

TRO Reference	Objection Detail	Theme	Response (extract)
	<p>2. it will be to the detriment of easy and free movement of emergency service vehicles; and</p> <p>3. that the lengths of the single lane are excessive. Whilst I appreciate that the bridges are constraints there appears no good reason why two lanes could not be maintained north of the Calder Drive junction. The westedinburgh link website advises that underpasses are not attractive and therefore at grade crossings are to be provided instead, including one between Calder Drive and Sighthill Road. There is also an existing underpass here. As an at grade crossing is to be provided why is this underpass not being removed to remove the maintenance burden it has? Removal and infilling would provide ample space for the two way cycleway east of Wester Hailes Road, thus allowing a two lane roadway to be maintained. Similarly, south of Calder Drive to as far as the overbridge over Murrayburn Drive there appears to be adequate verge space east of the road to allow two lanes to be retained on Wester Hailes Road.</p> <p>It is unfortunate that a general arrangement drawing of the proposed measures is not provided as this would assist in better understanding the proposed measures - the drawings provided only show the various proposed redeterminations and do not show any lengths of cycletrack that are to be constructed. It is therefore nigh on impossible to put into context these proposals from the information made available. It would have seemed straightforward to make the advertising of this proposed Order more understandable and inclusive by referencing the westedinburghlink.info website and the overall plans of the proposals shown there.</p>		