

CONSULTATION

Accessing Inverness

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION FEEDBACK AND RECOMMENDED COUNCIL RESPONSE

March 2019

Table of Contents

1.	Respondents	
2.	Quantifiable consultation questions and feedback	
	CONSULTATION FEEDBACK AND DRAFT COUNCIL RESPONSES:	
3.	Question 1: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed changes in Academy Street will make this area more attractive to visit, walk and cycle? Please tell us why.....	4
4.	Question 2: We have looked at a range of pedestrian and cycle crossing options for the project area, in particular Academy Street. Please tell us which of the following options you prefer, and why.....	14
5.	Question 3: The proposals for the Farraline Park / Railway Terrace area have been designed to make this a safer, more attractive environment to walk and cycle. Has this been achieved?	20
6.	Question 4: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals to develop a cycle route on Railway Terrace to link with the active travel hub, NCN1 and the Railway station entrance at Strothers Lane?	25
7.	Question 5: The proposed changes for Falcon Square are intended to create a safer space for walking, cycling and activities that make best use of public open space. Has this been achieved?	29
8.	Question 6: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals for use of higher quality materials and rain gardens within the proposed scheme?	36

Consultation Respondents

Government / Statutory Bodies

1. High Life Highland
2. SEPA
3. SNH

Business

4. Eastgate Shopping Centre
5. Inverness BID
6. Inverness Taxi Alliance

NGOs (including charities and campaigning groups)

7. Inverness Civic Trust
8. Paths for All
9. Own Your Street Inverness
10. Putting Inverness Streets Ahead [*made up of: Access for All - Inverness Access Panel, Autism Rights Group Highland, Deaf Services & Hearing Support Team - NHS Highland, Guide Dogs Scotland, Highland Cycle Campaign, Highland Senior Citizens Network, Highland Visually Impaired Working Age Group, Living Streets Inverness, Ross-shire Access Panel, Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB) Scotland and Sight Action*]
11. ACE [Active Community of Empowered individuals]
12. National Federation of the Blind of the UK

Individuals

- | | | |
|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 13. Alan Scott | 14. Graeme Watson | 15. Mr & Mrs Colin Jackman |
| 16. Alex Andrews | 17. Graham Tuley | 18. Neil Hornsby |
| 19. Amanda Ophof | 20. Helen Smith | 21. Raphaella perks |
| 22. Andrew Lynn | 23. Janet Adamson | 24. Roderick MacKenzie |
| 25. Brian MacKenzie | 26. Janet Home | 27. Ross Finlay |
| 28. C Campbell | 29. Janis Armstrong | 30. Sheila Fletcher |
| 31. Cecile Mettot | 32. Jenny Mayhew | 33. Simon Brooks |
| 34. David Edmiston | 35. Jenny Mayhew | 36. Stewart Dickins |
| 37. Elizabeth Shiach | 38. John Heathcote | 39. Stuart Dustan |
| 40. Emma Roddick | 41. Lynn Macfarlane | 42. Susan Hadfield |
| 43. F Sadler | 44. Margot Tuley | 45. Tom Matthew |
| 46. Fiona Catto | 47. Martin MacLeod | 48. W Grant |
| 49. Gordon Smith | 50. Mick Heath | 51. William Macdonald |

QUANTIFIABLE CONSULTATION QUESTIONS AND RESPONSES

Number of respondents: 51

1. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed changes in Academy Street will make this area more attractive to visit, walk and cycle?

Strongly agree	Agree	Remain Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13	11	7	1	5

2. We have looked at a range of pedestrian and cycle crossing options for the project area, in particular Academy Street. Please tell us which of the following options you prefer, and why.

Courtesy Crossings	Zebra Crossings	Other
10	8	15

3. The proposals for the Farraline Park / Railway Terrace area have been designed to make this a safer, more attractive environment to walk and cycle. Has this been achieved?

Strongly agree	Agree	Remain Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
3	14	7	2	5

4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals to develop a cycle route on railway terrace to link with the active travel hub, NCN1 and the Railway station entrance at Strothers Lane?

Strongly agree	Agree	Remain Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10	8	6	2	3

5. The proposed changes for Falcon Square are intended to create a safer space for walking, cycling and activities that make best use of public open space. Has this been achieved?

Strongly agree	Agree	Remain Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
9	4	8	4	4

6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals for use of higher quality materials and rain gardens within the proposed scheme?

Strongly agree	Agree	Remain Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13	7	5	2	3

1: To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed changes in Academy Street will make this area more attractive to visit, walk and cycle? Please tell us why.

Of **39** respondents to this question, **24** strongly agree or agree, **11** remain neutral, and **6** disagree or strongly disagree

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree	Summary of comments received	Proposed response
Government/Statutory Bodies			
Scottish Natural Heritage	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction of trees/planting is welcome which, combined with wider pavements will soften surroundings, create a more attractive place for people to walk/visit and promote biodiversity. - Any benefit to cycling of reduced traffic speed and a narrower carriageway is reliant on effective traffic management and behaviour change. Cycling friendly measures in the city centre will have limited value unless safe connecting routes are created to the wider area for both local and specific long distance journeys. - Negative impact on wider area should be analysed and mitigated to prevent other streets becoming rat-runs for vehicles and becoming less attractive/safe for walking and cycling. 	<p>SUDS will be looked at further in detail design stage</p> <p>Traffic management and traffic modelling will be part of the detailed design phase. We do not envisage rat running, and the model will help us to understand complexities of transport options. We will work with internal traffic team and community services to develop solutions.</p>
Business			
Inverness BID		<p>BID Directors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Support proposal to make Academy Street and its surroundings more attractive and friendly toward the public and visiting travellers. Expect this will make Academy Street a more attractive environment, subject to comments raised on business functionality. Support principles of increasing active travel and ensuring speed limit of 20mph is observed across the city centre, subject to due consideration being given to business needs and concerns. - Emphasise that existing traffic flow capacity on Millburn Road, Crown Road and Academy Street in both directions must be maintained. - Anticipate that removal of filter lanes on Academy Street will have a negative impact on city centre trading/footfall/customer base (by restricting city centre access, increasing congestion, slowing traffic, and increasing journey times/driver frustration). <p>Acknowledging limited scope/stage of concept design for Academy Street, the following concerns should be addressed:</p>	<p>Again traffic flow and capacity will be understood further during traffic modelling, which will form part of detailed design phase. This will also look at the changes to traffic from removal of filter lanes as part of scheme.</p> <p>This will be addressed during further preliminary designs, before moving to detailed design and engagement with local business is crucial.</p> <p>Again, traffic modelling will help understand this.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Business needs for public access, service area access, HGV and loading bay access, emergency services, etc; public transport needs; taxi provision. - Vehicle access from: Academy Street to Strothers Lane/Union Street (right turns); Queensgate to Academy Street (left /right turns) and Strothers Lane. - 15mph speed restriction on Academy Street, which is expected to exacerbate traffic flow. 	
Inverness Taxi Alliance	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How many taxi spaces are proposed within the project area and what advance consultation will take place with taxi trade if spaces are to be reduced? 	At present the scheme has only highlighted taxi provision at the top end of Academy Street, which has 3 spaces less than is current. We will engage with BID and taxi alliance to make sure the current provision of city centre rank spaces is maintained.
NGOs (including charities and campaign groups)			
Inverness Civic Trust	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improvements, including high quality materials, welcomed and expected to improve the experience for people using Academy Street. - Introduction of activity such as street cafés needs careful consideration/control to avoid proliferation of clutter. 	Support and comment noted.
Putting Inverness Streets Ahead	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive aspects of the proposals include: widening pavements; narrowing crossings; a low speed limit; increased greenery (trees); making cyclists use carriageway rather than pavement. - The Council should adopt a Street Charter based on RNIB's Street Charter Toolkit to address problems arising from, e.g., street clutter and shared space. - The online consultation portal is not accessible to people who are visually impaired. - Puts forward detailed advice on outdoor café/bar/restaurant seating and street furniture to meet the needs of visually impaired pedestrians. <p>The proposals raise the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The volume of vehicle traffic likely to continue to use the street has been under-estimated. - Absence of controlled crossings may have a negative impact on all road users (vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians). Proposed crossings will disadvantage: autistic people; people with reduced mobility; and 	<p>Support for the widening of pavements is noted.</p> <p>The council have not at this time agreed to adopt the street charter.</p> <p>Paper copies were provided to service points in the city centre. Accessibility of portal noted for future consideration.</p> <p>Outdoor café, eating space was highlighting in concept images to help demonstrate the width being proposed for the improved pedestrian area. We would work alongside stakeholders to agree principles including working with the city manager.</p> <p>Traffic counts are taken annually on Academy Street, in Aug each year to determine traffic</p>

		<p>blind/partially sighted people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No provision for blue badge spaces along the length of Academy Street. - “Flexible space” for loading bays, taxis etc cannot also be safe for pedestrians. Avoid replicating Huntly Street problems. - Pavements will be insufficiently wide to accommodate café spill out space <u>and</u> minimum footway widths set out in: Council guidance for new development; Sustrans handbook for cycle-friendly design; and Inclusive Mobility. 	<p>changes.</p> <p>The absence of controlled crossings is noted, and through further preliminary work we will look to address this, looking at key locations where they can be placed into the scheme to meet the needs of all users, while also being looked at in tandem with how this links with traffic modelling. We will continue to engage with stakeholders.</p> <p>Blue badge spaces and flexible space for loading will all be detailed through the further preliminary works to take place, before we progress to detailed design, and we will work with key stakeholders and businesses to pursue options.</p> <p>As we are working with Sustrans as key partner, we are very much aware of and working within their guidance.</p>
Own Your Street Inverness	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed changes, including greenery will make Academy Street safer and more attractive for pedestrians, reduce congestion and pollution and, if traffic is calmed, make cycling safer. Proposals are an excellent step towards improving Academy Street as a gateway for visiting train travellers, and for people’s enjoyment of the city centre on foot/ wheelchair. Signposts international evidence of increased footfall in shops from this type of improvement. - Strongly in favour of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ proposed movement hierarchy (pedestrian, cycle, vehicle) ▪ introducing several “demand” crossings to make street safe for visually impaired. - The optimal solution would be a segregated cycle lane and single lane of traffic. Relocating rail station would facilitate traffic flow – but budget constraints are recognised. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Further preliminary work will look to address the absence of ‘demand’ crossings. We will continue to engage with stakeholders.</p>
Inverness Active Community of Empowered individuals (ACE)	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ACE is a group of adults with learning disabilities who support the proposal to widen the pavements, reduce traffic speed and improve crossings on Academy Street because the street currently raises 	<p>Support noted for the scheme</p> <p>We will work with stakeholders to look at how</p>

		<p>accessibility issues (e.g. narrow, uneven pavements) particularly for those with visual and mobility problems.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For wheelchair users and people with visual/mobility problems , ACE wants pavements that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clearly defined by kerbs; ▪ Obstacle-free (e.g. no bicycle racks, rain gardens) ▪ Not shared as loading bays. 	<p>SUDS/Rain gardens and other key amenities such as cycle parking and loading can be integrated into the scheme, without adversely affecting those with protected characteristics.</p> <p>Proposed kerb height was adjusted to 60mm through consultation with local access panel.</p>
Paths for All (PFA)	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PFA supports proposals, particularly intention to improve active travel options in this part of Inverness. - PFA's vision is for walking and cycling to be the natural choice for short journeys, creating a healthier, socially inclusive, economically vibrant, environmentally friendly Scotland [reasons supplied including quality of life, place quality, accessibility, pedestrian safety, reduced car dependency, congestion and air pollution, promoting public transport, higher quality public realm and better physical, mental and social health]. - Signposts PFA's Smarter Choices, Smarter Places grant scheme aimed at increasing walking, cycling and use of public transport for everyday travel. 	Support noted.
National Federation for the Blind UK (Scotland)	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Supports stated objectives for walking, cycling, amenity and street activity but is unable to support key proposals that exclude large numbers of blind and disabled people from using Academy Street. - Perceives raised crossing points as "shared space" and provides a detailed rationale for why it disadvantages visually impaired people. - Anticipates that raised crossing points, low kerb heights and absence of signalled crossings will: have an adverse impact on economic activity on Academy Street; affect the balance of frail and disabled people in buses and taxis; cause people with spinal injury to suffer painful jolting in vehicles; and encourage delivery vehicles and taxis to park/set people down on pavements. - Objects to removal of any signal crossings because this discriminates against blind people and those with mobility impairments or learning/neuro-sensitive conditions such as dementia. - Signposts detailed advice on street design that reduces traffic speed. - Requests that the next stage of street design features kerbs, signal 	<p>We are not promoting shared space, the proposed kerb height was adjusted to 60mm through consultation with local access panel, while flat surfaces to enable wheelchairs other mobility restrictions must be provided. Key details on this will be worked on through further preliminary design.</p> <p>Other key examples of urban realm and active travel improvements highlight that improving public space can improve economic activity, as per Sustrans report.</p> <p>We are working with local transport providers on this scheme. Parking on the pavement would be an enforceable matter and dealt with by relevant staff.</p>

		<p>crossings, blue badge parking, safe parking/set -down arrangements for delivery vehicles, taxis and motorists, and a central coloured strip for cycle stands modelled on High St, Kensington.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides separate, detailed critique, section by section, of text and images in the consultation in terms of: legal requirement to accommodate blind and disabled people; rationale for avoiding shared space and zebra crossings; rationale for providing kerbs and frequent signal crossings; appropriate street furniture; use of planters; on-street parking; appropriate surface materials including tactile warning surfaces, colour contrasts and traffic calming features; need for detectable guarding at street cafés; and safe arrangements for: loading; cycle parking; bus stops; blue badge parking, shoppers pick-up/drop-off areas; taxi bays. 	<p>Details on key loading provision, taxi space etc. to be worked through in further preliminary design.</p> <p>The absence of controlled crossings is noted, and through further preliminary work we will look to address this, looking at key locations where they can be placed into the scheme to meet the needs of all users, while also being looked at in tandem with how this links with traffic modelling. We will continue to engage with stakeholders.</p> <p>The approach taken in Kensington would not fit into our street width available, but we are addressing concerns regarding cycle parking and raingardens through stakeholder engagement as part of further detailed design.</p> <p>Feedback noted regarding specific details on materials etc.</p>
Individuals			
Tom Matthew	Remain neutral	Positive proposal, but how far has the impact on bus services been taken into account?	We have actively engaged with local bus operators x3 meetings during the development of scheme.
Janis Armstrong	Remain neutral	What consideration has been given to the needs of mobility impaired (e.g. wheelchair users)? Current conditions are challenging.	We have taken the needs of a wide cross section of users into account, and the widened pavements, narrower road crossings have been designed to allow easier crossing and movement for those with mobility needs and also parents with buggies.
Janet Adamson	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic and traffic fumes on Academy Street need to be reduced. - Visitors' first impression needs to be improved. 	Support noted.
Cecile Mettot	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Where will Academy Street traffic be diverted to so that traffic volume can reduce, giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists? - Will owners of dilapidated property be forced to undertake maintenance & repairs to make the area attractive? 	We are actively encouraging a modal shift, to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport. However understanding the impacts of traffic flow will be understood through traffic modelling. Regarding properties, this falls outside the scope of active travel.

Martin MacLeod	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Street significantly friendlier to pedestrians and cyclists, solving current problem of overspill from pavements onto carriageway. – Queries whether nervous cyclists would feel comfortable cycling in line with traffic and, if not, whether a separate cycle lane is a better solution. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>We have looked at whether segregated cycle routes could be accommodated, and without changing to a one way street. At chapel street end in particular the road is very narrow, while the extra space at the other end is utilised for public transport provision.</p>
Sheila Fletcher	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Entrances to Margaret Street and Strothers Lane seem too narrow to accommodate large buses/coaches. 	<p>Our consultant carried out swept path analysis, and bus movement can be accommodated. This will be better understood through traffic modelling in next phase.</p>
Mick Heath	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Creates an obvious walking/cycling area where cars are welcome guests. Street transformed into a pleasant destination with space for street furniture, seating, plants. 	<p>Support noted.</p>
Andrew Lynn	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Current prioritisation of vehicle movement compromises pedestrian experience on Academy Street. Proposals will address current problems (few safe crossing points, particularly in front of train station, narrow pavements, traffic speed) and helps pedestrians make better use of the street. 	<p>Support noted.</p>
Stewart Dickins	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – If street is properly resurfaced, current pavement cycling problem will be eliminated because cyclists will no longer have to avoid the “pitted lunar surface”. – To understand problem, cycle north along the street on Friday, 4-5pm. 	<p>Support noted.</p>
William Macdonald	Strongly agree		<p>Support noted.</p>
Susan Hadfield	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supports wider pavements (currently too narrow) and planting. – Cyclists need access to station entrances from Academy St (past the Highland Hotel) and from Inglis St via Falcon Square. 	<p>Support noted, and cyclist movements are very much considered with plans.</p>
Elizabeth Shiach	Strongly disagree		
David Edmiston	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposals are largely cosmetic – window dressing on a slum that repeats opportunities missed over 20 years to make the city centre attractive, e.g. bus station should occupy Morrison/Eastgate 2 sites. 	<p>No change: while opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the priority for this project is to improve active travel routes leading from the Rail Station to other parts of the</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Illustrations feature large numbers of bikes but no wheelchairs or push chairs. How will bus traffic be managed to pass each other at choke points? 	<p>city centre via Academy Street, Falcon Square and Farraline Park.</p> <p>Again, traffic flow and capacity will be understood further during traffic modelling, which will form part of detailed design phase.</p>
Neil Hornsby	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Supports proposals but considers a major opportunity is being missed to create a fully integrated bus and rail hub (described) – as exists at Fort William and planned for Perth and Oban. Sets out social and environmental, as well as economic business case for such a hub, which could be funded by shelving Eastlink and diverting investment. – These proposals, combined rail station improvements and consideration for rail halt at Beechwood are evidence of sufficient political will. – Royal Mail move presents ideal opportunity to create a bus-turning/boarding area. A flyover is needed linking Millburn Road, the integrated station and the A82. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>No change: while opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the priority for this project is to improve active travel routes leading from the Rail Station to other parts of the city centre via Academy Street, Falcon Square and Farraline Park, including improved walking and cycling links between the rail and bus stations.</p>
Alex Andrews	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Gordon Smith	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Agrees in principle, noting research on under-utilised car parks and Scotland-wide action to create cycle safe areas, to European standards. – Can Academy Street/area be pedestrianised or vehicle access restricted to delivery/taxis/buses etc, denying access to private cars? 	Support noted.
Stuart Dustan	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Academy Street is not fit for purpose and is a major inconvenience for pedestrians. Proposals address key issues: lack of pedestrian priority, crossings and walkway width. They will attract more pedestrians/cyclists/customers to the street. Movement hierarchy needs to change to give priority to pedestrians then cyclists, public transport, delivery vehicles and, lastly, diesel and petrol cars. 	Support noted.
Emma Roddick	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Widening/improving narrow, uneven pavements will make a massive difference, particularly for people wheeling wheelchairs, prams, or luggage. – Unsure that key cycling constraints are being addressed, based on daily experience of cycling along Academy Street (and bicycle damage caused by uneven surfacing, not just potholes). Navigating oncoming traffic is very difficult on transfer between Academy Street and shared-use 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>The surfacing on academy street would be improved through the scheme.</p> <p>The interaction between Academy Street and Millburn Road will be addressed through the</p>

		walkway on Millburn Road. Sometimes forced to lift bike on/off pavements. At Falcon Square, sharing the road crossing with large volume of pedestrians is almost impossible. Being overtaken by cars is less of a problem.	Inverness City Active Travel Network CL+ Funding, which is a separate scheme from Accessing Inverness. Officers are working together to ensure synergy and joined up approach.
John Heathcote	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current problems include congested narrow pavements, near-stationary traffic, a road surface in poor repair, the sense that this part of the city is neglected. Improvements are necessary to attract high quality businesses to west end of street. - Cycle parking also needed - ideally Sheffield stands under video surveillance. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Cycle parking will be accommodated through further preliminary design.</p>
Amanda Ophof	Strongly agree	Current traffic volume/behaviour breaks up the city centre. First impression for visitors arriving by bus or train is busy traffic and a chaotic taxi rank. Proposals will help to reduce problems and make city centre more attractive and accessible to pedestrians and cyclists.	Support noted.
Ross Finlay	Strongly disagree	Academy Street is a main thoroughfare for cars. Other uses are of secondary importance.	<p>The transport hierarchy has been applied: Walking, cycling, public transport, use of vehicles.</p> <p>The funding we are seeking to deliver to develop this scheme is for active travel.</p>
Simon Brooks	Agree	<p>The principle of prioritising pedestrian and cycle movement is sound but proposals should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Restrict motorised traffic (daytime) to public transport and taxis, with timed access for service vehicles. - Create a single wider carriageway, rather than two lanes, because proposed geometry is very tight for buses. Include bus-sized pull-ins on alternate sides, allowing more space for pedestrians, SUDs features and loading, because the current width (4.5M max) appears unrealistic. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Through engagement with local business and members, there is currently no support for restricting motorised traffic.</p> <p>Swept path analysis has taken place to show that buses can utilise the proposed layout, which does change from 2 lanes (including turn lane) into one.</p>
Graeme Watson	Agree	Proposals reflect good intentions but it would be better to fully pedestrianize Academy Street apart from access - removing taxis altogether.	Support noted. Currently there is no support to fully pedestrianize, and this would not fit with funding to create walking and cycling improvements.
Mr & Mrs Colin Jackman	Strongly agree	- There is a need to improve the look of Academy Street while making it safer for pedestrians, cyclists and cars. This will encourage more people	Support noted.

		<p>to visit the street, make it more attractive for tourists and photography, and improve the local economy by increasing footfall and encouraging business start-ups.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Ensure proposals include kerbs that make drivers aware where pedestrian areas start and finish. Incorporate wheelchair access points. 	<p>Proposed kerb height was adjusted to 60mm through consultation with local access panel and will delineate where the pedestrian areas start and finish.</p>
W Grant	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Brian MacKenzie	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Academy Street should be a destination, not a through route. Traffic should be redirected and reduced to avoid slow-moving, nose-to-tail motor traffic, which fails to improve walking and cycling environments. – Proposals could be detrimental to cyclists and will not promote cycling because it is intimidating to cycle in front of a driver who does not have room to overtake. – Crown Road roundabout design fails in many ways and does not merit consideration. – Where are proposals for carriageway level, kerbside cycle parking, which should be considered before street cafes and rain gardens? At 4.5M wide, footways used/cluttered up for any other purpose will not match Council standards for new development. – To meet the needs of disabled pedestrians, proposals should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ feature a continuous 60mm raised kerb between the footway edge and the carriageway/loading areas. ▪ Use tactile paving at raised crossings. ▪ Provide clear routes beside the kerb <u>and</u> adjacent to the building line. 	<p>Agree Academy Street is a destination, and the current designs reflect this.</p> <p>The scheme is focusing on modal shift, but the designs, as shown in other locations where schemes have been introduced, have significantly reduced traffic numbers.</p> <p>We will work with local active travel stakeholders, but the median strip which was proposed to reduce overtaking is thought of as a safety feature so that vehicles do no overtake.</p> <p>Crown road junction required further design, and engagement with local business and stakeholders, this would take place through further preliminary works.</p> <p>Cycle parking etc. will be looking at through further preliminary design and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>The scheme does propose a 60mm kerb height, and use of tactile or similar textured materials has always been incorporated in outline design.</p>
Jenny Mayhew	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Proposals are bound to reduce vehicle traffic. – Is A96 traffic still funnelled through Academy Street? 	<p>Support noted. The Inverness City Active Travel Network is focusing on Raigmore interchange and along Millburn Road. This will improve active travel and encourage modal shift.</p>

			Academy street needs to function to allow vehicles to pass through, but this proposal should change travel behaviour, so that only those who need to drive in this area do so.
Margot Tuley	Remain neutral	Cycling on Academy Street would be quite intimidating if vehicles had no room to overtake. Narrowing the carriageway and increasing pavement width is likely to encourage cyclists to use pavements because these feel safer than the road. Creating separate space for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles would eliminate conflict.	<p>Advice from consultants showed that where there are slow speeds and the inability to overtake that traffic behaviour changes, and it is safe to cycle. This is a key priority for the scheme to enable safe and comfortable cycling. We are looking to incorporate cycle images onto the carriageway to encourage cycling.</p> <p>Again, we looked at options for segregated cycling, but the width restrictions prohibit this, if we wish to improve the pedestrian environment. This could only happen if it became one -way, which there is currently no support for.</p>
Roderick MacKenzie	Strongly agree	Terrific proposals that bring Inverness into line with northern Europe, where every town has designated cycling infrastructure.	Support noted.
Janet Home		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing the carriageway on Academy Street to two lanes, without a segregated cycle lane, is likely to slow traffic and discourage drivers from entering the city centre, which will not encourage people to shop there. - If taxi spaces are removed from Academy Street, they must be relocated to suit visitors arriving by train, and where they will be available for evening use. - Will The Highland Council or the Common Good Fund be required to pay some of the cost? - Local Community Councils or the Community Council Forum should have received invitations to the exhibition at Eastgate Shopping Centre. The exhibition was poorly signposted within the centre and poster text too small to read. - Victorian Market entrances have been changed twice in 15 years, at considerable expense. 	<p>Traffic modelling will be used to determine how the changes will affect journey times. The original outline design has no traffic signals, therefore there would not be the stop/start of traffic movements. However, we will need to model in key crossing points and look closely at options for design going forward as part of further preliminary work.</p> <p>Taxi spaces and feedback on consultation noted.</p> <p>The next stage of preliminary and detailed design could be 100% funded via Sustrans Scotland through an application process, however options for any construction need further discussion.</p> <p>Victorian market frontages outside scope of active travel.</p>

2: We have looked at a range of pedestrian and cycle crossing options for the project area, in particular Academy Street. Please tell us which of the following options you prefer, and why.

Of 33 respondents who answered this question 10 prefer courtesy crossings, 8 prefer zebra and 15 prefer another option

Respondent	Option	Summary of comments received	Proposed response
Government/Statutory Bodies			
Scottish Natural Heritage	Other	In favour of a combination of signalled crossings at the busiest places to control/ facilitate pedestrian movement and, elsewhere, un-signalled zebra crossings. Proposed zebras contribute to street clutter and result in stop-start journeys for cyclists/traffic. Although courtesy crossings provide a visually attractive, less cluttered streetscape, the absence of a clear priority could confuse cyclists, who may not be prepared to stop if people cross the road unexpectedly.	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
Business			
Inverness BID		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerned that a lack of controlled crossings may create a road safety issue. - Supportive of increased crossing areas, subject to provision of acceptable levels of designated loading/unloading areas and disabled parking. 	<p>The absence of controlled crossings is noted, and through further preliminary work we will look to address this, looking at key locations where they can be placed into the scheme to meet the needs of all users, while also being looked at in tandem with how this links with traffic modelling. We will continue to engage with stakeholders.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
NGOs (including charities and campaign groups)			
Inverness Civic Trust	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A mix of both crossings (e.g. zebras at Inglis Street, Victorian Market) is appropriate because sole reliance on courtesy crossings requires behavioural change by drivers and pedestrians. - Because Academy Street continues to be a major thoroughfare, traffic modelling is needed to ensure that reduced carriageway widths/speeds will not produce congestion. Ensure safe movement of heavy vehicles, whether or not bus access to/from bus station changes in the future. 	<p>The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Traffic management and traffic modelling will be part of the detailed design phase.</p> <p>Potential Bus Station reconfiguration is noted and will be considered during next design stage.</p>

Putting Inverness Streets Ahead	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong preference for controlled signalised crossings incorporating Audible and Tactile facilities (details provided), which do not feature in these proposals - citing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation advice on improving busy urban streets (2010) - 'Older people and people with a visual impairment may express a preference for signalised crossings as they provide greater certainty when crossing.' ▪ Transport Scotland (TS) requirements for inclusive design in the construction, operation and maintenance of road infrastructure (2013) - TS could 'no longer support the use of zebra crossings because they are unsuitable for visually impaired pedestrians'. ▪ The Council's Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments (2013): 'Signal controlled pedestrian crossings are the safest places for vulnerable pedestrians to cross the road, especially for visually impaired people.' ▪ Guide Dogs research (2017) showing controlled crossings to be the most reliable and least stressful crossings for blind or partially sighted people. - Explains why both zebra and courtesy crossings disadvantage visually impaired people with particular emphasis on their inability to interact visually with drivers or observe driver behaviour. Confirms importance to autistic people of controlled crossings and clearly demarcated pavements/roads. Calls for new controlled crossing on Union Street at junction with Academy Street. - Supports proposed 60mm kerb height, which accords with Guide Dogs advice (2009). - Perceives proposed raised tables at crossing points as "shared surface" that can make visually impaired and autistic people feel anxious and vulnerable. Cites Guide Dogs research (2017) revealing one in three respondents with a disability would go out of their way to avoid visiting a shared surface street. Urges: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of kerbs throughout to delineate pavement from carriageway, with tactile paving at crossing points. ▪ Moratorium on all use of shared surface in Inverness until Scottish Government publishes guidance on inclusive design for all, referred to in Scottish ministerial letter (October 2018). 	<p>The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Support for kerb height is noted.</p> <p>Shared surface streets have not been proposed.</p> <p>Raised tables at crossing points will be addressed during further preliminary design stage.</p>
---------------------------------	-------	---	---

Own Your Street Inverness	Other	Anticipates requirement for some signalised crossings to meet the needs of visual impaired people. Courtesy crossings are preferable to zebras providing they signal clearly that crossing is primarily pedestrian. Zebra crossings least satisfactory because they define carriageway as car-space. Signposts design guidance produced for Greater Manchester Combined Authority.	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
Inverness Active Community of Empowered individuals (ACE)	Other	Preference for traffic light controlled crossings where there is a clear indication for drivers to stop, and signals (visual and audible) confirming when it is safe to cross, because these are easy to identify and locate. Zebras are preferable to courtesy but both crossings may be ignored by drivers making them unsafe to cross. Concern that the number of crossings could also cause traffic to back up.	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered. Traffic management and traffic modelling will be part of the detailed design phase.
National Federation for the Blind UK (Scotland)	Other	Strongly opposes both options. Existing signal crossings should be updated and retained, or relocated elsewhere on Academy Street. Their paths should be wider. Transport Scotland withdrew support for zebra crossings in 2013, declaring them unsuitable for visually impaired pedestrians. In 2017 a UK Parliamentary Inquiry found that replacing signalised crossings with courtesy or zebra crossings discriminates against some disabled people. Scottish Government guidance on <i>Designing Streets</i> states that councils can be obliged to reinstate features, such as crossings, that have been removed. Contrary to consultation information, zebra crossings do not make mobility impaired people feel safer. Blind and visually impaired people along with those who are hearing or mobility impaired have difficulty detecting whether drivers have stopped. Crossings should feature: tactile tails on pavements running back to a building frontage; sounders and sensors; low level signals (to promote cyclist discipline).	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered. The documents referred to in the comments will be taken in to consideration during this design phase.
Comments from individuals			
Janet Adamson	Zebra	Drivers will not understand or comply with protocol for courtesy crossings.	All road users are governed by the Highway Code. There may be the opportunity of education of all users through press releases etc.
Raphaella Perks	Other	Favours signal crossings over proposed options because both zebra/courtesy would exacerbate traffic congestion at busy times of year.	Comment noted.

Janis Armstrong	Zebra	Elderly and disabled users might be better served by definite crossings.	Comment noted.
Martin MacLeod	Zebra	Zebras help drivers and cyclists to anticipate when to slow down /pay attention because they make it more obvious to pedestrians where it is safe to cross.	Comment noted.
Sheila Fletcher	Other	There has to be signalled crossings and clear definition between road and pavement. Both courtesy and zebra crossings will disable blind and partially sighted people and reduce their independence - because these crossings rely on pedestrians and motorists being aware of each other.	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
Mick Heath	Courtesy	Courtesy crossings will reinforce pedestrian priority.	Comment noted.
Andrew Lynn	Courtesy	Courtesy crossings allow more free movement of pedestrians and cyclists and help focus drivers' attention on pedestrian movement. Also more visually attractive than other options.	Comment noted.
Stewart Dickins	Courtesy	Although courtesy crossings might take drivers longer to get used to, they offer all users - vehicle, cycle, pedestrian the best experience overall in terms of safety/convenience.	Comment noted.
William Macdonald	Courtesy		Comment noted.
Neil Hornsby	Zebra	Zebra crossings safer for all concerned.	Comment noted.
Elizabeth Shiach	Zebra		Comment noted.
David Edmiston	Other	No need for crossing points if bus access is restricted (see response to Q1).	Comment noted.
Stuart Dustan	Courtesy	<p>Although counter-intuitive, removal of road lines/signs leads to safer streets because vehicles and pedestrians are made aware of each other's movements. Dutch engineer Hans Monderman pioneered this approach, which led to dramatic falls in accident rates. Evidence shows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ high rates of collisions/accidents between vehicles/cyclists and pedestrians at controlled crossings because lights encourage traffic to speed and pedestrians to be complacent; ▪ significant improvements in traffic flow in city centres where traffic lights have been removed. <p>Streets without formal crossings encourage all users to be more cautious/aware of each other. Prioritising pedestrian and cycle movement is also necessary to reduce petrol/diesel emissions for health and environmental reasons - so that Highlanders continue to benefit from clean, fresh air.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Support evidence appreciated and will be considered during the further preliminary design phase.</p>

Alex Andrews	Zebra		Comment noted.
C. Campbell	Courtesy	Over time, courtesy crossings would improve driver behaviour and could be extended to other areas. City centre streets are far too cluttered.	Comment noted.
Ross Finlay	Other	Improved crossing is not the priority for Academy Street. Five crossings would be adequate.	Comment noted.
Simon Brooks	Courtesy	Crossings without 'formal' controls will work better if traffic is restricted. Reducing clutter is important. (See also responses to Q1 and Q6.)	Comment noted.
Mr & Mrs Colin Jackman	Courtesy	Courtesy crossings minimise visual clutter, making the street more attractive, but may raise serious safety issues for people with sight problems. They are only preferable if pedestrian priority is clearly understood, and drivers are aware of their position and adhere to their rules – e.g. Older adults or people with impairments should be guaranteed extra time to cross safely.	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
W. Grant	Courtesy		Comment noted.
John Heathcote	Courtesy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These informal crossings are next best option to pedestrianizing Academy Street (ideal scenario), which is unrealistic if vehicular access for public transport and as a city centre thru-route is to be maintained. Formal crossing points are likely to be ignored if pedestrian footfall increases. - Will bus passenger pickup/drop-off be managed to maximise fuel-efficiency and minimise pollution? How? 	<p>The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Full consultation with the Bus Operators in the City during this next stage will ensure the pickup and drop-off points are considered.</p>
Amanda Ophof	Zebra	Zebra crossings are safer because they make it more obvious to drivers/cyclists where to expect pedestrians to cross, and who has right of way.	Comment noted.
Margot Tuley	Other	A mixture of crossings is needed to accommodate all ages/abilities. Lights feel safer but raised crossings may be appropriate where traffic is light.	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
Brian MacKenzie	Other	- Why are signal controlled crossings not an option? Proposals do not comply with the Council's Roads and Transport Guidelines for New Developments (2013), which state that 'Signal controlled pedestrian crossings are the safest places for vulnerable pedestrians to cross the road, especially for visually impaired people'? Transport Scotland withdrew support for zebra crossings in 2013 out of concern for visually	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.

		<p>impaired pedestrians. Courtesy crossings are even less suitable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove vacuous reference to cyclists being "enabled to move with flow of traffic" because cyclists are always free to do so if they so wish. 	Comment noted.
Graham Tuley	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considers courtesy crossings to be unsuitable for a wide range of reasons (details given), including that they: have no legal status; benefit vehicles not pedestrians (in particular visually impaired); encourage vehicle speed; and block vehicular traffic where pedestrian volumes are high and vice versa. Zebra crossings have legal status but are not recommended for visually impaired people. Proposed zebras do not comply with regulations because they lack formal signals. - Puts forward detailed proposals for 10 signal arrangements between Crown Road and Friars Lane, including new signalled crossings. 	<p>The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Submitted proposals will be looked at during this next preliminary design stage.</p>
Roderick MacKenzie	Zebra		Comment noted.
Jenny Mayhew	Other	<p>A mix of both options is needed on this long stretch of street. Courtesy crossings are not suitable for elderly/slow/visually impaired/pushchair users. They make elderly/infirm people feel vulnerable because it is not always easy to judge a driver's intentions, which can be difficult and scary. Not all drivers will be courteous.</p>	<p>The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p>

3: The proposals for the Farraline Park / Railway Terrace area have been designed to make this a safer, more attractive environment to walk and cycle. Has this been achieved?

Of 36 respondents to this question, 17 strongly agree or agree, 11 remain neutral, and 7 disagree or strongly disagree

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree	Summary of comments received	Proposed response
Government/Statutory Bodies			
Scottish Natural Heritage	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anticipates changes will improve current conditions, which prioritise vehicles over pedestrians and cyclists/active travel – but not ideal because buses and lorries will have continued access to F Park. - Supports the use of rain gardens and green infrastructure for sustainable urban drainage, visual interest, connecting people with nature, placemaking, and biodiversity. - Little value in localised improvements to cycle infrastructure unless safe connecting routes are created to the wider area for both local and specific long distance journeys (examples included; see response to Q1). 	Comments noted.
High Life Highland		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Interested in and supportive of proposals and delivery of active travel improvements at Academy St, Farraline Park and Falcon Square, funding permitting. - Improvements to pedestrian environment at Farraline Park will: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mean loss of parking space for blue badge holders in front of Library; ▪ Bring significant benefits to Library customers, in terms of ease/safety of access, and attractiveness of facility and setting. 	Support noted.
Business			
Inverness BID		Proposals should take account of future development opportunities arising from relocation of adjacent businesses.	Comment noted.
NGOs (including charities and campaign groups)			
Inverness Civic Trust	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pedestrians and cyclists have been catered for but no mention of how current drop-off arrangements/turning in front of Library will be handled. - No provision for safe turning of vehicles approaching from Railway Terrace via Strothers Lane, when prevented from entering Farraline Park. - Disabled parking /drop-off points must be provided. Potential to use loading bays on Strothers Lane should be considered. 	The drop off options will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered including the potential to redesignate the loading bays.

Putting Inverness Streets Ahead	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A safer and more attractive environment has not been achieved because illustrations show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ cyclist on pavement and two riding on the wrong side of the road. ▪ confusion over whether Blue Badge holder parking will be retained. - Considers these proposals will worsen existing situation and provides list of shortcomings/concerns that make current bus station design/bus movement unsafe for disabled people, in particular the visually impaired. - Suggests alternative improvements including: new barrier separating library from operational floor of bus station to protect pedestrians/cyclists; lip-free route between rail and bus stations for wheelchair users. - Queries whether proposals represent value for money, given potential for bus station to move in future. 	While opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the priority for this project is to improve current pedestrian and cycling links from the Rail Station to the Bus Station and Rose Street Car park.
Own Your Street Inverness	Agree	Supports increased space for pedestrians, more greenery/attractive features, reduced car access.	Support noted.
National Federation for the Blind UK (Scotland)	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calls for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Signalised, kerbed crossing point leading to Farraline Park because a raised table will make it more difficult for blind and disabled people to reach the bus station, which could lengthen their journey to a bus stop. ▪ Segregated cycle route through Farraline Park, a ban on cyclists using pavement, and appropriately placed cycle parking. - Queries why bus station facilities have not being updated (bus stands, shelters, lounge facilities etc). 	While opportunities may arise in the longer term to reconfigure and improve bus station facilities, the priority for this project is to improve current pedestrian and cycling links from the Rail Station to the Bus Station and Rose Street Car park.
Comments from individuals			
Janet Adamson	Agree		Support noted.
Raphaela Perks	Agree		Support noted.
Martin MacLeod	Agree	Generally supportive but an area for drop off/pick up from bus station is still needed to facilitate short stay drop-offs without incurring parking charges.	Comment noted.
Mick Heath	Agree	Seems a sound approach to mixing bus traffic and non-motorised users, which is a challenge.	Support noted.
Fiona Catto	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Great that cycling and walking will be enabled. Current traffic levels discourage cycling. Library needs to feel more accessible and central. The removal of parking spaces may be an issue but proximity to car parks should help. 	Support noted.

		- Both the Library and the city centre look dilapidated and in need of upgrading. Improving the look and feel of the city centre will incentivise people to visit and shop.	
Andrew Lynn	Agree	Proposals appear to help pedestrians and cyclists feel more comfortable and safe by giving them more space. A shared space with pedestrian priority might enhance this. Farraline Park is too vehicle-dominated, including cars using route as a "rat run".	Support noted.
Stewart Dickins	Agree	Supports aspiration. Proposal improves pedestrian safety and visual character, creating a modern feel, but does not address traffic/pedestrian conflict from a cyclist's perspective, apart from improving cycle link between the A82 and the rail station.	Support noted.
William Macdonald	Agree		Support noted.
Lynn Macfarlane	Agree	- Proposals would vastly improve access to F Park. - Strongly opposed to any form of taxi rank on Strothers Lane due to impact on residential amenity, especially at night. Restrict ranks to Academy Street.	Support noted and comment about taxi rank will be considered through further preliminary designs.
Elizabeth Shiach	Agree		Support noted.
David Edmiston	Strongly disagree	- Is the bus station moving? Why are buses missing from illustration? - Unacceptable to remove blue-badge spaces from front of Library. - 3-D illustration is misleading because it fails to show typical presence of large number of buses. Farraline Park is no longer a park. Vehicles need access for drop-off/pick-up from bus station. Proposed new planting will restrict bus manoeuvres. - "Accessing Inverness" should be about changing and improving bus access. Rather than exiting Farraline Park to Academy Street, long distance buses should leave via Rose Street.	While opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the current priority is to improve the walking and cycling environment between the rail station, bus station and Rose Street Car park.
Neil Hornsby	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Susan Hadfield		Additional improvements needed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Underpass should be accessible to tandems and cycles towing trailer – access currently restricted by chicanes. ▪ Widen scope of improvements to create continuous, safe cycle/pedestrian links from railway station through F Park to Rose Street retail units, and from here to Academy Street. 	Comment noted. The scope of Accessing Inverness is to improve the walking and cycling environment between the rail station, bus station and Rose Street Car park.

Stuart Dustan	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals are likely to create a safer environment for walking/cycling – but more radical intervention is needed to make it attractive. Greater emphasis on visual improvement will attract more people to the Library and the wider area and could reduce air pollution. Visitors arriving by rail and bus will also have a better “first impression”. - Priority should be to make cycling a desirable way to travel around the town. Consider potential for: dedicated cycle roads; fit-for-purpose (rather than retro-fitted) cycle lanes; a bike hire station/bike share stand; and secure bike stands/lockers. - Introduce green space, green walkways/infrastructure trees and plants. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comments regarding green space will be considered through further preliminary designs.</p>
Alex Andrews	Remain neutral		Comment noted.
Helen Smith	Remain neutral	Restricting access to the bus station by private car (apart from blue badge holders) may discourage people from using buses, in particular those who find it difficult to walk (elderly people, people with young children etc).	Comment noted.
Cecile Mettot	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move bus station to the Royal Mail site and create the attractive park that the city centre desperately needs. - Use Royal Mail car park and its building for buses/bus station/coach parking. 	While opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the priority for this project is to improve current pedestrian and cycling links from the rail station to the bus station and Rose Street Car park.
C. Campbell	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Re-routing buses to avoid turning into Academy Street will benefit more people than the number using the proposed new cycle lane. - Sufficient car parking must be retained, factoring in future impact of new Justice Centre. City centre economy relies on easy access by car from the wider Highland area. 	A longer term commitment to reduce bus movement between the bus station and Academy Street is set out in Inverness City Centre Development Brief Map A.1 (p46), which shows the area reserved for a future bus-only route linking Farraline Park to Rose Street and the A82.
Ross Finlay	Strongly disagree	Consultation is biased: pedestrians and cars far outnumber cyclists in the centre of Inverness. Who is going to cycle here?	Comment noted. Statistics show that there is a steady increase in cycling levels throughout the City and will continue to rise with improved infrastructure.
Simon Brooks	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agrees with restricting cars beyond access to car park, and low level rain garden that does not obscure Library façade. - Linkages to new cycle path need clarification (see response to Q4). 	The connections to / from any new cycling infrastructure will be addressed during further preliminary designs.
W. Grant	Agree		Support noted.

John Heathcote	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Changes appear minor. Restricting vehicle access to F Park results in a long car journey from Rose Street to Academy Street. - Electric cars will need access to recently installed electric car charging. 	Comments noted.
Amanda Ophof	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At present this not a friendly place to walk. Footways are too narrow for people with luggage. Current arrangements for bus station pickup/drop off are chaotic. The library and its location need to be emphasised. 	Support noted.
Alan Scott	Disagree	<p>Applauds intention to improve the city centre and Farraline Park but requests limiting vehicle access to taxis and blue badge holders to be reconsidered. This will seriously inconvenience bus users, especially long distance travellers with heavy luggage who need to be dropped off/picked up by car.</p>	Comments noted.
Margot Tuley	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to public transport needs to be as easy as possible to encourage wider use. Removing opportunity for drop-off/pick up from bus station will discourage use. - How will access be maintained to electric car charging points? - Bus station layout should be re-configured to enable passengers to board buses without crossing paths with buses. Buses should be able to exit F Park directly, avoiding Academy Street. 	<p>No change: While opportunities may arise in the longer term to reconfigure and improve bus station facilities, the priority for this project is to improve current pedestrian and cycling links from the Rail Station to the Bus Station and Rose Street Car park. A longer term commitment to reduce bus traffic between the bus station and Academy Street is set out in Inverness City Centre Development Brief Map A.1 (p46), which shows the area reserved for a future bus-only route linking Farraline Park to Rose Street and the A82.</p>
Brian MacKenzie	Strongly disagree	<p>More radical proposals are needed to make area safe for active travel. Work should be postponed until this can be tackled. Pedestrians and cyclists annoyed by the artist's impression showing cycling on a pavement.</p>	Comment noted.
Jenny Mayhew	Agree	<p>How will private cars be prevented from using the bus route (other than pickup/set down)? Will there still be parking for blue badge holders accessing the library? Options increase if Royal Mail leave the area.</p>	<p>Enforcement of the restricting of private cars will be developed as the project progresses. The drop off options will be addressed during further designs.</p>
Janet Home		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unacceptable to remove blue-badge spaces from front of Library, because blue badge spaces in the city centre are already in very short supply. Some disabled people could take 15 minutes to make the journey from the multi storey car park and the Library. - Also: the removal of short stay spaces for Library visitors is likely to burden drivers with the extra cost of paying for parking. 	<p>The drop off options will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered including the potential to redesignate the loading bays.</p>

4: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals to develop a cycle route on Railway Terrace to link with the active travel hub, NCN1 and the Railway station entrance at Strothers Lane?

Of 30 respondents to this question, 18 strongly agree or agree, 6 remain neutral, and 5 disagree or strongly disagree

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree	Summary of comments received	Proposed response
Government/Statutory Bodies			
Scottish Natural Heritage	Remain neutral	Supports creation of active travel routes and recognises constraints of retro-fitting. Preferred option (to attract less confident cyclists) would be for a cycle route that is not shared with buses and lorries. Reiterates responses to Q1 and Q3: Little value in localised improvements to cycle infrastructure without safe connections to wider area. This short cycle lane is unlikely to be sufficient to create a noticeable increase in cycling uptake.	Comment noted. These will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
Business			
Inverness BID		Existing road users should not be disadvantaged by proposed link from the Active Travel Hub, the National Cycle Network Route 1 and the Rail Station.	Comment noted.
NGOs (including charities and campaign groups)			
Inverness Civic Trust	Remain neutral	Supports provision of an integrated, connected cycling network within the city. There is a need to assess how all current proposals for active travel improvements will impact on the city's Active Travel Network, accompanied by further public consultation.	Comment noted and assessment will be carried out during further preliminary design phase.
Putting Inverness Streets Ahead	Disagree	Queries basis of proposal given likelihood that Royal Mail site will be re-developed in the near future, with potential for alterations to roadway and bus station.	No change: while opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the priority for this project is to improve current pedestrian and cycling links from the rail station to the bus station and Rose Street car park.
Own Your Street Inverness	Strongly agree	Vital to establish strong links between the cycle network and this gateway/proposed new travel hub.	Support noted.
National Federation of the Blind UK (Scotland)	Disagree	Unclear whether proposal protects walkers either crossing or on pavement alongside the cycle track. Existing pavements/crossings must not be compromised by new cycle track, including route passing multi-storey car	These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key

		park. Seeks continuous kerb separation between track and pavement with dropped kerbs at min 100M intervals. Signposts relevant UK Inclusive Mobility guidance (2004). New cycle track must maintain or improve access between car park entrances and rail station/retail destinations for drivers and passengers who are blind or disabled.	stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
Comments from individuals			
Janet Adamson	Agree	Supports cycle route but calls for proactive measures to stop unauthorised access by vehicles limiting its safety/attractiveness for active travel.	Traffic management will be considered as part of the detailed design phase.
Raphaela perks	Remain neutral		Support noted.
Mick Heath	Agree	Supports safe, signed links.	Support noted.
Martin MacLeod	Remain neutral	Queries whether link will be useful, whether sufficient numbers cycle from underpass to bus station/railway station.	Comment noted.
Stewart Dickins	Agree	Current conflict between cyclists/pedestrians and Royal Mail traffic, including parcel collection customers, is dangerous.	Support noted.
Andrew Lynn	Agree	Cyclists will feel safer than present sharing of road with large vehicles.	Support noted.
William Macdonald	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Neil Hornsby	Strongly agree	See response to Q1 (opportunity missed to create integrated bus/rail hub).	Support noted.
David Edmiston	Strongly disagree	Move bus station if possible.	No change: while opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the priority for this project is to improve current pedestrian and cycling links from the rail station to the bus station and Rose Street Car park.
Stuart Dustan	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - New cycle routes have a significant role to play in making Inverness communities healthier, happier and safer. Giving priority to motor traffic encourages inactivity and compromises road safety. - Cycle routes must, however, be fit-for-purpose. Avoid narrow lanes prone to abuse by drivers. Expand infrastructure – see response to Q3. 	Support noted.
C Campbell	Remain neutral	The creation of a safe walking environment on Railway Terrace is a bigger priority than a new cycling lane. Positioning the cycle lane behind the existing wall would be safer.	Comment noted.

Alex Andrews	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Ross Finlay	Strongly disagree	Cycling is not the priority.	Comment noted.
Simon Brooks	Strongly agree	This cycle path is needed, along with improvements for pedestrians and cyclists between Railway Terrace and both the rail station and Academy St. The dedicated route needs to continue through the A82 underpass and on to Innes St. Cycle access to underpass is currently restricted by chicanes.	Comment noted. The scope of Accessing Inverness is to improve the walking and cycling environment between the rail station, bus station and Rose Street Car park. Connections with the wider network will be considered during the preliminary design phase.
W Grant	Strongly agree		Support noted.
John Heathcote	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only locals are likely to come along the new cycle lane so it remains a priority to link the railway station to the national and local cycle network, including safe routes for cyclists travelling from north (avoiding impossible Shore Street roundabout), south and west (pedestrianised High Street). - Is the proposed 2M wide cycle lane wide enough for bikes with panniers to pass, factoring in edge conditions? - The rail station needs cycle parking. It is difficult to find somewhere to even prop a bike when accessing ticket machine, shop or loo. 	<p>No change: responsibility for upgrading Inverness rail station lies with Abellio Scotrail, who announced a £6M project to improve station entrances and facilities in September 2018.</p> <p>Connections with the wider network will be considered during the preliminary design phase.</p>
Mr & Mrs Colin Jackman	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Margot Tuley	Agree		
Amanda Ophof	Strongly agree	Inverness needs more safe cycle ways.	Support noted.
Graeme Watson	Agree	Good idea.	Support noted.
Graham Tuley	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notes ambiguities between drawing and legend, making proposal unclear. - Queries why route does not extend to Academy Street and NCN 1, and whether there is enough space on Railway Terrace to widen footway (to 2.0M) and proposed cycle lane (should be 3.4M – details provided). - Do nothing: proposals represent a waste of money so close to imminent re-development of Royal Mail site, including potential to reconfigure carriageway and bus station. 	No change: while opportunities may arise in the longer term to relocate the bus station, the priority for this project is to improve current pedestrian and cycling links from the rail station to the bus station and Rose Street Car park.

Mr Brian MacKenzie	Remain neutral	New cycle route will only be beneficial if two-way and segregated from the main carriageway. It should extend through the underpass (details supplied). Existing problems for cyclists on Railway Terrace relate to northbound lane (parked vehicles and crossing at bend by underpass).	Comment noted. The scope of Accessing Inverness is to improve the walking and cycling environment between the rail station, bus station and Rose Street Car park. Connections with the wider network will be considered during the preliminary design phase.
Jenny Mayhew	Agree	Supports creation of cycle lane along with a clear pedestrian route.	Support noted.
Roderick MacKenzie	Strongly agree	Current pollution is awful.	Support noted.

5: The proposed changes for Falcon Square are intended to create a safer space for walking, cycling and activities that make best use of public open space. Has this been achieved?

Of **32** respondents to this question, **13** strongly agree or agree, **8** remain neutral, and **8** disagree or strongly disagree

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree	Summary of comments received	Proposed response
Government/Statutory Bodies			
SNH	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The changes to the roads and crossing should be an improvement on the existing arrangements, but it is not clear how that will result in the public space at Falcon Square becoming safer for walking, cycling and other activities. - We support creating a cycle route connection that encourages active travel, however having a route that starts/finishes outside the main entrance to the shopping centre is likely to result in conflict between cyclists and shoppers: this needs to be considered in more detail and mitigated for. - Reference to advice in response to Q1 - there will be limited value in including cycling friendly measures unless how cyclists get to and from the area has also been carefully considered and catered for. - Safe connections need to be made with existing (and proposed) routes used by cyclists in the wider area, not just the Millburn Road route. - With regards to green infrastructure, support the use of rain gardens and green infrastructure for sustainable urban drainage, to increase the visual interest of the area and so contribute to placemaking, as well as connecting people with nature and contributing to biodiversity. 	<p>Comments noted. These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Connections with the wider network will also be considered during the preliminary design phase.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>
Business			
Inverness BID		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Falcon Square is a public space and therefore unsuitable for cycling. The square's "No-cycling" policy should be promoted and enforced to protect pedestrians. - Supports the introduction of 2-way cycle lanes leading from Millburn Road to High Street as a suitable route for cyclists that will have least impact on business providing road safety concerns for all road users are met. NB Impact on Eastgate Shopping Centre Emergency Fire Exits must be considered. 	<p>Comments noted. These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Traffic modelling will be carried out during the preliminary design phase.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reminder of ongoing concerns raised by BID regarding separate proposals to improve active travel infrastructure on Millburn Road, impacting on Eastgate parking/service access. <p><u>Proposed new roundabout:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need detailed survey and analysis (traffic flows, vehicle types, turning arcs, projected usage & potential congestion pinch points) with focus on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Cyclist safety; ▪ Maintaining safe collection and round-the-clock servicing arrangements at Marks & Spencer loading bay. 	
Eastgate Shopping Centre (ESC)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ESC is not against the principle of improving pedestrian and cycle accessibility throughout the city but cannot support measures that reduce Eastgate’s attraction as a shopping destination or compromise its servicing arrangements. - Puts forward detailed comparison of existing/proposed junction arrangement at the Milburn Road /Falcon Square/Crown Road junction, concluding that capacity would be reduced by replacement of the signal-controlled junction with a mini-roundabout. - Notes that scheme is at an early stage of design but considers proposals could impact directly on the ability of visitors and service vehicles travelling to and from Eastgate. Anticipates: roundabout will have to increase in size to enable service vehicles to manoeuvre safely; new segregated cycle lane could compromise service vehicle access; uncontrolled stream of traffic between Falcon Square and proposed new cycle lane could jeopardise cyclist safety. - Seeks assurance going forward that junction arrangement would not unduly delay visitors travelling to or from the Centre, and design proposals, including roundabout and cycle lane, will safely accommodate delivery vehicles and cyclists. - Seeks clarification that proposals will conform to ESC’s “No-cycling” policy on Falcon Square. 	<p>Comments noted. These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Traffic modelling will be carried out during the preliminary design phase and used to determine how the changes will affect journey times.</p>
NGOs (including charities and campaign groups)			
Own Your Street Inverness	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As per response to Q1, this reclaims Falcon Square access for pedestrians, and ensures that traffic takes second place. Falcon Square deserves to be softened by greenery and better used by all. - Segregated lanes for cycles would be optimal. 	Support noted.

Inverness Civic Trust	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals may make the space safer for pedestrians and cyclists but do not otherwise effect any improvement to the quality of the public space. - Unclear how pedestrian and vehicular traffic would be segregated safely between the Crown Road junction and Inglis Street. - Impact of changes to traffic movement in the Crown should be assessed with regard to re-design of the junction at Crown Road. 	<p>Comments noted. These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Traffic modelling will be used to determine how the changes will affect journey times.</p>
Putting Inverness Streets Ahead & RNIB Scotland	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Notes that Falcon Square is private property and that the only area of touched on by this proposal is at the south end of Academy Street. - This area looks levelled out in the proposals and controlled crossings are removed. See earlier response under crossings. - Proposals don't show cycle parking provision. 	Comments noted.
National Federation of the Blind UK	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Disagree with proposal to have no signalised crossing with kerbs. - Believe proposals will make it less safe and attractive. - Proposals will not expand space available to cross at Inglis Street more than would a widened and fully accessible signalised crossing with kerbs each side. - Concerns that opportunity not taken to turn Falcon Square in to a space that attracts people to actively use it; potential for fenced-off cycle parking, seating, and planting. - Opportunity to realign bus stop kerbing and stands to make it easier for buses to kneel / deploy ramps, and to update bus shelters outside Eastgate Centre to offer more covered space and seating with backs and arms. - Support creation of roundabout but only if existing signalised crossings are replaced with modern signal crossings with sounders and sensors, and if proposed cycle track does not share space with pedestrians. - Replacing signal crossings with zebra-style crossings is contrary to government good practice advice and statutory requirement to make adjustments for blind and disabled people. - Would like to know if design for cycle track will be kerbed to separate from pedestrians, and if Council will add signal crossings at any point where pedestrians have to cross the cycle track to reach a signalised road crossing. 	<p>The absence of controlled crossings is noted, and through further preliminary work we will look to address this, looking at key locations where they can be placed into the scheme to meet the needs of all users, while also being looked at in tandem with how this links with traffic modelling. We will continue to engage with stakeholders.</p> <p>Proposed kerb height was adjusted to 60mm through consultation with local access panel and will delineate where the pedestrian areas start and finish.</p> <p>All comments are noted. These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p>

Comments from individuals			
Janet Adamson	Strongly agree	-	Support noted.
Fiona Catto	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's like a little unused oasis - a pleasant space currently but with not much use. A cluster of cafes could be here surrounding a small green space, making it a pleasant area to come for coffee and a chat with friends. The buildings near Marks and Spencers could also be cleaned or repainted. - Inverness needs to become more upmarket with a shiny, wealthy quality. Currently, it looks unclean, unkempt, in disorder and poor. The town centre is not a pleasure to be in; there is no feeling of possibility, of greater opportunity. It looks frozen in time and lacking money, uninspiring. - Design should be quality looking, not bitty and cheap. 	Support noted.
Mick Heath	Strongly agree	This will be a big improvement. This section is currently unsafe.	Support noted.
Andrew Lynn	Strongly agree	Great proposal, gives the pedestrian priority at a busy junction between shopping areas. The dedicated cycle lane is a great addition to help cyclists coming into the centre and accessing the Crown area.	Support noted.
William MacDonald	Strongly agree	-	Support noted.
Alex Andrews	Strongly agree	-	Support noted.
Mr & Mrs Colin Jackman	Strongly agree	-	Support noted.
Neil Hornsby	Strongly agree	-	Support noted.
Martin Macleod	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wider pavements will help. - Replacement of traffic lights with a roundabout will likely have a negative effect on ease of cycling from Academy Street to new cycle path on far side of Millburn Road. - Crossing with a dedicated cycle signal in the phasing appears to work very well at junctions in the London Cycle Superhighway. Some ideas of what is being done in London should be adopted here. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Comments noted and will be taken in to consideration during further preliminary designs.</p>
Stewart Dickins	Agree	This is probably the best that can be made of a bad situation. At M&S	Comments noted.

		cyclists have three choices: Cycling on the flat pavement and giving pedestrians right of way, tricky due to the width of the pavement; Dismounting the curb and joining the “carmaggedon” of M&S drop offs, buses, and car drivers attempting to beat the red light at the crossing; or stopping and crossing the road at the traffic lights. Cyclists are averse to unnecessarily wasting momentum.	
Graeme Watson	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Intentions are good but if traffic was stopped from accessing Academy Street unless required this would make it even safer. - Taxis could be moved to behind Debenhams or in the new station link. - An additional road linking Harbour Road to Millburn Road may alleviate traffic from the City Centre. 	<p>Comments noted. Currently there is no support to fully pedestrianize Academy Street, and this would not fit with funding to create walking and cycling improvements.</p> <p>Location of taxi ranks will be further considered during the next preliminary design phase.</p> <p>Cross rail road linking Millburn and Harbour Road was explored several years ago, but no longer supported.</p>
W Grant	Agree	-	Support noted.
Janis Armstrong	Remain neutral	Will lowered kerbs be included at crossings for wheelchair users?	All comments are noted. These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs when crossings will be a major focal point.
Tom Matthew	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positive developments - Has the impact on bus services been taken into account- journey time and reliability? Bus services in Inverness are being reduced and bus operators are attributing declining bus patronage to congestion. 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>We have actively engaged with local bus operators x3 meetings during the development of scheme. Traffic modelling will show impact on journey time. This will be progressed during the next preliminary design phase.</p>
Raphaela Perks	Remain neutral		Support noted.

Dr John Heathcote	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cycle lanes are not going to work. Academy Street is designed for cyclists to ride on the carriageway; this should be continued as far as practicable, joining to lanes either side of Millburn Road. - Currently the connection to Crown Road is via Eastgate - this is signed as NCN 1. As drawn, the right turn from Academy Street to Crown Road is impossible. - The roundabout is a good idea. A complementary roundabout at the Friar's Lane junction would also be useful, so that vehicles can access Academy Street in either direction. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>All connections to existing active travel infrastructure will be considered during the next preliminary design phase.</p> <p>Traffic modelling will show the impact of the roundabout(s) on traffic flows.</p>
Simon Brooks	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is a roundabout or controlled junction necessary if through traffic restricted to bus/taxi/service vehicles? - Avoid dead space between cycle path and roundabout; pedestrians crossing cycle path should be considered. 	<p>Comments noted. There are no plans to restrict the types of vehicles allowed access to Academy Street.</p> <p>All users of the street, along with their movements, will be considered during the next preliminary design phase.</p>
Margot Tuley	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will roundabout be large enough to accommodate M&S vans which have a problem getting out? - Siting of cycle route: vision to cross into Eastgate is very poor but to cross from Eastgate going up Crown Road there are good sightlines. 	<p>Swept path analysis will be carried out to ensure appropriateness of any proposed infrastructure.</p> <p>Siting issues are noted.</p>
Jenny Mahew	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How pedestrians navigate the roundabout? - Something radical must be done about Falcon Sq. – a vast exposed windy bus stop at present. 	<p>All users of the street, along with their movements, will be considered during the next preliminary design phase.</p>
Susan Hadfield		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improved crossing at end of Inglis St welcomed. - Suggested cycle route at roundabout does not make provision for cyclists travelling to and from Stephens Brae towards the railway station and bus station. Stephens Brae is well used by cyclists. Cyclists would use the opposite side of Crown Rd to avoid crossing twice. 	<p>Comments and support noted.</p> <p>Cyclist movements will be considered during the next preliminary design phase.</p>
Sheila Fletcher	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposals seem to make the environment less safe for people with disabilities. - Removing signalised crossings causes problems for blind and partially sighted people who would have no indication that traffic has stopped to allow them to cross. - Issue of allowing walking and cycling on the paved area. 	<p>The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>Shared surface streets have not been proposed.</p>

			Raised tables at crossing points will be addressed during further preliminary design stage.
David Edmiston	Disagree	Source of problem is access to Square across busy road.	Comment noted.
Amanda Ophof	Disagree	Welcome the creation of better connected cycle ways, but the creation of a roundabout will not help the flow of traffic due to the volume of traffic using this crossing.	Support noted. Traffic modelling will show the impact of the roundabout on traffic flows and movements.
Brian Mackenzie	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing signal controlled crossing seems to work well enough. - The proposed changes on Inglis Street are not clear. - Removal of light controlled crossing would not create a safer space - quite the opposite it would feel and be dangerous. 	The crossing options for Academy Street will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.
Graham Tuley	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No changes are planned to Falcon Square it is Academy Street where changes are to be made. - Picture 6 shows the end of a crossing in middle of Inglis Street. - See comments on taxi ranks and traffic lights made earlier. - A cycle crossing of the road near the Eastgate Centre will encourage cyclists to ride at speed across the Square towards the railway station. - At Crown Road a 2 way cycle lane should be on the west side of the road instead of the 2 separate routes proposed. - Detail provided regarding required width, colouring, and delineation of cycle lane. - Ensure that delivery lorries to M&S can use the roundabout and leave via Millburn Road. - On Crown Road the proposed crossings are nearer to Academy Street - ideal for cyclists - but deposit pedestrians in the middle of the roadway. More difficult for people crossing from the east side to see round the corner. Retain at present location. - No cycle parking shown. Create a long covered cycle storage solution along wall at M&S & include CCTV coverage. 	<p>Comments noted and will be considered during the next preliminary design phase.</p> <p>Movements of all users to be considered.</p> <p>Cycle parking etc will also be considered and developed during the next phase.</p>

6: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposals for use of higher quality materials and rain gardens within the proposed scheme?

Of 32 respondents to this question, 20 strongly agree or agree, 5 remain neutral, and 5 disagree or strongly disagree

Respondent	Agree/ Disagree	Summary of comments received	Proposed response
Government/Statutory Bodies			
SNH	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is important that the city centre sets the tone for Inverness and creates a good impression, for those arriving in Inverness by train or bus. - Supports use of higher quality materials, which should help create a distinctive place, and contribute positively to placemaking. - Supports use of rain gardens and green infrastructure for sustainable urban drainage, to increase the visual interest of the area and so contribute to placemaking, as well as connecting people with nature (which has recognized health benefits) and contributing to biodiversity. 	Support noted.
SEPA	Agree	Very supportive of the use of permeable pavement, rain gardens and green landscaping to both manage surface water and increase biodiversity and amenity in the city centre.	Support noted.
Business			
Inverness BID		Utilise the highest quality materials, subject to their being sustainable and fit for purpose, including anticipated traffic levels.	Support noted.
NGOs (including charities and campaign groups)			
Own Your Street Inverness	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality materials will set the tone and reclaim some of what was lost in 20th century redevelopments of Inverness city centre using materials with poor durability. - We love the rain gardens! 	Support noted.
Inverness Civic Trust	Remain neutral	Welcome use of high quality materials but concerns about quality of workmanship and maintenance obligations (litter picking, tree/ shrub maintenance and replacement) and the need for management to avoid misuse (e.g. maintenance or delivery vehicles overloading footpaths).	Support and comments noted. Maintenance considerations to be worked out with colleagues in other Services within the Council.
Putting Inverness Streets Ahead / RNIB Scotland	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agree with use of higher quality materials and are sceptical about the use of rain gardens. - Welcome response of Council to feedback about surfaces being slippery when wet. - Recommend that the pavement colour contrasts against surroundings including street furniture, crossings and other features. 	<p>Comments and support for some aspects of the proposal is noted.</p> <p>Use of materials will be considered during future design phases.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request for slip resistant, non-reflective surfacing which retains its colour in different weather conditions e.g. when wet. - Surfacing should maintain its contrasting features at night under different lighting conditions. - Support 60mm kerbs. - Kerb and loading bay should be in contrasting colours & contrast between continuous footway and loading bay should be strong so that people with sight loss do not assume it is a safe space to walk in. - Trees could be an attractive addition provided they are in the right place, and species, size, quality, planting and maintenance are appropriate. - Concerns about the long-term viability and maintenance of the proposed rain gardens; litter, weeding, wet leaves can become a slip hazard. - Request for provision of grass for dogs (including assistance dogs) to relieve themselves on, with dog waste bins nearby, or a designated central area for toileting dogs. - Concern that the council has under-estimated how busy Academy Street is likely to remain; do not support the removal of controlled crossings and are concerned by the expanse of levelled shared surfaces. - Need to ensure that minimum pavement widths are respected; that commercial use of the streets is managed; and that the scheme does not encourage the proliferation of street clutter such as A-boards. 	<p>Support of kerb heights noted and welcomed.</p> <p>These concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p> <p>The concerns regarding absence of controlled crossings is noted, and through further preliminary work we will look to address this, looking at key locations where they can be placed into the scheme to meet the needs of all users, while also being looked at in tandem with how this links with traffic modelling.</p> <p>We will continue to engage with stakeholders throughout future design stages.</p>
National Federation of the Blind UK (Scotland)	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No objection to design of rain garden providing kerbing is at least 60mm high. If positioned on strip of roadway used for deliveries, taxis & setting down, they would also play a part in reducing traffic speeds. - High quality finish of paving helps drivers read the street as a place for business rather than a through route. Support use of natural stone finish; asphalt footpath may encourage cyclists to ride on it. - Use of tactiles should be restricted to those situations designated in UK guidance; textured paving will not prevent cane users colliding with parked vehicles; there are few tactile surfaces that people can tell apart with the soles of their feet; reference BS8300-1:2018. - Nothing to prevent vehicles overrunning and damaging paving. - Kerbs should be used to separate vehicle parking from pavements as there are large numbers of blind people with conditions like Diabetes II without the sensitivity in their feet to navigate tactile surfaces. - The presence of stationary vehicles on the roadway is recognised as 	<p>Proposed kerb height was adjusted to 60mm through consultation with local access panel and will delineate where the pedestrian areas start and finish.</p> <p>Comments noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.</p> <p>All of these concerns will be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p>

		<p>slowing the speed of traffic and is safer for blind and disabled groups; this is where parking should be. Reference 'Designing Streets'.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is very little contrast between the colours of the two kerbs and kerb channel finishes put forward for comment in the consultation document. - Low kerbs may not stand out sufficiently to prevent sighted people tripping over them. - Strongly contrasting materials should be used when low kerbs are used, otherwise 125mm kerbs are preferred which are more clearly visible and deter vehicles from over-running. - Use of different coloured surfacing on sections of roadway has a significant effect in slowing motorists down; this option is not considered in Accessing Inverness. - A narrow central strip might be seen to look like a heavy duty road edge or a reinforced road surface. - Driver's view of the street as a place or people or leisure will be underlined if a wider strip forms the central reservation, contrasting with the roadway. An even wider surface could have bike stands placed transversely across it. - Uncertain about the central strip finishes proposed and consider it more important to use every means to slow traffic, and keep cycle parking away from where it can be a hazard to sight impaired people. 	
--	--	---	--

Comments from individuals			
Dr Janet Adamson	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Janis Armstrong	Strongly agree	Gentler gradient and less bumpy for wheelchair users and mobility impaired	Support noted.
Raphaela Perks	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Mick Heath	Strongly agree	This is a key focal point in the city centre. To maximise its attractiveness as a destination, high quality materials should be used.	Support noted.
Susan Hadfield	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need a surface that is not slippery when wet or icy! - Higher quality materials will look more attractive. Trees and greenery contribute to a more attractive streetscape. 	Support noted.

Alex Andrews	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Mr & Mrs Colin Jackman	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important for drainage and also the look of the area. - One of us has eyesight problems and in the past has found that street art can be a serious tripping problem especially if the edges are low - suggest that the edges of these gardens on the pedestrian side be raised up and formed into seats. The edges on the vehicle side could remain. 	Support noted and comments will be considered during the next preliminary design phase.
W Grant	Strongly agree		Support noted.
Amanda Ophof	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Welcome the use of rain gardens, as trees would brighten up the city centre and have environmental benefits. - Higher quality material to be used if it lasts longer, more sustainable than conventional materials. 	Support noted.
Jenny Mahew	Strongly agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduce greenery wherever possible. - Raingarden excellent and essential, with netting to make cleaning rubbish easier. - Enhance drainage to reduce build-up of ice. 	Support noted.
Stewart Dickins	Agree	Aesthetics less important than practicalities, but finishes that are in keeping with recent streetscape improvements elsewhere would give continuity. Nice, not necessary.	Comments noted.
F Sadler	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rain gardens would be attractive, as long as they do not create obstacles for people with limited sight or mobility and are maintained and kept litter-free. - Difficult to see from the illustrations if there are significant differences in appearance and maintenance between the two qualities of surface. - Don't include pavement-level lighting: these are particularly slippery when wet. 	Support noted and comments will be considered during the next preliminary design phase.
William Macdonald	Agree		Support noted.
Stuart Dustan	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher quality materials used for further development of the city centre. - Supports the use of rain gardens both for their ability to assist with drainage, air quality improvements and for aesthetics reasons - Expand on idea of green structures in the city centre (e.g. green walkways, flower beds, trees in streets and paths). Create a space that enhances the appearance of the city centre and has a positive impact on the environment and people's mental health. 	Support / comment noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.

Dr John Heathcote	Agree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Academy Street needs to look the part if it is to be a prestige area of the city. The bottom end is definitely grotty. - Cyclists (and wheelchair users etc) hate cobbles - they are horrible to ride on and slippery when wet. - Anything that produces raised ridges approximately parallel to the direction of travel is extremely dangerous for cyclists, e.g. the proposed raised centre marker. - Suggest that the road surface is made from concrete pavements. Versions are available meeting sustainable drainage standards; they also facilitate maintenance of infrastructure. A centre line could be marked without producing a raised line. - There are also kerbs that do not result in a vertical step, easier and safer for user of wheels. - It is possible to get Caithness flags with built-in roughness (syneresis cracks) that do not become slippery. - It is not clear in the street layouts how the requirements for vehicle loading and cycle parking are going to be managed; cycle parking should be near where people are going. - There will be a requirement for motor vehicles to deliver and collect from commercial premises so if the road is narrowed to only 2 vehicle widths, space will need to be provided off the carriageway. 	<p>Support / comments noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.</p> <p>Vehicle loading / cycle parking / deliveries etc. will all be addressed during further preliminary designs. These designs will be the basis for future consultation / engagement with key stakeholders where all of these comments will be considered.</p>
Sheila Fletcher	Remain neutral	Will blue badge spaces be included? Ensure that all surfaces are completely non slip	Blue badge spaces and flexible space for loading will all be detailed through the further preliminary works to take place, before we progress to detailed design, and we will work with key stakeholders and businesses to pursue options. Materials will be considered during future design phases.
David Edmiston	Remain neutral	Just window dressing.	Comment noted.
Margot Tuley	Remain neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coloured asphalt is the most comfortable to walk and cycle on. - Rain gardens reduce the width of the pavement and could be a trip hazard. 	Comment noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.
Helen Smith	-	Please do not use Caithness flagstones or similar - the ones in Huntly Street are treacherous when it is wet or icy and a real disincentive to active travel.	Comment noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.

Martin Macleod	Disagree	No need for overly expensive and elaborate materials. Colour and/or texture change should be adequate to delineate surfaces. Not sure about "rain gardens", let us have some flowers/roses but nothing too fancy or expensive to maintain.	Comment noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.
Simon Brooks	Disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - High quality materials are not necessary, and will only add to the existing diverse and complicated use of materials found throughout the centre. - Keep it simple, to a restricted palette of materials. - Do not use granite setts in the middle of the road as these are unsafe for cyclists who, on occasion will need to cross this median strip. Stone setts at junctions will also discourage cycling because they are less comfortable/safe than tarmac to cycle over. 	Comment noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.
Ross Finlay	Strongly disagree	Is this really the best you can come up with in trying to improve the city centre for regular users?	Comment noted.
Graham Tuley	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Generally in favour of standard quality materials but strongly disagree with rain gardens. - Favour standard quality materials. - Agree with granite setts along the edge and centre of the road provided they are of a substantial size and do not become loose. - Detail provided regarding preferences for style, design and setting of granite setts. - Detail provided regarding style and design of asphalt / tarmac surfacing. - Detail provided regarding design and marking of loading areas. - Rain gardens will have a negligible effect on air quality; concerns regarding littering ,and maintenance of rain gardens and drainage. - Concern regarding ability of rain gardens to cope with rainfall. - Detail of suggested drainage options offered. - No problem with trees being planted provided that siting, species, size, quality and maintenance are appropriate. 	Comments noted and materials will be considered during future design phases.
Brian Mackenzie	Strongly disagree	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed rain gardens are too small to have any real effect. A Sustainable Drainage System (SUDS) will work just as well with grass. Large plant troughs were tried before and removed because the plants were neglected and the trough was used as a litter bin. A small park would enhance the city centre. A rain garden is a token and an obstacle. 	Comment noted.