets filled by University staff and students parking off campus, restricting access to on street parking for the residents of Whitehill Farm Road, Stoneyhill Terrace and Stoneybank Gardens, the suggested route 5.
Email	When parking permits were introduced council officials did not believe students would walk from these streets to the campus and would use public transport or cycle, how wrong they were! These predictions have not come to fruition, as is clear Monday to Friday when residents can't move there cars from these streets during uni times or they do so knowing they are unlikely to be able to park near their property on return unless after 6pm.
Email	The impact this project would have on my homes value, has not been considered and as someone with a physical disability access to my private transportation is vital to support my health and wellbeing. Further restrictions on parking to accommodate the very limited cyclists who would likely use these lanes, doesn't appear to be in line with Scotlands national outcomes to support the most vulnerable of our society during a cost of living crisis.
Email	There are already two national cycle routes from QMU, both which can take cyclists to Musselburgh Town centre, avoiding roads serviced by public transport to support safer travel for cyclists and avoid further disruption to locals residents. So why do we need another one? I would also question why cyclists want to go to Musselburgh High Street when all it has is charity shops, beauticians and the odd cafe available during the day.

Source	Comment
Email	Where is the evidence that there is significant need for this route? Who was canvased for these engagement as I have seen nothing, had no information provided to my home address and only heard about this via a friend on the community council.
Email	What evidence is available to support this significant use of government and council funds when local budgets are being cut and our population has significant challenges in ensuring food and accommodation security for our most vulnerable.
StoryMap	At the moment it looks as though cyclists are expected to stop at the end of Kerrs Wynd. If this is the case, a good amount of cycle parking should be provided here.
StoryMap	A cycle contraflow on Shorthope Street would be very welcome - however there is not a lot of space for one under current traffic conditions. It would be better to close the street completely to motorised traffic. If that is not possible then the contraflow must be well signposted to ensure that drivers are aware that it exists.
StoryMap	This is the main cycle commuting route East/West through Musselburgh and should be a priority for investment
StoryMap	This route is preferable for my cycling not Route 3
StoryMap	It's unclear how westbound cyclists on the B1361 join the lanes to pick up the new path on the A199 westbound. This is a popular route. Do they have to work round all the crossings in a clockwise fashion?
StoryMap	If this junction really is to be traffic light controlled, will it be synchronised with the lights at Luca's? On bad days, traffic heading west can back up well past this junction.
StoryMap	I don't believe an additional bridge is necessary and at 5m wide it will detract and destroy wildlife habitats. No new gooseneck bridge at mouth of Esk wanted or ever consulted on. This bridge is a ridiculous waste of money and resources, John Muir would turn in his grave.
StoryMap	There is already a perfectly good cycle path on the prom. This is just an attempt to greenwash the flood scheme. The town does not want it or need it.
StoryMap	The proposed route is too wide. 3m would be more than enough to accommodate all users
StoryMap	The existing path requires widening to 3 meters. It is presently too narrow to accommodate pedestrians & bikes.
StoryMap	There is no need for this section of route 3 when there is a route 2 option and when there is an already existing and well used traffic free path between fisherrow harbour and the river mouth, then up the river to the replacement electric bridge. The new bridge at the river mouth is an abject waste of money. The 5m wide path on top of an embankment is a waste of money when there is pentiful use made of the existing pathways and routes
StoryMap	It is ridiculous to route additional traffic through an area which is trying to encourage nature habitats and biodiversity. The majority should be directed to route 2
StoryMap	The existing path here was recently upgraded and is perfectly adequate for use by pedestrians, cyclists and wheelers alike. It would be an obscene waste of resources to replace this with a new super-highway.
StoryMap	There has never been any consultation about a new bridge at the mouth of the Esk. This is completely unnecessary when there are adequate bridges just upstream. This is a recreational route along the seafront that does not require upgrading as a thinly disguised attempt to greenwash an inappropriate flood protection scheme. Shame on you!
StoryMap	Is this not an environmentally sensitive area? Why would we seek to direct additional traffic through here when there is a much more appropriate active travel route (Route 2).

Source	Comment
StoryMap	The current provision is adequate; increasing the cycle track to 5m wide will endanger lives
StoryMap	Route 3 is wasteful. As a cyclist I prefer to use New Street & Electric Bridge. i would not use the coastal path or goose green bridge to commute therefore what is already there is suitable for its purpose.
StoryMap	I would feel unsafe enjoying my usual walk along the coast if it was being used as an active travel route by cyclists.
StoryMap	At 5m wide this would be a racetrack and a danger to pedestrians, dogwalkers, wheelers etc. Ridiculous, not least because the existing pathways here are perfectly adequate.
StoryMap	This would be great if wide enough and user friendly vehicle restrictions the current bridges cause conflict!
StoryMap	as a daily cycling commuter who lives close to the Electric bidge, the new Goosegreen Bridge seem a waste of money. Hundreds of thousands of cyclists use New Street then over electric bridge and either left to the sea wall pathway or on James Street. there has to be minimum disruption to biodiversity that is on the west side of the mouth of the Esk. This trumps cyclists wanting cut a few minutes off their journey.
StoryMap	A controlled crossing may be required for safety.
StoryMap	Currently this is a path across the field leading to a flight of steps connecting to the River Esk walkway. I frequently cycle this route, dismounting at the stpes and pushing my bike the short distance. I sometimes use an alternative route by road, continuing down to the entrance to the river Esk walkway at the bend in the Cowpits Road. It takes pretty much the same time. This is NOT a green decision.
Pop-Up	Potential for ped/cycle footbridge over rail line at QMU as current footpath inaccessible for wheelchairs - dangerous
StoryMap	What measures are being put in place (on all routes) to minimise the use of active travel paths by illegal electric scooters and illegal fully electric bikes which make the routes UNSAFE for pedestrians, dogs, children? Sustrans are aware that this is a problem on other routes and have no suggestions for how this can be addressed.
Pop-Up	lighting on newhailes road are poor
Workshops	Would rather see it on south side of railway between eastern underpass and Carberry Road – would avoid a whole series of difficult wiggling / junctions/ poor paths / geometry / land ownership / historic sites. Planned route does not seem ambitious enough
Workshops	crossing of Carberry Road very difficult due to such poor sightlines/ geometry
Email	If you did not wish to cycle across the field on the existing path (which admittedly is not a great option for bikes with road tyres) then cycling down Carberry Road and turning right on to Cowpits Road to join the River Esk walkway is a very readily accomplished alternate route on quiet roads with only a very short section of 40 mph (when the 20 mph speed limit exiting Inveresk ends). The speed limit on Cowpits Road is 30 mph. I have safely cycled both routes countless times. There is no appreciable difference in the time it takes.
Email	Please don't tarmac the countryside - especially when there is already an alternative in place. This is not a green decision.
Email	local feedback is that not only are the existing routes adequate but that the new planned routes would actually negatively impact the environment and tourism etc of Musselburgh as well as costing considerable money that would be better used to provide eg local services for elderly residents.

Source	Comment
Email	1. Failure of communication with private land owner: The proposed route above crosses a jointly privately owned driveway. Despite living at 24 Carberry Road for 9 years, I have had no communication from the Council that there was a plan to put a public cycle path across the private driveway. I presume permission would need to be granted by the landowner regarding this. I was only made aware of this by a neighbour shortly before Christmas, after the consultation meetings in early December.
Email	The proposed route 4 from Wallyford to the River Esk path passes through Green Belt farmland of considerable archaeological and historical interest
Email	Almost all works in this area must be preceded by archaeological investigations. Will this be done if this route goes forward?
Email	Will permitting a route in the Green Belt create a precedent for further developments – (eg new access to the derelict Edenhall hospital site)?
Email	Access to numbers 22, 22a, 24 and 26 Carberry Road (along which this proposed route would run) is a wayleave granted by the two Misses Cochrane. Half of the broad entry point on Carberry Rd does not belong to the Cochranes. If this were to be fenced off by the owners, the whole of the vehicular access route to 22 22a and 26 will be single track. There is no turning space at the entrance to 22, 22a, so most delivery vans already either reverse in, or reverse out. This is pretty dangerous for walkers, but if narrowed all the way to the road, and with increased cycle traffic, it would be increasingly hazardous, and no. 26 would be affected too. Rights of access and responsibilities for maintenance would need to be renegotiated.
Email	I'm surprised that the online maps do not mark other existing convertible footpaths. There is a good path off Wedderburn Terrace with a gentle descent down to the river, which would not require a ramp for cycles, and which has better road access (two way) and could link up to Crookston Road. Perhaps the cycle route could go through the broad access to the stables and farmhouse? Alternatively, Inveresk residents have been requesting a safe crossing point for pedestrians at the Crookston Road junction with the A6124 for years (and been ignored). Rerouting the proposed route 4 to here would give an added benefit.
StoryMap	The proposed route is far too wide
StoryMap	Hasn't this path just been replaced? An active travel path here is wasteful
StoryMap	What will it mean for Whitehill Farm Road to be a "quiet street"? No through traffic? Removal of parked cars? Street furniture so that the 20mph speed limit is obvious and respected?
StoryMap	There is an existing network of cycle and pedestrian paths throughout this area, why are these not being maximised?
StoryMap	I think the new Ivanhoe bridge a waste of money. The current one may not have room for a dual purpose travel path, but there is enough room for all users if cyclists give way to others. The steep gradient from the east side over the Esk will be very hard to push wheelchairs and shopping trolleys over, and it could be dangerous in the other direction on icy days.s
StoryMap	A new bridge would be great!
StoryMap	This access to the Lagoons / nature reserve needs to be improved for walkers, wheelers and cycles
StoryMap	You haven't given a date for the
StoryMap	You haven't given a date for the end of the consultation period
StoryMap	why no cycle route on the High Street across the river and onto the east side of the high street?
StoryMap	I think there should be cycle routes on this main road
StoryMap	why no cycle route on the busiest shopping areas? It seems there is an effort to exclude cyclists from the high streets and leave to cars and buses. I disagree.

Source	Comment
Email	Has anyone estimated the carbon cost of engineering and maintaining these routes, and the number of car journeys avoided, the likely bike traffic, and years taken to balance the books?
StoryMap	Why on earth would you place a bridge here across the most beautiful view when there is a bridge less that 5 mins walk away?? I mean for cyclist it is probably a 3 min detour! Absolute waste of money, and will destroy habitats - we have bats, kingfishers, seals, bird life - the river mouth is essential to them.
StoryMap	Should the existing path through the Grove not feature as an active travel route?
StoryMap	Do we have money to burn? The town does not need yet another bridge and particularly not at this sensitive (and scenic) place.
StoryMap	It would be good to consider how this could link up with the entrance to Pinkie Playing fields from Linkfield Road
StoryMap	It would be good to consider how this could link up with the community facilities at the Fisherrow Centre on South Street
Pop-Up	existing paths on old railway link are good. Can these be used / improved? (Route 6)
StoryMap	Great to have a much improved route for those who want to use a bike for direct transport and for accessing the east of the county
StoryMap	Encouraging people to access station easily will make it more likely to combine train and bike use. Well done. Currently heading west/uphill could be much more cycle friendly
StoryMap	Fantastic having an alternative option to access the east of the county. A beautiful route that will have minimal impact on wildlife. Great taking advantage of the MFPS
StoryMap	Please make sure that the right angled corners are removed from the new route. These are difficult for cyclists to negotiate. Curved corners create more space for everyone and reduce conflict
StoryMap	This will involve taking land from the fields alongside the railway. To the north of the railway there is a dirt track that could be utilized. The rest of the route from Crookston road across the field doesn't exist.
StoryMap	None of the existing routes are highlighted or visible. They should have been included.
StoryMap	What happens where you reach this busy road. What is the interface between the rest of the cycling network.
StoryMap	This path is a great idea. However few will be using this - the reality is that a rail and bus network takes them to all the city centre hotspots much faster
StoryMap	Route 4 headed east would stay on this side of railway and a new bridge over B6415 and onwards over Cowpits Ford Rd then over the river Esk to connect to Wallyford, Whitecraigs and Inveresk
StoryMap	steep slope down to riverside path
StoryMap	At east end the route would be parallel and level with railway alignment to meet new bridge over river Esk. Could serve as an access road for Network Rail too. Avoid gradients of dropping down into valley - as any 'freeway' should do.
StoryMap	This is a great idea. Edinburgh Council need to improve their end of the route from here to the Jewel / Innocent path. Are CEC or SESTRAN part of this project.
StoryMap	There should be fewer obstacles in the cycle route at Musselburgh station. It is essential that the bus gate is retained. The signage needs to be changed to point to the nice new route next to the railway line.
StoryMap	At this point the route is shown as going straight up a steep bank. There will need to be a gentle ramp with plenty of space for everyone.
StoryMap	these fields are scheduled monuments of national importance
StoryMap	there's a broad footpath down here to the river

Source	Comment
StoryMap	there's a footpath down here to the river
StoryMap	I'm concerned about the proposed contraflow here, it may not be safe for cyclists unless serious traffic reduction measures are committed to *and enforced*. Shighlines are poor and the space available is veyr constricted. Does race day traffic for the racecourse still get directed down here and if so, this will need to be changed as it woul dbe very unsafe to have this potential conflict in such a narrow street
StoryMap	The right turn coming from New Street onto Edinburgh Road is a tricky one here, especially if you have a bike trailer or similar weight that slows speed down. A two-way segregated cycle lane on the seaward side of the road, as the onward connection, would help solve this problem but then makes it more challenging for people to choose to connect to other destinations/routes from this path eg to turn left up Milton Road towards the college etc.
StoryMap	This is currently quite scary roundabout to do with children so segragation is needed
StoryMap	schedules monuments and Battle of Pinkie
StoryMap	schedules monumnets, battle of Pinkie and conservation area
StoryMap	scheduled monuments, Battle of Pinkie and conservation area
StoryMap	green belt land
StoryMap	green belt land
StoryMap	green belt land
Pop-Up	Important and well used exisiting paths aorund levenhall and racecourse (route 2)
Pop-Up	pedestrians crossing unsafe- need new crossings
StoryMap	green belt land
StoryMap	The Southern option seems preferable for a user.
Pop-Up	Cycle parking on high street is important
Pop-Up	Concerns over spacing of traffic calming and speed of vehicles between raised tables. Keep speed cushions.
Pop-Up	Maintenance of cycle bypasses is important
Pop-Up	consistent car parking prefered for bikes rather than weaving between traffic
Pop-Up	Important for cyclist to connect to whitefield road/high street. Could ASL be provided?
Pop-Up	Connecting in to cycle track is important. How frequent are gaps? Long stretches without junctions more gaps as possible.
Pop-Up	Important ped refuage islands + crossings here. Link to racecrouse gate crossing required and bus stops.
Pop-Up	School traffic is a problem
Pop-Up	gaps in wall on estate side could help access cycle track - make crossings for cyclists.
Pop-Up	visibility when crossing the road currently poor - would like a crossing further up on ravensheugh road.
Pop-Up	2-way cycling on all sides of plot may offer more options - flexibility in design important
Pop-Up	widen exisitng pavements
Pop-Up	concerns over roundabout lane reduction and traffic impact. Both lanes are used.
Pop-Up	potential for planting tress? Screeing the roundabout - consolidating the recycling bins.
Pop-Up	secure parking at wallyford park and ride
Pop-Up	more traffic on wallyford toll plot due to bus gate and less safe
Pop-Up	traffic speeds are high at roundabout and road
StoryMap	This is the only walkway where pedestrians can walk without the risk of being run off the path by cyclists cycling too fast - which happens frequently

Source	Comment
Pop-Up	Mini roundabout used by buses when closures/events on at QMU - less resilience
Pop-Up	existing cherry trees could be added to as part of tree planting
Pop-Up	car dangerously overtaking cyclist - on wrong side of traffic islands
Pop-Up	rat running cars via stoneybank cres learner drivers
StoryMap	design must be consistent with conservation area requirements
Pop-Up	plenty of crossings needed for access bi-directional cycleway
Pop-Up	diagonal crossing would help here
Pop-Up	Important to connections to Eidinburgh and Brunstane paths
Pop-Up	cycle crossing would be beneficial for this area
Pop-Up	slow traffic on approach to olive bank roundabout
Pop-Up	connection/crossing to harbour road should be captured
Workshops	Must connect to Route 2 – currently a gap
StoryMap	Either option would be a fantastic improvement on current situation. The dual option looks good. But I'd like to know what are pros and cons of either option
Pop-Up	2-way cycle track on south side of road would connect well in to estates
Pop-Up	prefer 1 way cyclelane on both sides for everyone to understand including pedestrians
Pop-Up	prefer 1 way cycle lane as they are more interactive
Pop-Up	is there opportunity to join up and create a cycle path leading into portobello? Recently road improvements by ECCC have no cycle lanes - totally missed opportunity
Pop-Up	harbour area currently very dangerous for pedestrians and cyclists. Remove parking bays - create safer area for pedestrians - will also enhance the harbour as a public amenity-zebra crossing needs added to junction with harbour road.
Pop-Up	more double yellows to reduce parking - new street
Pop-Up	Remove parking at end of shorthope street - we're losing greenery if flood protection plan goes ahead. Use car parks to green musselburgh and encourage more active travel
Pop-Up	what will be done about nursery drop off/pickup traffic? Area has lots of parking at these times.
Pop-Up	Concerns about narrowing carriage for getting in their cars - linkfield road
Pop-Up	More ambition - remove parking, reduce traffic, increase biodiversity
Pop-Up	Still no viable route into Edinburgh - nothing connecting the Brunstane Path
Pop-Up	Paths need to be improved. Maintenance at New Craighall path
Pop-Up	Shared space - safety concerns - the grove - high speed cyclists - no much consideration between cyclists and pedestrians - canal path and concern - cyclists ignore pedestrians
Pop-Up	shocking that no school other than Loretto is going to have a safe cycling route.
Pop-Up	awareness and safety of zebra crossing on approach - consider raised tables or reduce speed limits. - Levenhall Roundabout
Pop-Up	Theatre entrance and race course entrance - more placemaking
Pop-Up	improve access points - consider crossings - linkfield road
Pop-Up	entrance at Loretto theatre being used as replacement for events. consider wider improvements - raised table.
Pop-Up	high parking demand at events and school
Pop-Up	destination at harbour is important + integration with MFPS
Pop-Up	history of traffic collisions at junction of Edinburgh road and new street - liaise with road safety team
Pop-Up	if removal of cushions will people be encouraged to accelerate between them if they become raised tables.

Source	Comment
Pop-Up	Path with lights needed along Whitehill Farm Road
Pop-Up	Consider bus barrier and how cyclists bypass barrier - show barrier on plan
Pop-Up	door zones and advisory lanes concerns - whitehil farm road
Pop-Up	parking needs to be considered as QMU students use parking and residents are displaced
Pop-Up	High traffic volumes at the tesco roundabout
Pop-Up	connection to on-road onward journey - include in plans for journey hub?
Pop-Up	continuous footway instead of raised tables - highstreet/shorthope street
Pop-Up	shorthope street - very restrained space for contraflow cycle lane
Pop-Up	Vennel is quite dark - add enhanced lighting - Kerr's Wynd
Pop-Up	connectivity from the high street to kerr's wynd
Pop-Up	railway path is well used for walking and cycling
Workshops	How do you get in and out of the junction by the Brunton?
Workshops	Should consider linking that route through the car park (through link street)
Workshops	Need to be cognisant of the school past the brunton. Need to make sure we slow traffic but doesn't disrupt parking too much. Potentially engaging with the school if needed
Workshops	Some agreed with the measures on shorthope street but need to think about how it links with high street to make it safe for cyclists.
Workshops	Shorthope street is too narrow to accommodate contraflow cycling.
Workshops	Cycle parking on mill hill would be good - plenty of area to provide it.
Workshops	Lighting at millhill as quite dark - improve safety
Workshops	Road cushions help to maintain low speeds and its nice for cyclists due to the flatness between cushions. Pinch points aren't always the best for cyclists. New street seems to work fine. (New Street)
Workshops	Worries of drivers accelerating between cushions on New Street
Workshops	When events are on along the east end of New Street lots of cars are parked there - could be unsafe for cyclists.
Workshops	Maybe move the table outside the theatre which has a could 100 seats and I fairly busy right now due to the closure of the Brunton. There is also drop offs for Loretto in that area to be aware of.
Workshops	Raise tables off arms of roundabout at Levenhall roundabout to slow traffic down when coming off and on the roundabout to create safety for pedestrians and cyclists.
Workshops	Bridge / ramp infrastructure quite overwhelming compared with what is there currently.
Workshops	Paths should not need to be 5m (or 4m) wide. 3m is more than sufficient.
Workshops	Why are there no connections to key destinations like Musselburgh Grammar etc (I subsequently sent this person the 2022 version of the Masterplan showing the local links)
Workshops	There are no paths in all of Musselburgh that could be described as adequate for cycling. This plan does not go anywhere near far enough to genuinely provide for the community
Workshops	Route 2 – meaningful onward connection needed to Portobello/ must connect to Brunstane Path and Innocent Railway
Workshops	Route 3 - Connection needed to take people on through Prestonpans
Workshops	Route 4/6 – meaningful onward connections needed towards Fort Kinnaird / Brunstane / City Centre
Workshops	Route 5 - onward connection needed along Old Craighall Road / to Shawfair
Workshops	Secure cycle parking needed at High Street route ends

Source	Comment
Workshops	Shorthope Street seems too narrow for contra flow cycle lane. Better to close off access to all traffic. Don't recall any properties along there genuinely having a need for parking / access.
Workshops	Disappointing no longer goes through High Street
Workshops	Must speak to Loretto School about managing drop off / pick up better. Parents park everywhere and it's a nightmare to negotiate on a bike.
Workshops	It would be better to keep two bridges here with one for pedestrians and one for cyclists. That way no need for Goosegreen bridge
Workshops	Reducing radii of Beulah side road means residents who live to the west of it will no longer be able to use the junction to U-turn when they approach from Musselburgh to then park on the south side of Linkfield Road. (Advised her that she could drive further into the road and turn at a location further from the main road that would be safer for everyone).
Workshops	Not enough crossing points now the refuges have been removed. Please look at more locations, especially track into racecourse east of Beulah and east of Levenhall Roundabout.
Workshops	Crossing on north arm of Levenhall Roundabout of no use to Levenhall residents wishing to access the shop / pub etc. It needs to be further north. Suggested an additional crossing could be given consideration in forthcoming Levenhall-Prestonpans active travel link study.
Workshops	Not required. Existing paths perfectly adequate
Workshops	Intrusive width / bridge
Workshops	Being slipped through to greenwash flood wall
Workshops	Not right that this, especially bridge, will not need planning consent
Workshops	Concern over funding and lack of consultation
Workshops	Not required. Existing paths perfectly adequate
Workshops	Intrusive width
Workshops	Ivanhoe footbridge far too big a piece of infrastructure and will be unusable for anyone with a buggy or wheelchair
Workshops	Concern over speeds that cyclists will be able to achieve down bridge and ramps
Workshops	Being slipped through to greenwash flood wall
Workshops	Not right that this will not need planning consent
Workshops	Concern over funding and lack of consultation
Workshops	Safety concerns re conflicts between parking cars / doors / cyclists
Workshops	Impact of Stoneybank Cresc restriction on wider congestion / tailbacks Monktonhall Terrace
Pop-Up	potential archeological constraints
Pop-Up	peoples lives Vs convenient parking - no contest
Workshops	Rural sections of Route 4 should not be lit
Workshops	Does this really need to be tarmac? Feel a whindust surface would be better. This led to a quite heated debate with another attendee who entirely disagreed. I think in the end they could both see pros and cons with both options
Pop-Up	cycle lanes around plot are very indirect
Workshops	No clear drop kerbs indicated to access North High Street by the Brunton
Workshops	Connection to High Street is important. Also consider safety of car parking in North High Street
Workshops	Consider island protection for contraflow lane on North High Street
Workshops	Consider requirement for access/speed control chicane for proposed new footbridge
Workshops	Consider alternatives to cycle logos and visual traffic calming. I.e. cobble treatments or similar? For Kerr's Wynd. Consider Albert Lane in Stirling.
Workshops	Likes the traffic calming ideas as traffic speeds can be very high.

Source	Comment
Workshops	Concern of speed of vehicles on Millhill and New Street
Workshops	Agree with the approach to Levenhall Roundabout design
Workshops	Ensure that greenery and landscaping is provided where possible on all Quiet Streets to enhance the routes and biodiversity on Millhill
Workshops	Speed of traffic is a concern on Millhill and Links Road. Designs must ensure that traffic calming is suitable and controls speeds.
Workshops	Why crossing not split into two stages with refuge islands? Are cyclists on the correct side i.e. should they be on the other side? Where best is your interface / conflict point i.e. where cycles would position on stopping for peds? Levenhall Links Roundabout
Workshops	Consider improved connection on the Loan to new toucan crossing.
Workshops	Door zone is a concern. Can this be improved? Stoneybank Terrace
Workshops	Concerns over traffic speeds and how traffic will use the street and central traffic lane. Stoneybank Terrace
Workshops	Importance of connection into Newcraighall over the bridge. The bridge requires widening to accommodate active travel route.
Workshops	Bi-directional lane provides good legibility and connectivity to Newhailes.
Email	Spokes PG is encouraged to hear that there is a 'journey hub' proposed at the Brunton Theatre.
Email	If car parking still allowed on North High cycles. It would be good see removal of some to allow continuous cycling along N High St.
Email	Is the contraflow cycle lane entrance beside Links Street to be segregated prevent parking in the cycle lane? Or are double yellow lines proposed?
Email	Where North High St meets Brunton Court is an island (defender) physical barrier being provided to protect exiting cycles from turning vehicles?
Email	It is unclear if the existing Esk footbridge is being retained as the existing alignment would be preferable for connecting Brunton Court and Shorthope Street. Could the new bridge proposed be realigned like existing to avoid sharp turns for cycle users?
Email	Chicane barriers at the new bridge should not be used. Central bollard with chevron below and then the left turn will be enough to safely slow cycles (if that is desired).
Email	For the north south river path connection (Route 5?), it seems a shame this alignment means felling of trees north and south of the existing bridge. There is an existing carriageway that could be repurposed and linked southwards (Eskside East). To the south currently there is severely restricted headroom here at the Bridge Street road bridge. Please provide more detail how more headroom is achieved and safeguarded during periods of high river levels.
Email	At Millhill could narrowing (physical or visually) as per Cycling by Design 2021 be better for cycle safety than road markings. e.g. Albert Place in Stirling.
Email	At Stanhope Street, we consider a cycle contraflow suitable as long as the speed limit is 20mph retained and intrusive through traffic to Millhill is minimised. A January 2024 continuous pavement across the junction of Shorthopre Street and High Street should be provided. Aside from the benefits to High Street for pedestrians, this will further indicate the low traffic / mixed use status of Shorthope Street.

Source	Comment
Email	Spokes PG would like to see improvements to cycle parking provision on the High Street to encourage cycling to the shopper and workers in this area. This needs to be secure and suitable for various cycles including non-standard cycles.
Email	Spokes welcomes the improvements to Kerr's Wynd & Millhill Lane.
Email	Could visual narrowing along the length of road be better at reducing motor vehicle speeds and / or a modal filter provide a 'road cyclist' alternative from the coastal route 3 which will be more for leisure trips and avoid conflict with pedestrians. See Gogar Station Rd for example.
Email	Please provide information on what is proposed for the link to Joppa / Porty (CEC Quiet Route 10) via Edinburgh Road.
Email	Are advisory lanes best practice given they encourage close passes. Is a visually narrow cycle street a better design like recent works on Albert Place, Stirling? We are concerned that some of the cycle logo markings seem quite close to parked vehicle too, possibly encouraging cyclists to ride in the Door-zone.
Email	Would a modal filter on New Street removing through traffic be better here than multiple speed humps / raised crossings?
Email	Please keep the current alignment of the Electric Bridge as it is a very good to link from east-west away from main motor traffic routes. Also the current obvious segregation of bridge users should be retained in any new bridge design to avoid conflict as the current arrangement works much better than before Covid when the Electric Bridge was opened for cycles.
Email	<p>Is the cycle provision on Millhill eastbound (near the racecourse) soft or hard segregated? What happens at peak times like at frequent events like school pick-up / drop-off or on less frequent events like on race days? It seems unreasonable for cyclists to have to cycle around parked vehicles and then over to the left of the road when they get to the double yellows area shown on the drawing to get through the pinch-point.</p> <p>The "segregated area" looks as though parking is allowed at the start of it – b)</p> <p>The junction with the cycleway on Linkfield Rd looks horrendous – difficult to navigate, dangerous to cross the main road and unsafe for accessing Millhill.</p>
Email	Is there a way to ease eastbound cycle access geometry from Millhill into Linkfield Rd. Spokes welcomes the removal of these island pinch points. However we are concerned about the narrowness of the segregated cycleway throughout and especially here on Linkfield Road where the bidirectional route should be at least 3m wide (as per Cycling by Design, 2021) rather than the proposed 2.1m / 2.5m.
Email	Please clarify what the existing vehicle activated sign is.
Email	Spokes is encouraged to see improvements to cycle infrastructure at the roundabout. However it is complex due to the mix of uni and bidirectional cycle user routes. So we query whether these should be signalised toucans where bidirectional as it isn't a typical 'dutch roundabout' arrangement.
Email	Would it be better to have a concentric circular cycleway to minimise navigation of the roundabout by cycles? This arrangement is not as per the only UK 'dutch roundabout' at Fendon Rd, Cambridge (see GoogleMaps satellite image)
Email	Two of the busier of four crossings are single stage at Fendon Rd, Cambridge allowing a refuge in the between the two live lanes and allows visibility in one direction at a time especially when busy. Means if in doubt cycles can stop and take refuge. On the GoogleMaps satellite image below these are the top and lower crossings with pink central refuges.

Source	Comment
Email	Uni / Bi-directional transition westwards also be provided onto the roadway or west of the pedestrian zebra crossing to preventing cycles clearing the crossing suddenly then having to give way to pedestrians. We fear this could lead to cycles being forced to wait on the roadway without adequate space being provided.
Email	Finally what speed limit is proposed for motor vehicles using the roundabout. The Fendon Rd roundabout speed limit drops to 20mph for the roundabout and we would deem this essential if this was a first in Scotland.
Email	For southbound cycles headed to The Loan, what is safest crossing point? Ideally would be on right side before corner? Could a toucan crossing be provided or signalised junction?
Email	Good to see East Lothian Active Freeway plan to Tranent, Haddington & Dunbar being developed.
Email	Given the lack of active frontages along A6095 Newhailes Road Spokes Lothian Planning Group supports Option A for Route 6. However there needs to be easy access from the residential areas accessed via Clayknowes Crescent & employment destination at the Industrial Estate.
Email	However we would like to note concern that the crossing at the entrance to Newhailes House can be busy at times (infrequently weekends & events) so a safe crossing is essential at the exit / entry from the roundabout. A zebra with parallel cycle crossing would be preferable to give clear priority to walkers, wheelers and cyclists.
Email	We would also like to see detail of the crossing of Edinburgh Road (A199) to/from Harbour Road where the existing contraflow cycle provision needs to be enhanced.
Email	Spokes also note that Network Rail (not just City of Edinburgh Council) need to be engaged at the southern edge of Route 6 given the bridge crossing the East Coast Mainline railway is a notorious pinch point

A.3 Stakeholder List

Scottish Natural Heritage: Policy & Advice Officer	JG Serenity Taxis
The National Trust for Scotland	Border Buses
Edinburgh Lothians Greenspace Trust	Prentice Coaches
East Lothian Local Access Forum	Ten Ten Taxis
East Lothian Cycle Forum	Torrance Taxis
SEStran	Twenty Four Seven Taxis and Minibus Hire
Sustrans	William Black Ltd Taxis
Cycling Scotland	East Coast buses
CityCyclingEdinburgh	Lothian buses
Spokes	Prentice of Haddington
Local Riding Stables, Riding Groups and Horse Riders	E&M Horsburgh
East Lothian Ramblers and Hillwalkers	Taylor Wimpey
Walk Some More East Lothian	Persimmon
East Lothian Path Warden Volunteers	Campie Primary
Living Streets	Stoneyhill Primary
Beyond Boundaries East Lothian	Burgh Primary
Changes Community Health Project Musselburgh	Loretto RC Primary
Cycling Without Age	Pinkie St Peters Primary
Walk with Scott Foundation	Wallyford Primary
Edinburgh & Lothians Regional Equality Council	Whitecraig Primary
East Lothian Community Care Forum	Musselburgh Grammar
Musselburgh & Inveresk Community Council	Loretto Private
Wallyford Community Council	Musselburgh Active Schools Primary
Whitecraig Community Council	Scouts
Musselburgh Community Learning and Development	Beavers & Cubs
East Lothian Community Planning Partnership	Brownies
Musselburgh Local Area Forum	Guides
Inveresk Village Society	Boys Brigade
Musselburgh Conservation Society	ELC LDP Transport Consultants
Sustaining Musselburgh	Musselburgh Business Partnership
East Lothian Tenants and Residents Panel	East Lothian Business Gateway
First Step Community Project	Midlothian and East Lothian Chamber of Commerce (MELCC)
Ageing Well	Flood Protection Scheme
Musselburgh Area Partnership	Tourism departments
CHANGES Community Health Project	Queen Margaret University
Police	MSPs
Abbot Travel	MP
AC Taxis and Minibuses	Ward Councillors
Alba Taxis	Allan's Coaches
Alex Clark Enterprise	ASA Ladywell Coaches
Colin's Cabs	Burgh Taxis
Edinburgh Coach Lines Ltd	Edinburgh Roads Residents Group
Eve Coaches Ltd	Fisherrow Harbour & Seafront Association
GR Taxis	Fisherrow Trust
Fisherrow Yacht Club	Fisherrow Waterfront Group

