

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 3

Do the proposals in the Draft Elgin Transport Strategy meet the objectives? If not, why not?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Traffic flow will not be improved by adding traffic lights, zebra crossings etc. Traffic should be routed away from and around city centre to avoid further congestion. Short term: northbound traffic only on Moss Street. Nowhere does it suggest the route for southbound traffic. A by-pass should be in place to replace the supposed by-pass created by Alexandra Road.	OP, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Routing of southbound traffic from the town centre to Maisondieu Road would be considered as part of the detailed design of Option I2A.
Maisondieu Road is already problematic due to through traffic using it as a 'rat run' particularly at peak times in order to miss the roundabouts and pedestrian crossings at the main A96 route through Elgin. Traffic tailbacks from the roundabouts at both ends of Maisondieu Road are commonplace so this plan would just exacerbate this situation.	OP	Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.
A by-pass has been needed for a long time on the outskirts of Elgin to keep the traffic especially the heavy vehicles away from the centre of the town.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
I can not see the benefit of a road linking Maisondieu Road to Linkwood Road as anyone travelling from Aberdeen would turn left at the first roundabout at KFC to head for New Elgin and the Inverness traffic would still use Alexandria Road through Elgin.	OP	Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.
Need to shift traffic away from the centre of town. We need a proper by-pass. We need more free parking, to help residents in the town centre, who are being troubled by Moray Council workers parking in their streets.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Parking in the town centre is being considered in the Elgin Parking Strategy.
The Elgin Transport Strategy (TS) does not specifically identify the objectives, if this is the Vision as set out, then we agree with the principles of the vision. The proposals outlined could improve transport in Elgin, however there is not sufficient clarity around the delivery of these improvements to ensure the strategy is realistic and achievable. How are the objectives going to be measured? How will the Council know if journeys feel safer?	S, D	The objectives are contained on page 5 of the draft ETS summary document, which is titled 'Our Vision' and in paragraph 6.3 of the draft ETS main technical report. Section 8.0 of the draft ETS main technical report sets out the principles for the monitoring and evaluation of the draft ETS.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>From a review of the Elgin Transport Strategy (TS) it is not clear what these objectives are. We assume this question refers to the objectives identified in Page 38 of the Jacobs Report? We agree that in order to meet the objectives as set out in the Jacobs Report, a number of road improvements will be required. However, the method of delivering these improvements needs to be clear and achievable from the outset.</p>	S	<p>The objectives are contained on page 5 of the draft ETS summary document, which is titled 'Our Vision' and in paragraph 6.3 of the draft ETS main technical report.</p> <p>Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.</p>
<p>Your document mentions improving pedestrian crossings on the main A96, when we already have an underpass and footbridge in place, surely enhancing these resources would take pedestrians away from the busy through roads, freeing up the traffic flow. Perhaps you should consider removing these crossing in total.</p>	OP	<p>The A96 Alexandra Road has been identified as a barrier to movement. Crossing provisions for pedestrian and cyclists are required on pedestrian/cycle desire lines.</p>
<p>Pushing more traffic onto Reiket Lane which is already too narrow as it comes off the railway bridge.</p>	OP	<p>Noted. There are no proposals to widen Reiket Lane as the road widths are already in excess of 6.0 metres.</p>
<p>Replacing roundabouts – not sure about rationale on A96 as these function effectively. If so, traffic lights would need to be carefully fine-tuned and dynamic, so that motorists are not unnecessarily delayed (i.e. as Morriston Road/North Street junction currently). You could also add traffic lights to the existing roundabouts, only for use at busy times of day. Quality cycle lanes, especially on Station Road, are essential. If they are poorly designed, cycle lanes are not used (<a href="http://www.makingspaceforcyclists.org/">http://www.makingspaceforcyclists.org/</a>). Eye-catching data that 75% of people surveyed think the centre of Elgin is easily accessible by walking but more than 50% of people actually make the journey by car. It would be interesting to see more information of the reasons given for this disparity. Are the current proposals actually going to help, or is there a need for something more radical, a powerful disincentive to car travel (i.e. congestion charge, PAYE tax benefit for those who don't commute to work by car, etc.) Consultation mentions Moray Council efforts to reduce car commuting but what about incentivising companies to make similar improvements through reduced Business rates (or equivalent). Improved pedestrian crossing point on A941 at the railway bridge would definitely be very useful for pedestrians</p>	S, D, SP, I	<p>Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control. The size of the existing roundabouts would not support the introduction of traffic signals (insufficient space for queuing vehicles within the circulatory lanes). Cycle Lanes would be designed to current best practice standards. The survey data included travelers who were coming from out with Elgin and therefore making their journey by car which accounts for the disparity in the figures.</p> <p>Ideas around taxation are noted however this would be a matter for central government.</p>
<p>To some extent yes, although the proposals do not address specific issues that have been highlighted. Further detail is required on what some of the proposals are before it could be confirmed that objectives are being met. Consideration should also be given to not just the city but to include surrounding areas.</p>	S, D	<p>Comments relating to the provision of further detail noted.</p> <p>Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Your response categories lack clear definition. What does 'somewhat' mean?	D	Comment noted for this qualitative question. 'Somewhat' is taken to mean 'to some extent' or 'to a certain extent'.
Many of the plans considered move traffic around to outer areas simply moving the problem. The town requires revitalisation and many of the existing traffic management systems already adopted reduce growth in town and contribute to the congestion rather than reduce it.	O	Comments noted. Proposals aim to both support individuals to make more of their journeys by walking, cycling or public transport and to disperse traffic around the town.
Railway crossing needed on west side of town.	SR	Comment noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.
Improving roundabouts could somewhat make traffic go smoothly, but is there any plans for f.eg multistorey carpark at Dr Grays? And Elgin desperately needs a bypass, so many lorries go across the city - no improvements will change this. Crossing A96 is very dangerous and will get worse	S, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Parking at Dr Gray's hospital is a matter for NHS Grampian
There are not enough buses coming for the 35 and the drivers arrive at different times and sometimes leave early. Also the statue that is opposite Poundland is just weird and out of place.	NA	Comments noted. Delivery of Bus Service 35 is by a commercial operator and out with the control of the Moray Council. The consideration of public art is not part of the draft ETS.
Seems to be reliant on an A96 bypass happening at some point in the future. There should be a contingency for this not happening. Also, a new road (an alternative to the western link road) needs to be built. The measures designed to compensate for not having this will not definitely solve the problems that the WLR would have.	BP, S	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. The draft ETS has considered scenarios both with and without the A96 dualling in the year 2030. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.
I am very concerned that no alternative crossing over linking north and south has been considered beyond Ashgrove Road to Maisondieu Road. The area to the west of the wards is entirely undeveloped and a prime area for an alternative crossing. There is no consideration for permit parking to deter those working in the CBD of Elgin from parking in residential areas, no opening up existing car parks to become free parking to encourage parking there.	SR	Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street. Parking in the town centre is being considered in the Elgin Parking Strategy.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>There is no mention of improving the area around Sandy Road/Springfield Road/Glenmoray Drive junctions. You mention putting more crossing opportunities on Thornhill Road but nothing to address crossing at this junction which is incredibly busy before and after school. There is 1 island on Sandy Road near the top, nothing on Glenmoray Drive and nothing at the far end of Springfield Road near High School Drive, yet new cycle paths are currently being constructed.</p>	I	<p>Aspirational Option I3E is for the improvement of this area. This option is not part of the Core package. However, this does not preclude a scheme coming forward in the future. Comments relating to provision of additional pedestrian islands to cross Glen Moray Drive noted. The draft ETS does not preclude the provision of islands at individual locations within Elgin.</p>
<p>It is small term tinkering over different time periods. The tinkering will be superceded by more issues over the time of the strategy... in other words you will be back to square 1 and need yet another strategy in the future to cope</p>	O	<p>As with many strategies the draft ETS will be updated and reviewed in the future to reflect changes in travel demand and to take cognisance of new Local Development Plans as they are developed.</p>
<p>Making Moss St one way will cause further congestion in other areas as people try to get around. There are already cycle paths from Lossie Wynd to the station via High St , South St etc and very rarely used. Pedestrianisation of South St will cause issues with deliveries etc. Not enough footfall to justify this approach. Increasing pedestrian crossings on the A96 there are already 3 controlled crossing, 1 underpass and 1 overpass. Should encourage the use of the over and underpasses rather than the crossings operating every 2 or 3 minutes causing backlogs and frustration to traffic</p>	OP	<p>Routing of southbound traffic from the town centre to Maisondieu Road would be considered as part of the detailed design of Option I2A. Comments relating to Option I2E noted any design would take into consideration the access requirements for local businesses/residents. The A96 Alexandra Road has been identified as a barrier to movement for pedestrians/cyclists. Crossing provisions for pedestrian and cyclists are required on pedestrian/cycle desire lines.</p>
<p>the short term proposals are going to cause confusion and gridlock</p>	O	<p>Comment noted. Delays during construction would be minimised through appropriate traffic management.</p>
<p>Doesn't appear to do anything for the part of Elgin I live in (south west)</p>	I	<p>A number of options address movement from south-west Elgin, including improvements to Edgar Road for pedestrians and improvements to the Edgar Road/The Wards junction.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>If South Street is to be pedestrianised from Batchen St to Commerce Street disabled parking will need to be provided for lost spaces in South Street. There would be no access to Culbard Street or part of Academy Street. See no benefit for this pedestrianism [sic]</p>	OP	<p>Comments relating to Option I2E noted any design would take into consideration the access requirements for local businesses/residents. Requirements for disabled parking provision would also be reviewed as part of the design process.</p>
<p>A by-pass to the west of the railway station is still needed.</p>	BP, SR	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>
<p>This plan is a mish mash, get a route through Elgin and across Elgin bringing as little disruption and pollution to the residents of Elgin as possible. Abandon the plan to keep HGV traffic flowing through the centre of Elgin and densely populated areas. Instead bypass built up areas where possible. Recognise the health and safety risks with heavy traffic ploughing through the centre of Elgin and close to schools, Eastend, New Elgin, Elgin Academy and Bishopmill.</p>	O, BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Proposals within the draft ETS aim to address movements to and within Elgin, including Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.</p>
<p>Can't understand basing a new expensive road on an aged bridge. Unless you force people to use it in a one way system I think it will be avoided. And if you do create a one way system do you really expect buses and HGVs to use that bridge????</p>	OP	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Use of this proposal as part of a one-way gyratory is being considered. Buses and heavy goods vehicles already utilise the Ashgrove Bridge.</p>
<p>Far too much focus is on walking and cycling to work, even today, very few actually walk or cycle to if they have access to a vehicle. If you factor out the number of people who have to walk or cycle then the percentage that choose to walk or cycle is very low and far too much consideration is given to providing facilities for them rather than than addressing the issues of the many who wish to travel by car. It would be money far better spent if cycle paths / lanes and walking routes were left as they are and more spent on the motorists who are the largest percentage of users. Just recently a large sum of money was spent on creating a cycle way from the Cooper Park to the train station utilizing Reidhaven Street, now the proposals are to create another cycle path on Moss Street, a mere hundred yards away at the expense of motorists who will no longer be able to travel south on Moss Street. Pampering to the few at the expense of the many. There are some good ideas around making active travel easier and more convenient but I think it could go further.</p>	OP	<p>Providing active travel infrastructure and encouraging walking and cycling supports national and regional policies and strategies and Scottish Government outcomes relating improving health.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Cannot really see how traffic flow will be improved by having traffic lights and zebra crossings in several places. Also, if Moss Street is one way only going North I would imagine that traffic going south would then go through a residential area near 2 schools to come out on to Maisondieu Road increasing the noise and pollution in this area making it neither desirable nor healthy to live there, and also increasing the danger to youngsters walking or cycling to school. To avoid this residential area traffic would have to go back on to the A96 which would only add to the congestion there.	OP	Routing of southbound traffic from the town centre to Maisondieu Road would be considered as part of the detailed design of Option I2A.
The cycling and walking initiatives are welcome but the move towards changing mindsets towards active travel will take time (not a problem, just reality). However the main investment (£20-30M) is too risky to be base a strategy on, and it's not clear what it achieves. The overall impression is that it isn't coherent.	S	Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.
all the improvements are to the east of Elgin and does not address integration with bus and rail transport.	OP	Comment noted. The relocation of the bus station was not taken forward as a proposal as the key destination for most users of bus services is the town centre.
Having spend thousands attempting to get the bypass through Wittet Drive, I see you now propose a bridge from Ashgrove Cottages onto Maisondieu Road. I presume you are now thinking the cheaper end of town will not object? You are very wrong	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted.
The failure to provide a further rail bridge at the west end of Elgin	SR	Support for an additional crossing of the railway at an alternative location noted.
Final opinion will depend on the implementation and its success	NA	Comment noted.
We need the western link road. I'm sick of being stuck in traffic on that side of elgin it would make congestion so much better around peak times. The pedestrian crossings are fine on the A96 and thornhill road this would be a waste of money. A travel plan for council workers is also a waste of money, people get to work however they can, you already have cycle facilities and the cycle to work scheme which makes getting to work this way desirable. I live and work in Elgin but still drive over winter. However in the summer I do cycle in.	SR, OP	Support for an additional crossing of the railway at an alternative location noted. As one of the largest employers in Elgin, the Moray Council can through encouraging staff to use alternatives to travelling by car in a position to contribute to a reduction in peak hour traffic in Elgin.
Lack of detail on exactly how it is proposed to prevent parents from driving pupils to and from West End Primary school and parking in front of accesses	D	Comment noted. Detailed proposals for Option I2J would be developed in consultation with both the schools and local residents.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>There is a lot in the draft strategy and a lot to be achieved. Overall the proposals are positive and would appear to ease movement. I would have some major concerns about the proposal to pedestrianise South Street, Commerce Street and Batchen Street and know that the proposals would meet with major resistance from the businesses operating from them. Businesses within Batchen Street feel their trade has been adversely affected by the traffic changes imposed on the street and would be concerned about further pedestrianisation.</p>	S, OP	<p>Comments relating to Option I2E noted any design would take into consideration the access requirements for local businesses/residents.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 4

#### Do the proposals address your transport concerns?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>Addition of several traffic signals will reduce flow of traffic, increasing emissions, pollution, greenhouse gases and noise levels. Insufficient information given for routes for traffic when streets pedestrianised or converted to one-way. Quiet residential streets cannot accommodate becoming main traffic routes, as many streets have no or limited off-street parking. Concern over existing traffic volume and speed near Resource Centre for vulnerable people, around schools and residential homes around East End School, Abbey St, Institution Road, Duff Avenue, Seafield Street Bowling Club, Maisondieu Place, Seafield Crescent and Maisondieu Road. Any increase in traffic in this area would be detrimental to safety, air quality and noise pollution.</p>	OP, D	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.</p> <p>Routing of southbound traffic from the town centre to Maisondieu Road would be considered as part of the detailed design of Option I2A.</p>
<p>As above (i.e. Maisondieu Road is already problematic due to through traffic using it as a 'rat run' particularly at peak times in order to miss the roundabouts and pedestrian crossings at the main A96 route through Elgin. Traffic tailbacks from the roundabouts at both ends of Maisondieu Road are commonplace so this plan would just exacerbate this situation.)</p>	OP	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.</p> <p>Option I3C seeks to address dispersal of queuing traffic at A96/Maisondieu junction.</p>
<p>Your proposals would cause more traffic problems.</p>	O	<p>Comment noted. The draft ETS has been developed to improve overall network performance.</p>
<p>We need a by-pass keeping traffic out of the centre.</p>	BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>There is insufficient information provided to assess how the identified 'core package measures' will be delivered, therefore we cannot comment at this stage if our concerns will be addressed. The strategy has divided Elgin into four 'quadrants' and each development site will be required to provide contributions for core strategy improvements within their respective quadrants, and also contribute 'proportionately' to the identified town centre improvements. We have concerns regarding the potential payments being sought from each of the 'quadrants' and sites contained therein as it is unclear who will be required to pay when and for what. We seek further clarification on the information that will be expected within Transport Assessments (TAs) which will be submitted in support of future planning applications. If a site located within a particular quadrant is required to contribute towards all the proposed core package measures within that quadrant, then is expected that the TA will assess impacts created on all these identified core package measures? We would also seek further information on the procedures to be followed if a TA identifies an impact on road infrastructure located within an adjacent quadrant. Proposed costs have already been set out and a total figure of £30 million has been identified to deliver the core package measures. It is stated that developers will contribute only to core package measures which are impacted as a direct result of their proposed development. This suggests, therefore, that in reaching this £30m total, assumptions have already been made in relation to which sites will contribute to what core package measure and the payments that can be expected to be sought from each site. However, this information is not provided in the Transport Strategy. If this information has been prepared, we would ask that it is made available for comment prior to the adoption of the TS as Supplementary Guidance (SG) to give a clear picture of how the calculations have been informed.</p>	D, DO	<p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development. The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review. Developers will still be required to undertake a Transport Assessment for their development to identify their impact on the transport network. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development. Developers will still be expected to address the impact of their development at locations which are not part of the draft ETS, e.g. at junctions in close proximity to the development site.</p>
<p>They do not address the fact that the town is too small for the volume of traffic and needs bypassed.</p>	BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>There is insufficient information provided to assess how the identified 'core package measures' will be delivered, therefore we cannot comment at this stage if our concerns will be addressed. The strategy has divided Elgin into four 'quadrants' and each development site will be required to provide contributions for core strategy improvements within their respective quadrants, and also contribute 'proportionately' to the identified town centre improvements. We have concerns regarding the potential payments being sought from each of the 'quadrants' and sites contained therein as it is unclear who will be required to pay when and for what. This information is required in order to enable wider discussion. We seek further clarification on the information that will be expected within site specific Transport Assessments (TAs) which will be submitted in support of future planning applications. If a site located within a particular quadrant is required to contribute towards all the proposed core package measures within that quadrant, then is expected that the TA will assess impacts created on all these identified core package measures? We would also seek further information on the procedures to be followed if a TA identifies an impact on road infrastructure located within an adjacent quadrant. Proposed costs have already been set out and a total figure of £30 million has been identified to deliver the core package measures. We request further detailed information from the Council on how this figure has been calculated. It is stated that developers will contribute only to core package measures which are impacted as a direct result of their proposed development. This suggests, therefore, that in reaching this £30m total, assumptions have already been made in relation to which sites will contribute to what core package measure and the payments that can be expected to be sought from each site. However, this information is not provided in the Transport Strategy. If this information has been prepared, we would ask that it is made available for comment prior to the adoption of the TS as Supplementary Guidance (SG) to give a clear picture of how the calculations have been informed.</p>	D, DO	<p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development. The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review. Developers will still be expected to address the impact of their development at locations which are not part of the draft ETS, e.g. at junctions in close proximity to the development site.</p>
<p>Still feeds the majority of traffic through the centre of the town when there is an opportunity to divert it around the south when the new housing estates are built.</p>	BP, SP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>
<p>The proposals do not address NHS Grampians issues around improved parking and transport links to Health Facilities within the city. The Hospital and GP practices within Elgin bring a significant number of people (patients &amp; staff) to the city from surrounding areas therefore improving transport links from surrounding areas need to be considered. The proposals do indicate improvements to Bilbohall which is welcomed, although further detail on the proposals is required. Active travel improvements around the city is welcomed, although further details on the proposals is required.</p>	S	<p>Parking within Dr Grays hospital is a matter for NHS Grampian. Support for Options I4C and I3G is noted.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Your response categories lack clear definition. What does 'somewhat' mean?	D	Comment noted for this qualitative question. 'Somewhat' is taken to mean 'to some extent' or 'to a certain extent'.
Plans already implemented require to be reviewed. Many steps taken including the closure of access to South Street etc have instead of reducing traffic, increased congestion and frustrated locals and businesses alike.	OP	Comment on existing access to town centre noted.
Issues concerning southern part of Main Street not addressed. Already a significant pedestrian route, usage will only increase as development to south of town is progressed. Pavements are inadequate, particularly considering large number of LGV movements. Case for at least a section of this road to be made one-way?	I	Suggestion to undertake works to improve Main Street, New Elgin noted. However opportunities to widen footways are limited due to the existing space between buildings on both sides of the road. One-way treatment to this key north-south route has not been considered due to the lack of alternative routes for traffic.
I am concerned as a resident of maisonndieu place that traffic in and around my home will increase via the creation of a new rat run. There appears to be no consideration to traffic calming in and around my home were a proposed link with the ashgrove area to become a reality.	OP	Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.
There are 3 retail parks with car parks which come off Edgar Road. Asda/B&Q have a roundabout. The other 2 have junctions. It would make more sense for the Asda/B&Q roundabout to also feed the Boots retail park to assist with the flow of traffic and only have 1 way in/out. I think there also needs to be something done about the Wards Road junction/Glenmoray Drive/Wards Road. This section of road gets really congested, particularly when there are trains crossing - could there be a roundabout at each end to help traffic flow.	I	Access to the retail parks is via private land. Any changes to access would need to be promoted by the owner(s) of the retail parks. Option I3H is for the improvement of this junction.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
The biggest issue for me and many others I speak with who live in New Elgin is that there is no obvious route between the south of the town and the north of Alexandria Road (Bishopmill, Lossie etc). As a result of this many "rat run" up Seafield Street, Reidhaven Street then down the High Street to Alexandria Road(Halfords roundabout) then up Bishopmill Brae.	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of Option I1B.
Not enough free parking near centre	NA	Noted. The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.
Again it is tinkering in the small and medium term. The idea time to add cycle paths and junction redesigns is within a larger joined up plan	O	Comment noted.
could maybe add more about how this strategy relates to a wideMoray strategy; connecting Elgin up with outlying areas and vice a versa.	NA	Moray Local Transport Strategy 2011 considers the wider Moray area and the inter-urban links. An update of this strategy is due in the future.
Still going to cause congestion by adding crossings. Should remove light controlled crossings on A96 and use underpass and overpass	OP	The A96 Alexandra Road has been identified as a barrier to movement. Crossing provisions for pedestrian and cyclists are required on pedestrian/cycle desire lines.
no mention of enforcement of parking restrictions	NA	Noted. The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.
It doesn't alleviate my issue of getting to the town or towards Inverness/Forres as I mainly use the level crossing and the proposal for Ashgrove Road will not help this, as I would have to use Edgar Road (highlighted as an issue) or New Elgin Road (also highlighted as an issue) to get to it. I regularly walk or cycle to town and find the 'missing link' between Hay Street and the Wards an issue - particularly when there is a lot of traffic about after the barriers have been down. I feel it is unsafe for my children as they are not as aware as me where traffic is likely to go.	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>The identification of I3G (rationalisation at Bilbohall Road/Fleurs Road/Mayne Road/Wards Road) and I4C (new cycle/pedestrian north/south rail bridge) are welcomed as core measures and it is understood that they would allow two way traffic over the railway bridge. However, it is not clear in the Report, or at the stakeholder consultation that this would be the case, as no real detail has been provided to date. We therefore request that the Elgin Transport Strategy provides further information in relation to these measures and assurances that they would indeed allow two way traffic over the bridge which would relieve access in the Bilbohall area. Although it is welcomed that I3G is identified in the short term (by 2018), measure I4C is identified for delivery in the medium term (by 2022). It is questioned why both cannot be delivered in the short term which would enable the delivery of housing allocations at the earliest opportunity. It is requested that consideration be given to the delivery of measure I4C in the short term, by 2018 also.</p>	SP, D	<p>Support for Options I4C and I3G is noted. Detailed consideration of these options would be undertaken as part of the Master planning process for the Bilbohall development sites.</p>
<p>Somewhat - for walking. Not really - for cars &amp; vehicles. Improvements to pedestrian crossings must include drop kerbs that allow wheelchair users free movement - so they can get off roads smoothly. Too many drop kerbs in town cause front wheels to jar and chair has to be tipped to permit chair to gain access to pavement. Centre road islands must also have free access for safety.</p>	D	<p>Comments relating to dropped kerbs noted. New pedestrian crossings would be designed to current best practice guidance for users with impaired mobility, users of mobility scooters etc.</p>
<p>Another crossing of the railway line is needed - possibly a pedestrian / cycle bridge from Gleener Oils across the goods marshalling yard ( by the yellow crane ) to Maisondieu Road . This would encourage people from south east Elgin/New Elgin to walk or cycle into town . A road bridge would not have the same benefit</p>	SP	<p>Support for Options I1B and I4B noted.</p>
<p>As above.</p> <p>This plan is a mish mash, get a route through Elgin and across Elgin bringing as little disruption and pollution to the residents of Elgin as possible. Abandon the plan to keep HGV traffic flowing through the centre of Elgin and densely populated areas. Instead bypass built up areas where possible. Recognise the health and safety risks with heavy traffic ploughing through the centre of Elgin and close to schools, Eastend, New Elgin, Elgin Academy and Bishopmill.</p>	O, BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>See above.</p> <p>Can't understand basing a new expensive road on an aged bridge. Unless you force people to use it in a one way system I think it will be avoided. And if you do create a one way system do you really expect buses and HGVs to use that bridge????</p>	OP	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.</p> <p>Use of this proposal as part of a one-way gyratory is being considered. Buses and heavy goods vehicles already utilise the Ashgrove Bridge.</p>
<p>As above.</p> <p>Far too much focus is on walking and cycling to work, even today, very few actually walk or cycle to if they have access to a vehicle. If you factor out the number of people who have to walk or cycle then the percentage that choose to walk or cycle is very low and far too much consideration is given to providing facilities for them rather than than addressing the issues of the many who wish to travel by car. It would be money far better spent if cycle paths / lanes and walking routes were left as they are and more spent on the motorists who are the largest percentage of users. Just recently a large sum of money was spent on creating a cycle way from the Cooper Park to the train station utilizing Reidhaven Street, now the proposals are to create another cycle path on Moss Street, a mere hundred yards away at the expense of motorists who will no longer be able to travel south on Moss Street. Pampering to the few at the expense of the many.</p>	OP	<p>Providing active travel infrastructure and encouraging walking and cycling supports national and regional policies and strategies and Scottish Government outcomes relating improving health.</p>
<p>The cycle lane on Moss Street is welcome (assuming it's bidirectional and people aren't going to park on it) and the routes from Pinefield and Ashgrove as well. But I'm not convinced about the cycle lane on Station Road, it seems half-hearted. Painted cycle lanes aren't great (especially if there are pinch points at crossing islands) and what happens if you want to continue on up Hay Street? That will still feel dangerous. Cycling West to East through the town centre is easy but East to West is awkward. Why not a bi-directional cycle lane either the full length of South Street or on the West end of the High Street. There's plenty of room if you get rid of the parking</p>	SP, I	<p>Comments relating to detailed design of cycle infrastructure noted. Should draft ETS be approved then cycle schemes would be developed in line with current best practice guidance.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>A bridge/road from Ashgrove to Maisondieu will only increase traffic through a residential area including Seafield Street, Seafield Crescent and Maisondieu Place, none of which are suitable for a high volume of traffic. This will bring added pollution, noise and safety concerns to these quiet residential streets mostly populated by the elderly and people with young families. Trying to go down any of these openings out on to Maisondieu Road is to be avoided at all costs, especially if you want to turn right, as you have no vision of what is coming and the traffic travels along Maisondieu Road at such a speed that you take your life in your hands any time you use these openings. In the vicinity of the proposed bridge/road you have Moray Resource Centre, used by the disabled and people with special needs, premises for those with sight problems in Victoria Crescent, East End School, St Sylvester's School, Abbeyside and Abbeyvale Old People's Homes, Anderson's Institute and a house for people with special needs in Seafield Crescent. An increase in traffic would not be beneficial in any way to the people using the above services. Also, on Seafield Street, you have the Moray Bowling Club which hosts tournaments and needs to be able to park cars and buses in the surrounding area during the bowling season. Last year they hosted the under 21 world championships bringing welcome business to the area. The bus which serves the home for those with special needs often has difficulty getting up and down Seafield Crescent because of parked cars. The residents of these streets need to be able to park too.</p>	OP	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.</p> <p>Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.</p>
<p>Main issues for cycling and walking are crossing busy roads. A96 east, central and west all need addressing, as does the railway line at Laich Moray. The cycleway at Moss Street helps but I'm not convinced that one-way streets help create the right environment.</p>	S	<p>Support noted. Options I1B and I4B would address north-south movements for pedestrians and cyclists at the railway line.</p>
<p>as before it does not fully address transport integration</p> <p>all the improvements are to the east of Elgin and does not address integration with bus and rail transport.</p>	OP	<p>Comment noted. The relocation of the bus station was not taken forward as a proposal as the key destination for most users of bus services is the town centre.</p>
<p>see above &amp; at what cost to go through the objections. Councillors are to be informed as well as Scottish Government, neighbours, businesses etc. The road at Ashgrove is bad enough as it is without this preposterous suggestion. Easily seen none of the transport team live anywhere near these proposals.</p>	OP	<p>Objection to Option I1B noted.</p>
<p>While parents have the ability to choose which primary school their offspring can attend we will still have the school run clogging up traffic.</p>	NA	<p>Parental choice of schools is a matter for Education.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
The timing of the lights will be critical to the success of the project. The junctions are close together and if the timings are wrong the traffic flow will be adversely affected.	D	Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
There is a large development of houses being built in Findrassie off of Covesea Road - it is already difficult to get down to Covesea Rise due to the cars parked on the road down Covesea Road. How is all of the extra traffic from this development going to cope on a road that is already tight for space? Planning permission for the houses was given with no thought to adding to the road network to get all of the cars in and out.	NA	Comment noted. This comment relates to a specific development.
Lack of detail on exactly how it is proposed to prevent parents from driving pupils to and from West End Primary and parking in front of vehicle accesses. Provision of traffic lights at South Street/Hay Street junction is a terrible idea. It will cause queuing traffic to back up in Northfield Terrace, blocking off access to the car park and cause delays to all traffic . How will Mayne Road traffic be accommodated ?	D, OP	Proposals within the draft ETS aim to address movements to and within Elgin, including Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools. Detailed design of improvements to South Street/Hay Street junction will take movements to/from Mayne Road into consideration and provide road markings to ensure that entrance to car park was maintained.
No improvement listed for the lossiemouth road / lesmurdie road junction.	D	Option I4M is for improvements for pedestrians and cyclists at this junction.
As above, there are some ideas that would aid the movement of traffic within the city. We would want to ensure that there is positive signage that promotes the city centre and does not just encourage people to drive past.	NA	Comment noted.



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 5

Would the proposals make Elgin easier for you to travel around? If not why not?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Proposals MAY be beneficial to cyclists but volume of vehicles preclude risking cycling. Suggested traffic light junctions and zebra crossing stop the flow of traffic and add to air pollution and congestion. Shared pedestrian/cycle paths not beneficial.	SP, OP	Comments relating to pollution and congestion noted. Option M2B urban Traffic Control seeks to co-ordinate proposed traffic signals to minimise congestion and pollution.
Already have, like other homeowners, considerable issues in relation to utilising the vehicular access to own property. We have to reverse in off Maisondieu Road and due to volume of traffic travelling in both directions makes this difficult and at times dangerous due to traffic speed.	OP	Comment noted regarding existing access issues on Maisondieu Road.
I use the bus or a taxi.	NA	Comment noted.
I walk everywhere because if I move my car out of its parking space in Seafield Street (I have no drive) I cannot then re-park until after 5:30 pm because of Moray Council workers using the street to park all day.	NA	Comment noted. The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.
We support the improvement of the transportation infrastructure in Elgin, but have significant concerns to the proposed method sought to deliver them. More information is needed in order to clearly identify what payments will be sought when and for what core package measure. Until this information is provided, it is not possible to assess if the core package measures proposed are viable and therefore if they will ease travel movement within Elgin. As one of the Council's Partners in the delivery of these aspirations transparency is required on the cost, funding and delivery of the improvements.	S, DO	The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development. The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning & Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the draft Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review. The business case and funding for both the strategy and any individual elements will be considered by Moray Council at the appropriate stage.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
It's quite simple - the proposals do not address the sheer volume of traffic in the town. Elgin is a small town and simply to divert traffic within the town is not addressing the problem - traffic will just make it's way back to the familiar choke points. Nor is making driving around the town so intolerable as to dissuade people to use the roads. The town needs to be bypassed.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Robertson Homes Limited (RHL) do not object to the improvement of the transportation infrastructure in Elgin, but rather to the proposed method sought to deliver them. More information is needed in order to clearly identify what payments will be sought when and for what core package measure. Until this information is provided, it is not possible to assess if the core package measures proposed are viable and therefore if they will ease travel movement within Elgin. Therefore further consultation will be required.	S, DO	The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development. The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning & Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review.
Possibly, but it would be difficult to answer this until the further details on the proposals are provided.	D	Comment noted. Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.
As above - lack of definition  Your response categories lack clear definition. What does 'somewhat' mean?	D	Comment noted for this qualitative question. 'Somewhat' is taken to mean 'to some extent' or 'to a certain extent'.
Would expect that traffic signals to north and south of railway bridge at bottom of New Elgin Road will restrict traffic flow more than the existing roundabouts do.	OP	Traffic signals would be co-ordinated to optimise traffic flow and would provide signal controlled crossing for pedestrians and cyclists.
I live outside Elgin with no access to transport services.	NA	Comment noted. Draft ETS seeks to address movements within Elgin.
I can walk or cycle easily to the town centre and have good access by road or on foot to shopping or leisure/entertainment locations	NA	Comment noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
I mainly travel around Elgin on foot, I have no issues with the current situation. It seems the main problems are from through traffic and those taking the car from new housing estates on the edge of the town.	NA, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Public transport timetable for buses from New Elgin to centre of Elgin are not as convenient as they used to be	NA	Comment relating to commercial bus services noted.
I think there is a real issue with getting around New Elgin from New Elgin Road west right along towards the High School. The Western Link Road would have helped with congestion around town.	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
Would still be congestion as I previously mentioned	O	Comment noted. Options in draft ETS seek to improve overall network operation.
I don't have trouble getting round Elgin	NA	Comment noted.
<p>As I said above, I would have to use Edgar Road or New Elgin Road to get to the railway crossing and it diverts me off the most direct route.</p> <p>It doesn't alleviate my issue of getting to the town or towards Inverness/Forres as I mainly use the level crossing and the proposal for Ashgrove Road will not help this, as I would have to use Edgar Road (highlighted as an issue) or New Elgin Road (also highlighted as an issue) to get to it.</p>	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
Not really for travel by car. Another rail crossing so close to those we already have will create more problems in the inner circle road. There are a limited [number of ] parking places in town. If parking was limited to 2 hours max for non-residents workers would then have to walk, cycle or take public transport. Street parking would then be available for visitors to the town. Otherwise town centre could be even emptier.	OP, NA	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.</p> <p>The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.</p>
Poor road surfacing (potholes and especially failed utility re-instatements) results in a very bumpy surface which is bad to cycle on - for example Greyfriars Street at Moray Council HQ is very rough.	NA	Comments on road conditions noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>As above.</p> <p>This plan is a mish mash, get a route through Elgin and across Elgin bringing as little disruption and pollution to the residents of Elgin as possible. Abandon the plan to keep HGV traffic flowing through the centre of Elgin and densely populated areas. Instead bypass built up areas where possible. Recognise the health and safety risks with heavy traffic ploughing through the centre of Elgin and close to schools, Eastend, New Elgin, Elgin Academy and Bishopmill.</p>	O, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
<p>See above. I believe more folk would use The Wards father than be forced to divert via a new road compounding the problems there that are not addressed at all in this strategy.</p> <p>Can't understand basing a new expensive road on an aged bridge. Unless you force people to use it in a one way system I think it will be avoided. And if you do create a one way system do you really expect buses and HGVs to use that bridge????</p>	OP	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.</p> <p>Use of this proposal as part of a one-way gyratory is being considered. Buses and heavy goods vehicles already utilise the Ashgrove Bridge.</p>
<p>I travel by car for all journeys, too many cycle lanes / paths means to many crossings, slowing my journey. So many Zebra crossings in Edgar road are going to slow traffic even more.</p>	OP	<p>Comment noted. Strategy seeks to encourage walking and cycling as an alternative to cars. Testing of strategy shows an overall improvement in journey times.</p>
<p>Can't really see how proposed new bridge/road at Maisondieu would improve traffic flow. Also, I am not keen on shared cycle track/pavements. I don't like bicycles flying past me when I am out walking and would be wary of using these areas.</p>	OP	<p>Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.</p> <p>Comment relating to shared use cycle paths noted.</p>
<p>I live within the town centre</p>	NA	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Pinch points such as the 8 acres junction and Wittet drive/A96 junction mentioned but not addressed. On street parking on Moss Street and Main Street, New Elgin disrupting traffic flow should be addressed.</p>	I	<p>Option I3I is a development specific scheme and Option I3J is part of the 'aspirational' package and could be taken forward should development or specific funding become available.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
They are hardly revolutionary and the key investment is probably not deliverable on several grounds, not least affordability.	O	Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.
the proposals have the potential to create more pinch points and not allow the free flow of traffic	O	Comment noted. Testing of the strategy shows an overall improvement in journey times.
as above  see above & at what cost to go through the objections. Councillors are to be informed as well as Scottish Government, neighbours, businesses etc. The road at Ashgrove is bad enough as it is without this preposterous suggestion. Easily seen none of the transport team live anywhere near these proposals.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted.
Within Elgin I travel on foot	NA	Comment noted.
Traffic lights tend to slow the flow of the traffic and sensible roundabouts help to make the travel more smooth.	OP	Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
I look forward to improvements to the benefit of cyclists, especially those to help the less confident cyclists who are currently using pavements and who hopefully would feel more able to use the roads.	SP	Comment of support noted.
Only if we get the bypass. At the moment you've got all of the Inverness-Aberdeen traffic coming through town on the A96 - it needs to be directed around the town so that local traffic only is on the town centre streets.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Elgin really needs a third bridge over the railway, to the west of Hay Street - proved by the number of vehicles and delays at the Wards level crossing	BR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
Overall yes, the proposals for South Street, Batchen & Commerce Street, would however not aid movement and would adversely affect the businesses.	OP	Comments relating to Option I2E noted any design would take into consideration the access requirements for local businesses/residents.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 6

#### What do you see as the benefits of the proposals?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Potential benefits to cyclists but probably limited by volume of vehicle traffic and fumes. Greater awareness of cyclists mandatory by all vehicles. Some benefit to pedestrians but not if sharing lanes with cyclists.	SP	Comments of support noted.
Don't see any benefits - driving traffic into a residential area with close proximity to a local school and narrow streets with properties using on street parking as they have no off road parking does not make it appear like strategic thinking.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.
Not any - just a never ending heavy flow of traffic and noise 24/7.	O	Comment relating to traffic noise noted.
Waste of money, Moray Council need to use their money for a proper by-pass or nothing at all.	O, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
It is critical that planned developments must be taken into account when considering infrastructure improvements, however, the proposed method and rationale for developer contributions is unclear. We would contend that a more equitable and targeted benefit would be delivered through the opportunity for the development industry to input meaningfully into the method and guidance of delivering infrastructure improvements. Ultimately, no transportation benefits will be delivered if the framework for developer contributions is flawed from the start and results in a barrier to development. It is not felt that sufficient information has been provided at this stage, nor has there been sufficient time to discuss the content of the proposed strategy.	DO, D	The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development. The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning & Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
RHL agree that cogniscense of planned development in Elgin must recognise necessary infrastructure upgrading, however, the proposed method and rationale for developer contributions is still unclear, despite a number of discussions with the Council. We would contend that a more equitable and targeted benefit would be delivered through the opportunity for the development industry to input meaningfully into the method and guidance of delivering infrastructure improvements. Ultimately, no transportation benefits will be delivered if the framework for developer contributions is flawed from the start and results in a barrier to development. It is not felt that sufficient information has been provided at this stage, nor has there been sufficient time to discuss the content of the proposed strategy.	DO, D	Comment relating to developer obligation process noted.
Making junction improvements and restricting access to one way on some street will make improvements but bad driving habits will not be resolved by these changes, perhaps "forcing" change on drivers is needed through signal controlled junctions.	S, SP	Comment of support noted.
Some better cycle routes within Elgin	SP	Comment of support noted.
Improved access to Elgin for cyclists and pedestrians. Fixing problematic junctions and "pinch points". Reducing journey times for cars and associated pollution/cost	SP	Comment of support noted.
Improved signals, roundabouts, road layout	SP	Comment of support noted.
The improvements to the junction at Bilbohall if done correctly would open up the south west of the city to further development. Active travel improvements are welcomed.	SP	Comment of support noted.
Enhanced cycling/ mobility and walking provision.	SP	Comment of support noted.
Sustainable transport links like cycle paths and inproved roads arounds schools are goid	SP	Comment of support noted.
Initiate the discussion about how best to ameliorate traffic congestion in Elgin.	NA	Comment noted.
Improved movement of traffic around Elgin	S	Comment of support noted.
Concern about the parking around Dr Gray's. Understood that residents may have concert around parking but so long as this parking is sensible then needed as staff may not physically be able to walk or bike in to work	NA	The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
edgar road - wards junction and rail bridge - reduce congestion, safer passage for pedestrians near dr grays with improvement of roundabout, cycle routes - reduce bike accidents and encourage people to cycle	SP	Comments of support noted.
more oppertuinty to cycle to work or even walk.	SP	Comment of support noted.
More busses for the 35 that come every half hour.	NA	Comments noted. Delivery of Bus Service 35 is by a commercial operator and out with the control of the Moray Council.
Safer streets and roads. Less congestion.	S	Comment of support noted.
Links between ashgrove road and maisondue road	SP	Comment of support noted.
Safer travel of course!	S	Comment of support noted.
I cannot see any meaningful benefits	O	Comment noted.
Possible easing of congestion.	S	Comment of support noted.
In addition to those cited by your selves I feel many of these changes will encourage greater levels of physical activity and therefore help improve health.	SP	Comment of support noted.
safer streets and healthier residents of Elgin if opportunities are taken up.	S	Comment of support noted.
Ease of vehicles travelling around Elgin	S	Comment of support noted.
Can only be a good thing	S	Comment of support noted.
Greater access through city with the Ashgrove bridge crossing. More access to safe walking routes about town.	S, SP	Comment of support noted.
none	O	Comment noted.
Making flow through various junctions and choke points easier.	S	Comment of support noted.



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Cyclists will love it	S	Comment of support noted.
making a more vibrant and safe town centre with better transport facilities.	S	Comment of support noted.
Very little if any	O	Comment noted.
none	O	Comment noted.
Additional cycle facilities around Laichmoray Roundabout and Moss Street	SP	Comment of support noted.
Additional crossings and better opportunities for pedestrians / cyclists to cross at signal junctions rather than roundabouts.	SP	Comment of support noted.
<p>NHS Grampian are the owners of The Firs, Bilbohall Hospital, a day hospital with residential accommodation. It is identified in the Moray Local Development Plan as OPP7. The LDP states that “the redevelopment of the NHS buildings that are surplus to requirements, for residential development will be supported. Access to the site is constrained and development that would result in additional trips using the Bilbohall Railway Bridge will not be supported until an alternative access is provided”. Adjacent to this is site R1: Bilbohall North which was granted planning permission in 2005 for 60 units. 40 houses have now been built, however, the remaining 20 are constrained until transport constraints can be overcome. It is understood that measures I3G and I4C will relieve the access constraint that exists and allow for the redevelopment of the wider Bilbohall area, including the NHS owned Bilbohall Hospital site as per the Local Development Plan allocation. These measures are considered to be fundamental to the redevelopment of this area, in the absence of the Western Link Road.</p>	SP	Comment of support noted.
Pedestrian/wheelchair crossings	S	Comment noted.
1.) Reduced car use > reduced pollution > healthier population 2.) More pupils walk to school > healthier population	S	Comment of support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Our vision is for walking and cycling to be the natural choice for short journeys, creating a healthier, socially inclusive, economically vibrant, environmentally friendly Scotland. Active Travel is about improving quality of life and quality of place. And with over 50% of all driven journeys in Scotland being less than 5km, and 26% less than 2km, there is plenty of scope for achieving a significant shift to walking and cycling as the most sustainable forms of transport. We therefore support proposals to encourage these travel modes.	SP	Comment of support noted.
more walking and cycling	S	Comment of support noted.
At last the traffic situation in Elgin is being looked at overall, which makes a lot of sense.	S	Comment of support noted.
None it's far too sketchy.	O	Comment noted.
I like that safety concerns along Edgar Road and approve of using vegetation as a divider.the proposals need refinement though.	SP	Comment of support noted.
none	O	Comment noted.
It is all an improvement but I'd like to see more	S	Comment of support noted.
There would be benefits for cyclists but I do not see that many people cycling.	S	Comment of support noted.
As described in the objectives  I live within the town centre	NA	Comment noted.
Better, safer access and travel around Moray	S	Comment of support noted.
Not a great deal. It is hard to see how a major investment in a sub-standard railway crossing will pass the economic appraisal test.	OP	Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.
not a lot !	O	Comment noted.
none	O	Comment noted.

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
No benefit	O	Comment noted.
Easing the current traffic congestion	S	Comment of support noted.
Don't know	NA	Comment noted.
Replacing roundabouts with signals will have a double edged effect, everyone will get a turn but some people will feel that they are held up by the lights. See debate about the Longman Road roundabout lights in Inverness.	SP/OP	Comment noted. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
Improved safety	S	Comment of support noted.
Easing congestion at the main roundabout would make traffic flow easier and helping to reduce snagging points particularly at peak points in the day. Improving the cycle paths particularly with better storage provision for cycles would be positive. As stated we would be hoping for good signage to encourage people to stop and shop.	SP	Comment of support noted.
benefits - planning ahead to address anticipated growth and current planning issues	S	Comment of support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 7

Do you foresee any challenges to be overcome?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
To create an integrated transport policy with sufficient public transport in place, over which Moray Council have no control. The cost. To make openings on to Maisondieu Road safe - currently all junctions have poor visibility and traffic speed along Maisondieu Road makes it hazardous. Residential streets not suitable to cope with increased traffic, especially where residential homes, schools and Resource Centre located.	OP, F	Objection to Option I1B noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal. Comment related to funding noted.
As detailed in previous answers. The WLR project ended badly and resulting in huge costs to the council in project scoping costs, compulsory purchase etc yet we appear to be taking the same approach again. It would make sense to await the A96 dualling project and then work up a strategy which ties into this comprehensive transport project.	F	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Comment related to funding noted.
Where is the money REALLY coming from. The council got a huge amount of money from the Scottish Government eg not very long ago for the Flood Prevention Scheme.	F	Comment related to funding noted.
The cost.	F	Comment related to funding/cost noted.
Remove centre island and bollards between 43-41 Maisondieu Road, as they serve no purpose and one bollard was knocked down over one year ago, a portable Keep Left sign was put up, and it has been lying flat for over three months as the sand bags holding it down has rotted away.	I	Comment relating to existing issue on public road passed to Roads Maintenance team.
East end of Elgin very congested. Active travel route up Seafield Street will make problem worse, as will traffic lights on Maisondieu Road as will mean more congestion at the top of Queen Street with motorists using Seafield Street to avoid lights, like Blantyre Place in Bishopmill.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>We foresee a significant number of challenges due to the absence of sufficient detail available with this consultation. The TS proposes that in addition to contributions sought for core package measures within defined quadrants, a proportional financial contribution will also be sought towards town centre core package measures. For the purposes of this strategy, the identified town centre boundary has been changed from that of the LDP, and there are a substantial number of core package measures sought for the town centre. However, there is no information provided on how these measures are to be delivered and how the town centre core package payments are to be allocated on a 'proportional' basis. The Council have stated that the total cost of the identified core package measures will be £30m and have stated that £30m is already included in the capital programme. It is expected that development industry pay £15m of this, with the other £15m being provided by the Council. Given the current financial constraints can the Council fund their required £15m share and over what timescale? It has also been suggested that the Council may deliver these core package measures up front and then seek retrospective payments from the development sites which have been identified as having an impact on this measure. We would question if the Council has the funding or has identified a value for money process in which to deliver these core package measures up front. Furthermore, we have serious concerns regarding the legitimacy of relying on future S75 agreements to pay for these works. We do not consider that this would meet the tests of Circular 3/2012, which states that S75 payments are required to mitigate the impact of development. We would welcome the Council's view on how they foresee the legal agreement being set out and agreed. In the event that core package measures are delivered by the Council and payment sought retrospectively from developments that are deemed to have an impact, how will this payment be calculated? If a planning application is submitted 3 years after the delivery of the road improvement, how will the supporting TA deal with that particular road improvement in its assessment? By the time an application is submitted, the traffic movement in respect of that site would have changed as a result of the road improvement being delivered by the Council, therefore the method of calculating the impact and ultimately the required payment is unclear. Over the lifetime of the strategy (i.e. up to 2030) the traffic movements in Elgin will change. Has this been considered in the TS? Will the impact that a site may have on the road network be calculated now, or at the time of an application by which point the traffic movements may of changes substantially? Assuming the Council are to undertake the works, how would these improvements be delivered? First come first served? There is no identified prioritisation of the proposals to be delivered, therefore it is unclear what works are proposed to be undertaken first. The scenario could arise whereby core package measures in respect of sites are not delivered for years, despite a contribution having been paid. The concern would be if this may then threaten the deliverability of development sites until such times that these improvements are undertaken.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	DO, D, F	<p>Comment relating to developer obligations and funding noted.</p> <p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development.</p> <p>The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the draft Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review.</p> <p>The draft ETS will be reviewed as part of the development plan process. The Moray Local Development Plan 2015 already includes LONG designations which provide housing up to 2045. These sites have been considered in the draft ETS.</p> <p>The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>The proposed TS identifies the required works to be undertaken in respect of allocated sites to 2030. If the proposed works are not paid for in full by the end of 2030, where are the additional funds required to pay back the Council for undertaking the works going to come from? Is any shortfall in infrastructure project investment occurring pre-2030 to be paid for by post-2030 development projects? If additional funding becomes available through a region/ city deal type package will this be utilised to deal with existing improvements required in the absence of no development and how would that affect the proposals. The cost of the identified core package measures are identified as 'preliminary' in the Jacobs report. It therefore seems premature to be seeking funding contributions in respect of this TS at this stage. How can preliminary costs allow for accurate calculation of the funds to be sought from each development? Will this figure increase with inflation? How have the calculations sought been informed the if the final costs are unknown? This creates a risk of failing to raise the required funding, or conversely an over payment of the required contribution. We note that 240 windfall units have been included in calculations. This seems low considering large unallocated sites may come forward and existing allocated sites may increase their zoned capacity. This risks the situation of a windfall site coming through before 2030 and the Council having no basis for seeking payment as the 240 'allocation' has been used up. Therefore, sites may benefit from road improvements while providing no payments. Considering there are already potential windfall sites emerging (such as the residential element of 8ha identified in the Barmuckity Business Park Framework) 240 units seems very low. There is expected to be two further LDPs delivered before 2030. Are new sites identified through these LDP's going to be required to contribute to the core package measures, even though these may be retrospective?</p>	DO, D, F	<b>See response above</b>
<p>I think the proposals grossly overestimate people's willingness to change their habits. With more and more housing further from the town centre cycle paths or not, the majority of people will still want to take the car.</p>	PB	Comment noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021.
<p>We foresee a significant number of challenges due to the absence of sufficient detail available with this consultation.</p>	D	Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Education of general public	PB	Comment noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021.
Poor planning decisions based on infrastructure that never appears.	P	Comment noted.
Bypass for Elgin is essential and we still need a solution for south-west Elgin if the "link road" is not on the table. If many more new houses built in New Elgin, problems will only become worse.	BP, SR	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
delays in travel while improvements are being implemented	T	Comment noted. Delays during construction would be minimised through appropriate traffic management.
Changing people's habits & funding the proposals.	PB	Comment noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021.
North - south link road proposals and impact on residents and businesses in affected areas with regard to increased pollution, increased noise, increased traffic, difficulty in turning into/exiting house driveways if live in Maisondieu Road, real possibility of Maisondieu Place being used as a short cut or for parking.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.
These plans do not make the town more accessible only more complex and already commuters and locals alike do not access the town as it is so difficult to pop in for something as all the close by streets are closed off. Pedestrianising South street will only add to this burden pushing traffic further into side streets that are residential and reducing accessability to the high street even further. It will damage businesses.	OP	Comments relating to Option I2E noted any design would take into consideration the access requirements for local businesses/residents.
Reluctance of individuals to walk or cycle rather than ride. Reluctance of parents for their children to walk or cycle to school.	PB	Comment noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021. Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Getting it right for all	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
Potentially moving the railway tracks??	OP	Comment relating to tracks within goods yard noted.
adequate parking at the hospital.	NA	Parking at Dr Gray's hospital is a matter for NHS Grampian.
town is growing and people want changes but not near their houses, mentality should change, no changes without compromises, there always be someone unhappy	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
when changes take place the congestion, the fact it will take 13 years to complete.	T	Comment noted. Delays during construction would be minimised through appropriate traffic management.
Money	F	Comment related to funding noted.
lack of money for engineering projects	F	Comment related to funding noted.
Convincing people to give up their cars. Ensuring rail track are willing to sell land for road construction. Ensuring that there is a political will to look at additional sites for a north south link that do not become drawn into being tagged as a "by pass". Local residents in the maisonndieu area are not happy with the proposed link in equal measure to those in the whittet drive area.	PB, OP	Comment noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021. Objection to Option I1B noted.
Getting people out of their cars and onto their bikes or their feet	PB	Comment noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021.
Finance, Getting decisions, implementing change	F	Comment related to funding noted.
Drivers giving space to individuals and businesses in South Street	PB	Comment relating to Option I2E noted.
To get people to use public transport it has to be right place, right time and right fare.	PB	Comment relating to public transport provision and fares noted.
Blind approach of so many in the town; happy to complain about any change but equaklly whinge when they have to wait when driving, even for a few minutes. Too much of a "can't do" approach in Elgin amongst the public.	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>As above</p> <p>The biggest issue for me and many others I speak with who live in New Elgin is that there is no obvious route between the south of the town and the north of Alexandria Road (Bishopmill, Lossie etc). As a result of this many "rat run" up Seafield Street, Reidhaven Street then down the High Street to Alexandria Road(Halfords roundabout) then up Bishopmill Brae.</p>	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
money	F	Comment related to funding noted.
The "not in my backyard" mentality	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
probalby public opinion. the "not in my back tyard" mentality.	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
Only moving problems to new areasDifficult to say, wait for the bypass and push for it to be done quicker	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Isn't the idea to get people out of their cars? Better, more frequent public transport is needed. Why disturb residential areas when other less residential and less developed parts of Elgin are not in the equation? For example west of the Railway Station, the Wards Area.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.
nd Duff Ave Which are parked solid	NA	The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.
Selling the 'alternative' to Wittet Drive to the public - will they just think they're a softer touch - and it won't help those which Wittet Drive Bridge was supposed to help	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
Moss Street, what about residents without off street parking. Will they be able to park on street? Behaviour change. Persuading residents at Ashgrove that the link to Maisondieu Road is a better option than Wittet Drive rather than political.	OP	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
It is considered that more detail is required on each of the proposals. The Transport Strategy does not provide enough information and there was no real detail provided on this at the Stakeholder event. Further details are also required on the delivery of these measures and how they will be funded going forward.	D, F	Comment related to funding noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Public transport is very unreliable (apart from Deveron Bus which is likely to stop after May.) Care workers could have greater problems getting parking close to clients on the main roads. Road plans should be linked with parking - suggest on street 2 hour max to prevent people (non residents) leaving cars/vans all day or for days & weeks when going away by train. Have residents permits and set resident permit areas marked especially when residents have no way of getting cars off the street.	NA	Comment noted. The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.
Car culture of parents collecting pupils at West End Primary School.	PB	Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021. Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.
Behaviour change will be key to the success of the strategy.	PB	Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021.
high car use	PB	Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021.
The expansion of the north and south developments must impact heavily on the future traffic density within Elgin.	P	Draft ETS has taken developments within Moray Local Development Plan into account along with an allowance for 'windfall' sites.
Finance, planning and route planning.	F, P	Comment related to funding noted.
Public incredulity re the Eastern Link proposal, cost of the route, especially if a bridge over the sidings is required. Resident objections on Station Road / Maisondieu Road.	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
getting planners to put the motorist first. the largest percentage of road users.	P	Comment noted.
The people in my area do not want increased traffic with more noise and pollution and safety concerns for children walking to school. We already have problems with cars parking in our streets. Maisondieu Place is too narrow for a high volume of traffic and the fact that emerging from the above streets onto Maisondieu Road is so dangerous makes scheme impossible to imagine.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
If Moss Street becomes one way, it will become a dangerous rat run without appropriate traffic calming. At the moment, the congestion caused by 2 way traffic and parked cars slows the vehicles to safe speeds and reduces noise. The effect on Town Centre residents does not appear to have been discussed at all.	OP	Comment noted. Routing of southbound traffic from the town centre to Maisondieu Road would be considered as part of the detailed design of Option I2A.
Much rests on the choice of the bypass route	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Money, A96 dualing	F, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
There is no money. Western Link Road was dropped because of cost and it was less than £9M	F	Comment related to funding noted.
addressing traffic and pollution problems especially to the west side of the town	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
you are going to have a huge challenge with the new bridge proposal. Neighbours in the area are on the case	OP	Objection and comment relating to public acceptance of proposal noted.
People who live in the Ashgrove Cottages	OP	Objection and comment relating to public acceptance of proposal noted.
Budget and political opportunism	F	Comment related to funding noted.
Lack of funding. Most of the plan is too limited, not ambitious enough.	F	Comment related to funding noted.
Creation of cycling lines on narrow streets.	OP	Cycle Lanes would be designed to current best practice standards.
Getting public support for the plan	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
The public's opinion generally. People don't like change, but they equally don't like the council unnecessarily wasting money on studies that are a waste of time as I have stated above.	PB	Comment relating to public acceptance of proposals noted.
Volume of traffic	V	Comment noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Public transport - the train times are not set up to encourage commuting into Elgin (if you're coming from Inverness you can arrive before 8 am or after 10 am - not ideal for working people!) and there is a serious lack of bus provision to outlying area. If the bus and train companies don't add in more services of course people will continue to use their cars.	NA	Comment noted. Longer distance public transport is provided by commercial operators and out with remit of Moray Council.
<p>see question 4 above.</p> <p>Lack of detail on exactly how it is proposed to prevent parents from driving pupils to and from West End Primary and parking in front of vehicle accesses. Provision of traffic lights at South Street/Hay Street junction is a terrible idea. It will cause queuing traffic to back up in Northfield Terrace, blocking off access to the car park and cause delays to all traffic. How will Mayne Road traffic be accommodated?</p>	D, OP	<p>Proposals within the draft ETS aim to address movements to and within Elgin, including Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.</p> <p>Detailed design of improvements to South Street/Hay Street junction will take movements to/from Mayne Road into consideration and provide road markings to ensure that entrance to car park was maintained.</p>
The council doest have the money to make things nice - money needs to be spend elsewhere	F	Comment related to funding noted.
The current financial situation	F	Comment related to funding noted.
funding	F	Comment related to funding noted.
Finance is obviously a major constraint. I do think major resistance would be met re the proposals for South Street, Batchen & Commerce Street.	F, OP	Comment related to funding noted. Comments relating to Option I2E noted any design would take into consideration the access requirements for local businesses/residents.
financial pressure and vested interests (car drivers) likely to thwart strategy	F	Comment related to funding noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 8

What do you consider the most important part of the draft strategy?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
To improve road junctions for ALL users and reduce congestion and restricted traffic flow e.g. Moss Street.	S	Comment of support noted.
Most important part for me is that it will result in the opposite effect in relation to what it wants to achieve. The majority of traffic currently on Maisondieu Road is through traffic, at high speed at times, and this draft strategy does not appear to take this into account.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.
This strategy must be taken holistically for the improvement to be successful and therefore no one part is more important than another. However, the TS aims to fix existing problems through funding (in part) from developers. This is not in line with the aims of the Scottish Government Circular 3/2012. Circular 3/2012: Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements sets out 5 tests that are required to be met when seeking developer obligation payments. The third test states that the payment sought must 'relate to the proposed development either as a direct consequence of the development or arising from the cumulative impact of development in the area'. In order to identify the direct consequence of a particular development, a comprehensive evidence base is required from which calculations of potential impacts can be assessed. Developers cannot be expected to pay for existing problems. A fundamental consideration of this TS has to be the impact that the financial contributions sought will have on land value of development sites. Developer obligations payments will be directly reflected in the value of land and it is ultimately the land value which will bear the cost of these contributions. This strategy in part comes from the consultation on developer contribution where it was highlighted that without the base cost information on the improvement required at each junction an assessment of developer contribution could not be assessed. To date this has not been increased. This guidance has been based on current LDP allocations, however this TS did not inform the LDP, nor was it identified through policy or proposed SG until recently. Land deals for these allocated sites could have been done long before this guidance was produced and these costs will not have been included within any calculations to inform these deals. Ultimately, this has implications for the viability of these sites, and may threaten the deliverability of allocated land.	DO	<p>Comment relating to developer obligations and funding noted.</p> <p>The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.</p> <p>Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.</p> <p>The package of measures has been developed to accommodate additional demand for travel associated with developments within the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
See comment above	DO	<p>The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development. The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the draft Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review.</p> <p>The draft ETS will be reviewed as part of the development plan process. The Moray Local Development Plan 2015 already includes LONG designations which provide housing up to 2045. These sites have been considered in the draft ETS.</p>
<p>This strategy aims to deliver road improvements in Elgin in respect of the development sites identified in the LDP, which RHL supports in principle. However, there is no evidence base from which to assess capacity issues. The TS aims to fix existing problems through funding (in part) from developers. This is not in line with the aims of the Scottish Government Circular 3/2012. Circular 3/2012: Planning Obligations and Good Neighbour Agreements sets out 5 tests that are required to be met when seeking developer obligation payments. The third test states that the payment sought must 'relate to the proposed development either as a direct consequence of the development or arising from the cumulative impact of development in the area'. In order to identify the direct consequence of a particular development, a comprehensive evidence base is required from which calculations of potential impacts can be assessed. Developers cannot be expected to pay for existing problems. Further information is needed in respect of the current road capacities before a detailed response can be considered. A fundamental consideration of this TS has to be the impact that the financial contributions sought will have on land value of development sites. Developer obligations payments will be directly reflected in the value of land and it is ultimately the land value which will bear the cost of these contributions. This guidance has been based on current LDP allocations, however this TS did not inform the LDP, nor was it identified through policy or proposed SG until recently. Land deals for these allocated sites could have been done long before this guidance was produced and these costs will not have been included within any calculations to inform these deals. Ultimately, this has implications for the viability of these sites, and may threaten the deliverability of allocated land.</p>	DO	<p>Comment relating to developer obligations and funding noted.</p> <p>The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.</p> <p>The package of measures has been developed to accommodate additional demand for travel associated with developments within the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
See comment above	DO	<p>The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the draft Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review.</p> <p>The draft ETS will be reviewed as part of the development plan process. The Moray Local Development Plan 2015 already includes LONG designations which provide housing up to 2045. These sites have been considered in the draft ETS.</p>
Easing the flow of main road traffic through the town until Scottish delivers it's promised by-pass	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
North South Traffic	SP	Comment of support noted.
new railway crossing at Ashgrove for cyclists, which will join-up existing cycle lanes and result in huge improvements to quality of life	SP	Comment of support noted.
reducing traffic around schools and improving public services	SP	Comment of support noted.
Active travel is important as is the junction improvements. it is also important that the surrounding communities are considered during the process.	SP	Comment of support noted.
Informing the community effectively - you need to contact potentially affected householders direct about north - south link road proposals ie letters to households. Your communication strategy was completely ineffective in the Maisondieu Place, Maisondieu Road and Seafield Crescent area. Only 2 out of 40 households contacted had any vague awareness of these developments and the 2 aforementioned had no idea it could directly impact on them. Few buy a newspaper, many have no internet or iPhone. All would have expected a letter direct from the council.	A	Comment relating to communication of proposals noted. Proposals effect all parts of Elgin, therefore any letter drop would be for all properties.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
De-conflicting through traffic with local traffic.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Parking and congestion	NA, V	Comments noted.
consider all points of view.	S	Comment of support noted.
improving roundabouts, crossings and cycle routes	S	Comment of support noted.
cycle routes and bypass	S, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Transport	S	Comment noted.
Links between ashgrove road and maisonduie road.	SP	Comment of support noted.
Not sure to be honest.	NA	Comment noted.
The idea of an ashgrove to maisonndieu road link is very important and a great concern as no other sites are being explored and the weak vision in encouraging public transport	SR	Comment noted. Other sites for north-south rail crossing were considered as part of the strategy but were ruled out.
Recognition that the railway and A96 are major barriers to movement across Elgin.	S, SP	Comment noted.
reducing the congestion of trafic	V	Comment noted.
Traffic movement and flow	V	Comment noted.
New cross railway route	SP	Comment of support noted.
promotion of accessible public tranport	NA	Comment noted. Use of accessible vehicles for public transport services are a matter for commercial operators.
Junction reconfiguration. Edgar Rd/The Wards and Wittet Dr/Bilbohall/Mayne Rd.	SP	Comment of support noted.



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
A Bypass is needed for Elgin.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
It is very very cyclist focussed.	SP	Comment noted.
Safe travel	S	Comment noted.
The Ashgrove Road / Maisondieu Road development.	SP	Comment of support noted.
Improvement to cycle & footways	SP	Comment of support noted.
none	NA	Noted.
Identifying the problem areas - though I can't understand why Edgar Road/ the Wards and Wittet Drive aren't on it, when Thornhill Road is. If there is a bypass to the south of Elgin then New Elgin Road and Main Street will be a bigger focus for traffic and this has been identified as an issue in all the scenarios	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
It must be seen to be delivered. You must take on board the public comments.	NA	Comment noted. Public consultation will be an on-going part of the delivery of the options and future reviews of the strategy.
Deterring parents from taking pupils to and from school.	PB	Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021. Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.
Measures to improve active travel infrastructure and to encourage more walking, cycling and use of public transport.	SP	Comment of support noted.
see answer to question 6  more walking and cycling	SP	Comment of support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Future proposed bypass excluded, sorting out the shambles which Alexandra Road has become, will be a great step forward.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Main road routes around Elgin, avoid the Town.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Failing on a sensible NEW route over the railway.	OP	Comment noted.
An additional crossing of the railway line.	SP	Comment of support noted.
All of the active travel provisions	SP	Comment of support noted.
The proposed new bridge/road from Ashgrove to Maisondieu Road, and bridge at Laichmoray and Moss Street being one way.	SP	Comment of support noted.
The undiscussed effect the proposals will have on the residents that live along the new, faster routes.	O, D	Objection to Option I1B noted.
Linking new developments to create cohesive and joined up network for all users (vehicular and pedestrian)	P	Comment related to planning for new developments noted, see supplementary planning guidance on urban design.
pedestrian and cyclist safety	S	Comment of support noted.
Cycling facilities. But they are weak and fail to address key issues.	OP	Comment noted.
failing to meet the considerable problems facing the community and its economy	F	Comment relating to funding noted.
An FOI may be appropriate regarding the cost so far of this report & what was done in the past that has been thrown out.	NA	Noted.
Distribution of traffic	V	Comment noted.
Attempting to equalise/balance out areas that are currently miss-matched. For traffic flows, delays, accessibility, access to leisure, parking, etc., etc..	S	Comment of support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Don't know	NA	Noted.
reducing congestion	V	Comment noted.
Improving the status and safety of people in town who are not in a car	S	Comment of support noted.
<p>1. see question 4 above . 2. a further road crossing of the railway line</p> <p>Lack of detail on exactly how it is proposed to prevent parents from driving pupils to and from West End Primary and parking in front of vehicle accesses. Provision of traffic lights at South Street/Hay Street junction is a terrible idea. It will cause queuing traffic to back up in Northfield Terrace, blocking off access to the car park and cause delays to all traffic . How will Mayne Road traffic be accommodated ?</p>	D, SP	<p>Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.</p> <p>Detailed design of improvements to South Street/Hay Street junction will take movements to/from Mayne Road into consideration and provide road markings to ensure that entrance to car park was maintained.</p>
Easing the flow of transport at roundabouts by changing them to traffic controlled signals. Renovation at the Bus station, if we seriously want to encourage people to use public transport then we should make the station a cleaner, brighter and more welcoming place.	SP	Comment of support noted.
recognition of need to encourage more Active Travel and discourage car use	SP	Comment of support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 9

The draft strategy proposes a range of proposals to make it easier to walk and cycle around Elgin. Do you support the proposals?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Too many cyclists use the existing pavements despite this being against the law. Clearer signage is required so that pedestrians can feel safe.	OP	Comment relating to use of footways by cyclists noted. Cyclists are permitted on designated cycle routes but not generally on footways.
Very heavy emphasis on cycling which serves a minority of the population. For a variety of reasons people will always require vehicle transport and access. Increased and improved pedestrian crossings helpful depending on location. Question pedestrian crossings on A96, major artery through town with negative impact on flow of traffic.	S, OP	Comment noted on provisions for cyclists. The A96 Alexandra Road has been identified as a barrier to movement. Crossing provisions for pedestrian and cyclists are required on pedestrian/cycle desire lines. Cognisance would be taken of effects on traffic flows.
The roads are not wide enough to make cycle paths.	OP	Comment noted.
Not the active travel route up Seafield Street. Already too busy, congested, over-parked with Council employees, and a bus route. Not safe for children on bikes, same for Institution Road. Residents without drives on Seafield Street need parking areas reinstated for their use.	OP	Comment noted. Design of route will take cognisance of local conditions and parking requirements.
We support the principle of the proposals. However there requires a comprehensive programme to change behaviours implemented through schools, colleges and the workplace to bring about real sustainable cultural change	S, PB	Comment noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021. Options M4A, M4B, M4C and M4D seek to support programmes for behavior change.
It is already easy to walk/cycle. Tweaking bits here and there will not have the desired impact.	O	Comment noted.
Agree that improvements need to be undertaken, but too many outstanding issues in relation to this TS to ensure these proposals will be delivered. Existing vehicular access would have to be reduced significantly (one way systems in some cases) to allow for the identified walking and cycling strategies to be delivered. Any infrastructure works relating to cycling/walking should not to create a greater problem in respect of vehicular movement. We would seek further clarification if the Council already has the money in place to deliver these 'short term' proposals? It is stated within the Transport Strategy for Elgin Committee Report (7th December) that existing developer obligations payments have been identified to fund some of these core project measures. What is the justification for using money already raised through S75 contributions towards these improvements? And is there a legal justification for doing so?	S, DO, D, F	Use of developer contributions for schemes will be in line with the relevant Section 75 Agreements i.e. contributions received for improvements to Hay Street/South Street junction will be used for delivering a scheme to improve the operation of that junction.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Need to make this safer near the A96.	S	Comment of support for Option M1C noted.
In principle with some caveats - see comments above	S	Comment of support noted.
Response options force respondents into an all or nothing reply - not happy with the format of your question.	NA	Comment regarding format of survey noted. Opportunity is available to use text boxes to provide clarification to answer e.g. support improvements to cycling but do not support Option A.
See 7 above. Great idea in theory but cycling and walking not so attractive when it is cold wet and windy and there are hills to negotiate as is the case in Elgin.  Reluctance of individuals to walk or cycle rather than ride. Reluctance of parents for their children to walk or cycle to school.	S, PB	Comments relating to weather and topography noted. Behaviour change programmes form part of the Moray Council Active Travel Strategy 2016 – 2021. Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.
id love to cycle to work but i dont want to cycle with the cars on such busy roads.	S	Comment relating to barrier to cycling noted. Proposals include off-road cycle routes and additional pedestrian/cycle crossings.
I'm not clear on what the proposals are	D	Comment noted.
I think more of the cycle paths need lit. If you want to encourage cycling/walking you have to help to make people feel safe. The path up Glenmoray Drive, the path from New Elgin Road through to the Doocot Park for example are quite dark in Winter. A full pavement on Wards Road would also be helpful.	S, I	Comments relating to provision of street lighting noted and passed to Roads Maintenance section. Provision of footway along Wards Road is limited due to third party land.
neither	NA	Noted.
But, in conjunction with making traffic flow better	S, V	Comment noted.
No issue with walking or cycling around Elgin as most cyclists cycle illegally on the pavement anyway	S	Comment of support noted.
The Council should think of introducing 'Boris' bikes in centre of town and New Elgin (not Bishopmill as everyone would only zoom down into town not back.)	I	Comment noted. Projects such as 'Boris Bikes' may form part of future Active Travel Strategies.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
not sure about the proposal for the direction of traffic flow on Moss Street. Having observed it when road works are on the junction appears to work better when southbound.	D	Comment noted. Northbound would reduce the number of approaches to the Laichmoray junction from four to three, reducing the number of conflicting movements and increasing available capacity for remaining approaches.
There are a number of diagrammatic pictures included within the strategy, these are misleading on the end product ie 8 zebras on Edgar Road, Double Yellow Lines on Seafield Street to name a few.	D	Comment relating to annotation on diagrams noted. Diagrams to be updated to clarify proposals.
Yes - for walking and cycling.	S	Comment of support noted.
See answer to Question 5. Poor road surfacing (potholes and especially failed utility re-instatements) results in a very bumpy surface which is bad to cycle on - for example Greyfriars Street at Moray Council HQ is very rough.	NA	Comment relating to existing issue on public road passed to Roads Maintenance team.
Far too much focus is on walking and cycling to work, even today, very few actually walk or cycle to if they have access to a vehicle. If you factor out the number of people who have to walk or cycle then the percentage that choose to walk or cycle is very low and far too much consideration is given to providing facilities for them rather than than addressing the issues of the many who wish to travel by car. It would be money far better spent if cycle paths / lanes and walking routes were left as they are and more spent on the motorists who are the largest percentage of users. Just recently a large sum of money was spent on creating a cycle way from the Cooper Park to the train station utilizing Reidhaven Street, now the proposals are to create another cycle path on Moss Street, a mere hundred yards away at the expense of motorists who will no longer be able to travel south on Moss Street. Pampering to the few at the expense of the many.	PB, OP	Providing active travel infrastructure and encouraging walking and cycling supports national and regional policies and strategies and Scottish Government outcomes relating improving health.
Do more	S	Comment noted.
Don't really think you will encourage many people to take up cycling instead of driving and you may be overdoing the cycle lanes to the detriment of the traffic flow.	O	Comment noted.
Extend cycle path along river with associated arterial links	I	Comment noted. This proposal will be used to inform future Active Travel Strategies.
But they are not substantial.	NA	Comment noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
I do not know the remit given but it looks swayed towards the needs of one developer	NA	Comment noted. The draft ETS has been developed to address growth associated with developments in the Moray Local Development Plan, which are being promoted by a number of different landowners/developers.
the cycle path down Lossie Wynd at present is a farce so not expecting anything better to be honest with any proposals.	NA	Comment noted.
As long as it does not encroach on residents	S	Design of schemes will take cognisance of local conditions, including access to properties.
The increased use of cycles is minimal and does not justify the expenditure	O, F	Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.
I support some, but you have not give me this option in your preferred answers.	NA	Comment regarding format of survey noted. Opportunity is available to use text boxes to provide clarification to answer e.g. support improvements to cycling but do not support Option A.
Walking and cycling need to be supported and encouraged	S	Comment in support noted.
I already think that cycling is easy enough, it's much better here than most places and if peopel aren't cycling i dont beleive its because of the fascilities	NA	Comment noted.
Making cycling safer is a good idea. It's already easy to walk in Elgin.	S	Comment in support noted.
I only use my car in elgin - therefore personally it a waste of loney looking at inproving cylce and walking links	O	Comment noted. Providing active travel infrastructure and encouraging walking and cycling supports national and regional policies and strategies and Scottish Government outcomes relating improving health.
We are keen that people are able to access and enjoy the city centre, the method of transport they use is less of a concern for us. If more people are walking and cycling then that eases congestion on the roads.	S	Comment of support noted.

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Type of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
support proposals	S	Comment of support noted.



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 10

The draft strategy recognises that the railway acts as a barrier to movement around Elgin. Do you support the proposal to create an additional crossing of the railway?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
In my opinion, there is no need to build any more crossings of the railway. We already have four crossings.	O	Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.
Adapt existing crossings perhaps by one-way systems. Cost prohibitive.	O, F	Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.
This would only be a necessity if through traffic continued on through Elgin on 'internal' roads. Building a by-pass would reduce traffic levels, and may negate the need for a rail crossing. The A96 dualling may offer an opportunity to address some of these concerns. Project objective should be: 1) remove through traffic, 2) build on improving internal traffic once 1) has been achieved.	BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.
The cost of building a bridge across the railway would not be cost efficient.	F	Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.
Can't see any benefit from a road connecting Ashgrove/Linkwood to Maisondieu Road.	O	Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.
Not where it is proposed. The original plan in the west end needs reinstated, the north-south link Ashgrove to Maisondieu is a proposed road to nowhere.	SR	Objection to Option I1B noted. Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin also noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>Whilst crossing the railway line presents challenges at present it is not known whether the proposed road improvements will help mitigate that and therefore whether an additional rail crossing is required. There is no proposed design identified in respect of the railway crossing (Project I1B). We therefore cannot provide a detailed response to this proposal. It is clear that an agreement will have to be reached with Network Rail and any other landowners of the land required to deliver this proposal. It is likely to take considerable time to secure this land to allow for development to progress, therefore further information is required on the proposed timescales for delivery and if there has been any consideration of what funds may be 'ring fenced' for this project given it may take significant time to progress. We also seek clarification on any upgrading works proposed for the road network surrounding any new railway crossing and how the crossing has been modelled and designed.</p>	D, DO	<p>Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case. Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.</p>
<p>The railway has adequate crossings. Any more will just funnel traffic into already congested areas and residential streets.</p>	O	<p>Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.</p>
<p>This is an imperative</p>	S	<p>Comment of support noted.</p>
<p>Does it? Why aren't you waiting for the A96 bypass to be decided first? The route could affect traffic flow into and around Elgin. Then, analyse what needs to be done short, medium and long term. Reckon you're rushing ahead so that you can extract significant finance from housing developers. Again, your question format forces an all or nothing answer but I've chosen NO.</p>	BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project. Traffic modelling for the year 2030 has been undertaken with and without an allowance for the A96 dualling. Comment regarding format of survey noted. Opportunity is available to use text boxes to provide clarification to answer e.g. support improvements to cycling but do not support Option A.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>The Town Centre boundary has been altered for the purposes of this strategy and we would seek further information provided to understand what 'proportionately' means when seeking payment for this crossing from developments in other quadrants. Sites to the south of Elgin will use this crossing and benefit more from it than other sites in the town. There is no final proposed design identified in respect of the railway crossing. We therefore cannot provide a detailed response. It is clear that an agreement will have to be reached with Network Rail and any other landowners of the land required to deliver this proposal. It is likely to take considerable time to secure this land to allow for development to progress, therefore further information is required on the proposed timescales for delivery and if there has been any consideration of what funds may be 'ring fenced' for this project given it may take significant time to progress. We also seek clarification on any upgrading works proposed for the road network surrounding any new railway crossing and how the crossing has been modelled and designed. The information provided is not complete enough to allow us to answer this question.</p>	DO, D	<p>Comment noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.</p> <p>Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.</p> <p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development.</p> <p>The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the draft Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review.</p>
<p>I dont think the railway is a barrier to access. Growing up adjacent to it i have never seen a problem with access.</p>	O	<p>Objection to Option I1B noted.</p>
<p>Needs to be on the west side of town. Needs to be a bridge instead of a level crossing at the end of Wards Road or futher west; exactly as proposed for the Western Relief Road in its original form.</p>	SR	<p>Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.</p>
<p>Not sure how this can be done</p>	D	<p>Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design and determine a delivery programme for the various options.</p>

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
How does it. Their are so many bridges over it	O	Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.
Not in the draft proposal. There is a crossing point at Shaw place and by the wards. The rail line could be bridged to the immediate east side of the old station utilising the brownfield site of the old sawmill by link wood road.	O	Objection to Option I1B noted. Alternatives at Shaw Place, The Wards and just to the east of New Elgin Road are constrained by surrounding development.
The proposed crossing at ashgrove astounds me, there is already a crossing at Mayne Road which is hardly used. All this will do is create more traffic using maisondieu place, seafield street and other streets in that area, which is currently a quiet residential area. Im sure the residents do not with their roads to be used as through roads.	O	Objection to Option 1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.
I think its in the wrong place	O	Objection to Option 1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.
This is essential	S	Comment in support of proposal noted.
It's vital. Western Link Road was challenged as much by nimbyism as any other factor. We ca't let this happen again.	S	Comment in support of proposal noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
The crossing should be in the west but outside Elgin, from the Eight Acres westerly.	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
Every little helps	S	Comment in support of proposal noted.
There are already 6 bridges and a level crossing in Elgin. Why can't these be developed to solve the problem e.g. more can be done with the level crossing area on the Wards. Make it one way and widened and also make the existing railway bridge one way. That area is low residential as opposed to your plans which will disrupt quiet residential areas.	O	Objection to Option 1B noted. Option 1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.
But not at Ashgrove. It needs to be to the west of New Elgin Bridge	O, SR	Objection to Option 1B noted. Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
There is a much better crossing by extending Wittet Dr. Councillors must be made aware of this, look at the business case for Ashgrove and Wittet Drive and consider the benefits. The level crossing at the Wards will create additional disruption with dual tracks and automated barriers.	O, SR	Objection to Option 1B noted. Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
Creating an additional crossing and allowing two way traffic over the crossing will relieve traffic congestion and allow the delivery of residential sites in the Moray Local Development Plan. This is especially important since plans for the Western Link Road were dropped. It is argued that measures I3G and I4C, which allow this, should both be delivered in the short term, by 2018.	S	Comment in support of proposal noted.
Yes but further out to cater for all the traffic not going to be stopping in Elgin.	S, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Vehicle numbers on Wards Road show that another railway bridge is needed WEST of the train station.	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
Suggested crossing at Ashgrove looks promising.	S	Comment in support of proposal noted.
BUT NOT THERE. You have a much better solution planned and ready to go. PLEASE look at it again.	O, SR	Objection to Option 1B noted. Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>see comments to question 4</p> <p>This plan is a mish mash, get a route through Elgin and across Elgin bringing as little disruption and pollution to the residents of Elgin as possible. Abandon the plan to keep HGV traffic flowing through the centre of Elgin and densely populated areas. Instead bypass built up areas where possible. Recognise the health and safety risks with heavy traffic ploughing through the centre of Elgin and close to schools, Eastend, New Elgin, Elgin Academy and Bishopmill.</p>	O, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
<p>A crossing would be good but not where it involves putting huge volumes of traffic through quiet residential areas i.e. not Wittet Drive nor at Maisondieu Road.</p>	O, SR	Objection to Option 11B noted. Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
<p>but not the new link road</p>	O, SR	Objection to Option 11B noted.
<p>It is, by the Council's own studies, in the wrong place and it is difficult to follow the rationale. It is challenging on a number of fronts.</p>	O	Objection to Option 1B noted. Option 11B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing.
<p>it is imperative to help the economy but not at the east end where improvements have already taken place</p>	O, SR	Objection to Option 1B noted.
<p>see above</p> <p>An FOI may be appropriate regarding the cost so far of this report &amp; what was done in the past that has been thrown out.</p>	O	Objection to Option 1B noted.
<p>Residents of Ashgrove Cottages will be affected by heavier traffic which already encroaches on their lifestyle</p>	O	Objection to Option 1B noted.
<p>But not at the east end of Elgin</p>	O	Objection to Option 1B noted.
<p>I would not support the permanent loss of the freight facility at Elgin Station.</p>	O	Objection to Option 1B noted.
<p>this should have been done as part of the western link road</p>	SR	Objection to Option 11B noted. Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Type of Comment</b>	<b>Response</b>
It's only a matter of time before there's an accident at that level crossing - we desperately need a new bridge taking traffic up and over the trainline.	S	Comment of support noted.
see answer t question 5 above  Elgin really needs a third bridge over the railway , to the west of Hay Street - proved by the number of vehicles and delays at the Wards level crossing	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
This is a pinch point that causes major delays and hold ups, our major concern is that traffic is not driven away from the city centre to the retail parks, who do not face the barriers that the city centre businesses do with parking charges.	S	Comment of support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Question 11

The draft strategy proposes to replace a number of existing roundabouts with traffic signals. Do you support the proposal?

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
It could be beneficial depending on which roundabouts. Pansport junction would be improved by signals to assist keeping traffic flowing in all four directions. Some other locations would hamper flow of traffic	S	Comment of support noted.
Build up of traffic at both ends on Maisondieu Road will be exacerbated, at peak times, by introducing traffic lights. Roundabouts allow traffic to move through all four points smoothly whilst traffic lights will allow traffic to build back due to volume.	O	Objection noted. Option I3C seeks to address dispersal of queuing traffic at A96/Maisondieu junction. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
Not on Maisondieu Road, will create more potential problems for Seafield Street with those trying to avoid the lights.	OP	Objection noted. Option I3C seeks to address dispersal of queuing traffic at A96/Maisondieu junction. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
We question the benefit of replacing roundabouts with lights, given the amount of traffic lights proposed in junctions within the town center. There is no detailed information provided on the capacity issues of existing roundabouts or how traffic lights will resolve traffic congestion issues, so we are not in a position to provide comment on whether traffic lights will provide an improvement.	D	Request for detail noted. Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
Roundabouts keep traffic flowing whereas traffic lights bring it to a halt. Peak time traffic light controlled roundabouts would be a better solution.	O	Objection noted. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control. The size of the existing roundabouts would not support the introduction of traffic signals (insufficient space for queuing vehicles within the circulatory lanes).
Roundabouts when properly laid out and used by people who have some lane discipline allow the traffic to flow better than traffic lights.	O	Comment noted.



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
We question the benefit of replacing roundabouts with lights, given the amount of traffic lights proposed in junctions within the town centre. There is no detailed information provided on the capacity issues of existing roundabouts or how traffic lights will ease traffic congestion issues, so we are not in a position to provide comment on whether traffic lights will provide an improvement. We require further information on this, and would request that further consultation is undertaken to allow us to provide a meaningful response.	D	Request for detail noted. Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
On balance, I believe it would be better to add lights to existing roundabouts for use when they are especially busy, so we can enjoy the best of both worlds!	S	Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control. The size of the existing roundabouts would not support the introduction of traffic signals (insufficient space for queuing vehicles within the circulatory lanes).
My answer is yes for some traffic signals and no for others. Poor question formatting.	S/O	Comment regarding format of survey noted. Opportunity is available to use text boxes to provide clarification to answer e.g. support improvements to cycling but do not support Option A.
This is caveat by the fact these should be reduced not increased.	NA	Comment noted.
Traffic signals can fail. Traffic is not moving while the lights change.	O	Comment relating to signal failure noted.
Too many roundabouts with different lanes for different direction on each one, causes confusion with all visitors and also some locals	S	Comment in support noted.
would help traffic flow and should assist emergency vehicles	S	Comment in support noted.
some people are so careless on roundabouts, traffic signals would make it safer	S	Comment in support noted.
Signals cause delay and frustration	O	Objection noted. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
traffic lights are a menace: see Nairn and the rondabouts with traffic lights in Inveress	O	Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control. The size of the existing roundabouts would not support the introduction of traffic signals (insufficient space for queuing vehicles within the circulatory lanes).
Why is it people cant drive round a roundabout in Elgin? How about traffic lighted roundabouts?	S, I	Comment noted. The size of the existing roundabouts would not support the introduction of traffic signals (insufficient space for queuing vehicles within the circulatory lanes).
As long and the time for stopping and starting traffic is higher in off peak times than say high peak times	S	Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
Yes and no, only if it is going to improve the flow of traffic however, traffic lights break down, what would happen then at least with roundabouts they aren't prone to technical issues.	S	Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control. Comment relating to failure of signals noted.
Neither	NA	Noted.
Traffic lights tend to slow traffic and cause further delays in my opinoin.	O	Objection noted.
Signals are probably safer.	S	Comment in support noted.
Doesn't usually speed up the traffic only causes further delays	O	Objection noted.
everywhere else is replacing traffic lights with roundabouts	O	Objection noted.
I think that there should be a mixture and some other things will probably help pedestrians and cyclists more	S	Comment in support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Unsure. With a mixture of roundabouts and traffic lights the lights would need to be well timed to avoid back ups at roundabouts. No consistency for lanes in roundabouts at present - very difficult for visitors and those who do not drive a lot.	S	Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control. The size of the existing roundabouts would not support the introduction of traffic signals (insufficient space for queuing vehicles within the circulatory lanes).
1.) Terrible idea. 2.) How would traffic lights at Comet roundabout accommodate vehicles emerging from Mayne Road onto South Street?	O	Objection noted. Detailed design of improvements to South Street/Hay Street junction will take movements to/from Mayne Road into consideration
Bad idea . At least with a roundabout the traffic has a chance to keep moving	O	Objection noted.
This will sort out the confusion about which lane one should be in to go straight ahead, as it varies from roundabout to roundabout.	S	Comment in support noted.
Will slow the traffic even more and increase emissions and pollution.	O	Objection noted. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
So long as pedestrians are well catered for.	S	Comment noted. Proposals would include provisions for pedestrians at junction.
Don't think this will improve flow of traffic.	O	Objection noted. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
Go to the South of England and see the effect of mixed roundabouts and traffic lights!	NA	Comment noted.
prefer 20mph speed limit & pedestained option	NA	Comment noted. 20mph zone has been considered.
Urban roundabouts make life difficult for walking, cycling etc.	S	Comment in support noted.
driver have a habit in this town of ignoring the lights that already exist	NA	Comment noted.
actually may have got one thing right!	S	Comment in support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Not convinced this will assist traffic flow	O	Objection noted. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
There is unlikely to be sufficient space for the vehicles to stack at t/lights, at most of the highlighted junctions within Elgin	D	Request for detail noted. Should the draft ETS be approved, the next stage would be to undertake design. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
See earlier comments about timing of lights and distance between junctions.	S	Comment noted. Option M2B is for the co-ordination of any new traffic signal controlled junctions through Urban Traffic Control.
It's been proven that roundabouts keep traffic flowing better than traffic signals, so putting them in seems a bit daft.	O	Objection noted.
Bad idea- higher maintenace, reduced journey times	O	Objection noted.
The roundabouts are very dangerous as not many people use their turning signals. Traffic signals would be much safer. This would also make the road safer for pedestrians	S	Comment in support noted.
For the reasons stated above. As also stated we would hope for signage to promote what is on it the city centre, shopping, services food, etc	S	Comment in support noted. Signage is not part of the draft ETS.

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

**Question 12**

**Are there any other comments you would like to make on the proposed strategy?**

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>Having lived here for over 20 years, I can say that there is not an issue with congestion. Traffic moves consistently along Maisondieu Road and seldom becomes backed up so I don't see any need for another crossing over the railway. In any case, the majority of vehicles using the Laichmoray crossing to come from New Elgin are turning left. Surely the main issues in the future will be in New Elgin where the developer intends to build thousands of houses? Allowing the construction of these homes to the south of Elgin will obviously entail more cars being on our town streets but bringing traffic over into the town centre when there is no need makes no sense to me. Traffic moving to the east or west of the town should be using the top road to exit the town centre either via Reiket Lane or Wittet Drive until the by-pass is built. The plans as set out show three options none of which are helpful as far as I can see. Taking extra traffic along any of the proposed streets, which are totally residential, is nonsensical since every parking space is taken up by residents or workers who want free parking, leaving only a single lane with passing places. Surely this should not be made any worse? Option a) The plan to extend the existing road from Ashgrove Rd and connect it to Maisondieu Rd at the bottom of Maisondieu Place has nothing to recommend it I feel. The whole idea is ridiculous in my view. This road itself is narrow, clogged up with parked cars and does not lead traffic anywhere that will benefit the user. Similarly, Seafield St and Seafield Crescent are residential streets largely occupied by pensioners. Taking traffic up any of these roads will simply lead to even more congestion with the presence of two Primary schools plus a nursery as well as sheltered housing at the other end of Queen St which in themselves generate a lot of double yellow line parking as well as safety issues. This will remain an ongoing issue since we have no traffic wardens to monitor the situation and the police do not see it as a priority. In addition, there is the bowling green which hosts many events throughout the year and St Sylvester's church where there is more often than not a large number of vehicles coming and going either for services or funerals. In any case, my experience of living and driving here for over 20 years shows that drivers are unlikely to gain entry onto the roundabout at South College St since traffic coming from an easterly direction doesn't even have to slow down because they can easily see if anything is coming from the other side therefore the opportunities of getting onto the roundabout are few and far between. Options b) and c): The other options in the plan do not fare any better since they will only move traffic towards the Pansport roundabout where they will have to join the A96 traffic going through the town. The proposed presence of 3/4 way traffic lights on Maisondieu Road will simply mean that drivers will avoid them and instead use Seafield St as a rat run thus leading to even more congestion at the Queen St roundabout.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	<p>OP, P</p>	<p>Objection to Option 1B noted. Option 11B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Measures to discourage the use of local streets by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of the proposal.</p> <p>Option 13C seeks to address dispersal of queuing traffic at A96/Maisondieu junction.</p> <p>Draft Elgin Transport Strategy has been developed to keep Elgin moving for the future (2030), this includes providing access to the Town Centre.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>This has long been a feature on Blantyre Place which is regularly treated as a short cut to avoid the lights on Morrision Road. Seafield St, as already mentioned, has a demographic of mainly senior citizens, who should not be faced with the prospect of accessing their drives or indeed parking outside their homes in the face of mounting traffic. In addition, there is at least one disabled resident who requires regular attendance by carers as well as ambulance services which of course blocks the street totally for the duration of their visit. To encourage pedestrians and cyclists along the street as well as vehicles is badly thought out, I would say. At the east end of town, the Reiket Lane crossing is ideal for any traffic heading out of town in that direction so I feel they should be directed away from the town not into it. Traffic from the east heading for New Elgin should also be diverted along Reiket Lane since there is no need for them to be going through the town. The exit on to the A96 at the end of Ashgrove Rd would be far more effective as a leaving point if it was changed into a roundabout instead of drivers relying on others letting them join. With that in mind, I think the whole concept of pushing even more traffic towards the centre of town goes against the Scottish Government's policy of taking vehicles away from town centres. Surely we should enhance our town centre now that it is pedestrianised? Improve cycling and walking by all means but keep traffic out of it as much as possible.</p>	OP, P	See response above
<p>There appears to be significant lack of awareness of the proposed strategy - greater publicity required, BEFORE changes implemented. Requirement to create vastly improved public transport at affordable cost. Reduction in private property values.</p>	A	<p>Comment relating to communication of proposals noted. Drop in sessions were held on five occasions during the consultation period. Articles in the local press and social media posts have been used to raise awareness of the consultation. Provision of the majority of public transport services in Elgin is by commercial bus operators who set their own fares.</p>
<p>There are continual issues in relation to road flooding in the area of Maisondieu Road and its convergence with Maisondieu Place. Three episodes, the worst of which was in Oct. 2014. We have been advised that this is as a result of gullies not being able to cope with volume of surface water and that the Flood Alleviation Project will not address the issue. Water floods onto Maisondieu/Station Road from Moss Street, Duff Street, Seafield Street. Maisondieu Place and run off from an additional solid road area will contribute to this issue. How will this be avoided when we have been told there are no funds available to address this issue.</p>	OP	<p>Objection to Option 1B noted. The treatment and attenuation of surface water would be considered and provided for as part of the detailed design for Option 1B.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>Go back to original plan in the West End of Elgin. Appendix B had photo of Seafield Street with double yellow lines - there are houses at the bottom half of Seafield Street with NO drive, already struggling for parking on a daily basis. A Council Officer has assured residents there will be no double yellow lines on Seafield Street. I would like to see Moray Council employees given FREE allocated parking to reduce parking on Seafield Street, Institution Road, etc. and allow the street to return to the normal residential street it once was. This will also allow the area to be safer for children etc getting to school. A school bus could be laid on for pupils coming from Pinefield, as Seafield Street is already used by buses. This would also reduce the amount of traffic in the area. There is to be a new school built in the south of Elgin, some pupils at East End will move there instead. Seafield Street too narrow to have cycle lanes and too busy to be safe.</p>	SR, OP	<p>Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.</p> <p>The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.</p> <p>Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.</p>
<p>We have concerns regarding the speed at which this strategy is being implemented and used by the Council. We do not feel that sufficient information has been provided to allow a comprehensive assessment to be made, and the timing of the deadline (16th February) of the response and the Full Council meeting (29th March) to discuss this Strategy seems rushed. It has been suggested that the TS has already been approved by Council, through the adoption of the Developer Obligations SG. The adopted SG does not include any of the detail of this TS. We question how the Council can therefore suggest that this approach has been agreed. Furthermore, it unreasonable that developer obligations payments would form a material consideration in respect of applications as this stage given that this TS information has not been agreed or formally approved, and fundamental questions are still outstanding. There remains a significant level of information that has not yet been made public that will be required to be reviewed to provide a complete response: - The Council have stated that calculations are to be informed by a spreadsheet tool. However, this has not yet been made available. While we appreciate that sensitive information may be identified in this tool, we would at least expect to view a hypothetical calculation to be made available. - The Committee Report (7th December) states that a Business Case is still to be undertaken. We need to see sight of this information in order to make a meaningful response and we fail to see how this guidance can be adopted without the opportunity to comment on the content of this business case. If it is proposed that developers contribute 50% of the required funding for these works, surely it is reasonable to expect to review/comment on the business case that informs the improvements sought. - From discussions with the Transportation team, a detailed technical note is to be issued in respect of the trip rate calculations to be used to inform the payments to be sought. This information needs to be provided in order that detailed, considered assessment can be made by developers and landowners.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	D, DO	<p>Comment relating to developer obligations and funding noted.</p> <p>The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.</p> <p>The package of measures has been developed to accommodate additional demand for travel associated with developments within the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>We assume that there be a further iteration of the TS (and all supporting information) issued for consultation before it is adopted? We consider that there should be further opportunity for comment once the final details in respect of the outstanding information is made available. As we have advised, if the development industry is sought to pay £15m of this contribution, there needs to be the opportunity for meaningful dialogue and input into 'workable' guidance. Consistency and transparency are required at early stage to inform the consideration of sites and provide a clear and realistic calculation of likely financial contributions to be sought. Given the experiences of other Council's (i.e. Strategic Transport Fund in Aberdeen City and Shire) when promoting similar cumulative transport measures, we suggest that a transparent and inclusive process should be followed. Ultimately, a court decision has ruled that the STF process is not lawful in seeking payments for transport improvements which are not directly impacted as a result of proposed developments. However, we consider that Moray Council is following a similar process. There is still a substantial level of information not available and the Council are progressing on the basis of this TS forming a material consideration in the determination of applications before there has been the opportunity to fully consider the outcomes. We would be grateful for clarity from the Council regarding how the implementation of financial agreements be set? If contributions are to be sought through legal agreements for each site, how will this reflect estimations of future phases and how will flexibility be embedded to allow legal agreements to be quickly and easily changed if required? Council is suggesting that this strategy will be 'constantly evolving'. This will not work in practice when legal agreements are signed. Consistency and transparency are required at early stage and a clear method to calculate the likely financial contributions to be sought are fundamental to informing the consideration of sites and their viability. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the Council and would request they provide a clear indication of the strategy of how this TS is to be implemented through the planning process.</p>	D, DO	<p>The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the draft Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review. The draft ETS will be reviewed as part of the development plan process. The Moray Local Development Plan 2015 already includes LONG designations which provide housing up to 2045. These sites have been considered in the draft ETS.</p>
<p>We foresee a significant number of challenges due to the absence of sufficient detail available with this consultation. The TS proposes that in addition to contributions sought for core package measures within defined quadrants, a proportional financial contribution will also be sought towards town centre core package measures. For the purposes of this strategy, the identified town centre boundary has been changed from that of the LDP, and there are a substantial number of core package measures sought for the town centre. However, there is no information provided on how these measures are to be delivered and how the town centre core package payments are to be allocated on a 'proportional' basis.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	D, DO	<p>Comment relating to developer obligations and funding noted. The initial business case for key infrastructure proposals is positive, and each package of interventions would only proceed with a positive business case.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>What level of contribution will be sought from developments in the NE/NW quadrant to fund these town centre proposals considering they will utilise the junctions/railway crossing less than developments in the SE/SW quadrant? We see no justifications set out in the TS. We are unclear as to what is considered a 'proportionate' payment for these town centre core package measures. We would seek further clarification from the Council on their definition of what is considered proportional within the TS. We have concerns about how a 'proportional' contribution has been determined, and that this has not been defined at this stage. We question how this approach will meet the tests of Circular 3/2012 as no evidence of proportionality and direct impact has been provided. The Council have stated that the total cost of the identified core package measures will be £30m and have stated that £30m is already included in the capital programme. It is expected that development industry pay £15m of this, with the other £15m being provided by the Council. Can the Council fund their required £15m share? It has also been suggested that the Council may deliver these core package measures up front and then seek retrospective payments from the development sites which have been identified as having an impact on this measure. We would question if the Council has the funding or has identified a value for money process in which to deliver these core package measures up front. Furthermore, we have serious concerns regarding the legitimacy of relying on future S75 agreements to pay for these works. We do not consider that this would meet the tests of Circular 3/2012, which states that S75 payments are required to mitigate the impact of development. We would welcome the Council's view on how they foresee the legal agreement being set out and agreed. In the event that core package measures are delivered by the Council and payment sought retrospectively from developments that are deemed to have an impact, how will this payment be calculated? If a planning application is submitted 3 years after the delivery of the road improvement, how will the supporting TA deal with that particular road improvement in its assessment? By the time an application is submitted, the traffic movement in respect of that site would have changed as a result of the road improvement being delivered by the Council, therefore the method of calculating the impact and ultimately the required payment is unclear. Over the lifetime of the strategy (i.e. up to 2030) the traffic movements in Elgin will change. Has this been considered in the TS? Will the impact that a site may have on the road network be calculated now, or at the time of an application by which point the traffic movements may of changes substantially? Assuming the Council are to undertake the works, how would these improvements be delivered? First come first served? There is no identified prioritisation of the proposals to be delivered, therefore it is unclear what works are proposed to be undertaken first. The scenario could arise whereby core package measures in respect of sites are not delivered for years, despite a contribution having been paid.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	<p>D, DO</p>	<p>The package of measures has been developed to accommodate additional demand for travel associated with developments within the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>The existing Developer Obligations supplementary guidance contains outline information regarding the consideration of the cumulative impact of developments on transport infrastructure. The measures within the Core package seek to address the cumulative impact of development.</p> <p>The Developer Obligations Supplementary Guidance annual review will come to Planning &amp; Regulatory Services Committee in August 2017 and it is planned to incorporate the draft Elgin Transport Strategy and a detailed methodology for calculating transport related Developer Obligations within this review.</p> <p>The draft ETS will be reviewed as part of the development plan process. The Moray Local Development Plan 2015 already includes LONG designations which provide housing up to 2045. These sites have been considered in the draft ETS.</p>

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>The concern would be if this may then threaten the deliverability of development sites until such times that these improvements are undertaken.</p> <p>The proposed TS identifies the required works to be undertaken in respect of allocated sites and sites as yet unidentified to 2030. If the proposed works are not paid for in full by the end of 2030, where are the additional funds required to pay back the Council for undertaking the works going to come from? Is any shortfall in infrastructure project investment occurring pre-2030 to be paid for by post-2030 development projects? Additionally, we understand that alternative funding streams are being pursued in order to deliver these core package measures. Should these funding streams be made available, how is this going to impact the contributions sought from developers? Has this been considered in the calculations at this stage? Will there be a system in place for refunds if developers have made a payment towards a particular core package measure which then benefits from an alternative funding stream. The cost of the identified core package measures are identified as ‘preliminary’ in the Jacobs report. It therefore seems premature to be seeking funding contributions in respect of this TS at this stage. How can preliminary costs allow for accurate calculation of the funds to be sought from each development? Will this figure increase with inflation? How have the calculations sought been informed if the final costs are unknown? This creates a risk of failing to raise the required funding, or conversely an over payment of the required contribution. We note that 240 windfall units have been included in calculations. This seems low considering large unallocated sites may come forward and existing allocated sites may increase their zoned capacity. This risks the situation of a windfall site coming through before 2030 and the Council having no basis for seeking payment as the 240 ‘allocation’ has been used up. Therefore, sites may benefit from road improvements while providing no payments. Considering there are already potential windfall sites emerging (such as the residential element of 8ha identified in the Barmuckity Business Park Framework) 240 units seems very low. There is expected to be two further LDPs delivered before 2030. Are new sites identified through these LDP’s going to be required to contribute to the core package measures? How will this impact on already agreed S75 payments? It appears that sites which are progressed earlier will be penalised by higher payment contributions. RHL have serious concerns regarding the viability of development proposals based upon the perceived implications of this TS. In response to the Development Obligations Supplementary Guidance in 2016, a Valuation Report was prepared in November 2015, commissioned by the Council and prepared by a District Valuer (DV).</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	<p>D, DO</p>	<p><b>See response above</b></p>

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>This report concluded that ‘developer obligations of around £6,000 per unit appears reasonable’. In response to this DV calculation, RHL’s response to the Developer Obligation SG included commentary that this £6,000 per unit figure should be considered a ‘tipping point’ for the viability of a site. It is now proposed to almost double the amount sought within just a year of this Developer Obligations SG being adopted. Discussions with the Transportation team suggest they would seek £5.5k (based on £15m sought from developers to pay for the core package measures, across 2,700 units allocated in the LDP that are required to contribute) per unit from the developments identified in the LDP towards the Transport Strategy alone. This payment is required before any additional contributions are agreed for site specific technical works. In addition, Moray Council’s SG identifies specific payments are required for education, healthcare, sports facilities, waste, environmental and access improvements in addition to this TS contribution. Furthermore, there is a requirement to deliver 10% on site accessible housing in addition to 25% affordable housing contribution. These cumulative contributions need to be considered in full by the Council, rather than seeking three tiers of contributions in relation to different services requirements. All contributions sought need to be considered together to ensure that the overall financial contribution is proportionate and acceptable, and, most importantly that they will not threaten the viability of new development. RHL has concerns regarding the speed at which this strategy is being implemented and used by the Council. We do not feel that sufficient information has been provided to allow a comprehensive assessment to be made, and the timing of the deadline (16th February) for responses and the Full Council meeting (29th March) to discuss this strategy seems rushed. It has been suggested that the TS has already been approved by Council, through the adoption of the Developer Obligations SG. The adopted SG does not include any of the detail of this TS. We question how the Council can therefore suggest that this approach has been agreed. There remains a significant level of information that has not yet been made public that will be required to be reviewed to provide a complete response: - The Council have stated that calculations are to be informed by a spreadsheet tool. However, this has not yet been made available. While we appreciate that sensitive information may be identified in this tool, we would at least expect a hypothetical calculation example to be made available. - The Committee Report dated 7th December (Transport Strategy for Elgin) states that a Business Case is still to be undertaken. We need to see sight of this information in order to make a meaningful response and we fail to see how this guidance can be adopted without the opportunity to comment on the content of this business case. If it is proposed that developers contribute 50% of the required funding for these works, surely it is reasonable to expect to review/comment on the business case that informs the improvements sought.</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	D, DO	See response above

**Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire**

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>- From discussions with the Transportation team, a detailed technical note is to be issued in respect of the trip rate calculations to be used to inform the payments to be sought. This has not been made available to date. This information needs to be provided in order that detailed, considered assessment can be made by developers and landowners. This information has not been made available since the publication of the Draft TS, and is only being issued following a request by RHL. We are concerned that this information is still not available for review. We assume that there be a further iteration of the TS (and all supporting information) issued for consultation before it is adopted? We consider that there should be further opportunity for comment once the final details in respect of the outstanding information are made available. As we have advised, if the development industry is being requested to pay £15m of this contribution, there needs to be the opportunity for meaningful dialogue and input into 'workable' guidance to ensure that the delivery of development sites does not stall. Consistency and transparency are required at early stage to inform the consideration of sites and provide a clear and realistic calculation of likely financial contributions to be sought. Given the experiences of other Council's (i.e. Strategic Transport Fund in Aberdeen City and Shire) when promoting similar cumulative transport measures, we suggest that a transparent and inclusive process should be followed. Ultimately, a court decision has ruled that the STF process is not lawful in seeking payments for transport improvements which are not directly impacted as a result of proposed developments. However, we consider that Moray Council is following a similar process. There is still a substantial level of information not available and the Council are progressing on the basis of this TS forming a material consideration in the determination of applications before there has been the opportunity to fully consider the outcomes. We would be grateful for clarity from the Council regarding how the implementation of financial agreements be set? If contributions are to be sought through legal agreements for each site, how will this reflect estimations of future phases and how will flexibility be embedded to allow legal agreements to be quickly and easily changed if required? Council is suggesting that this strategy will be 'constantly evolving'. This will not work in practice when legal agreements are signed. We request further clarity from the Council on how 'trigger points' for payments will be identified for large, phased sites. We assume that the total payment towards the TS will not be required up front, however there is no guidance provided on how large, phased sites will provide payments. It is not clear how this strategy will relate to the planning process. The consultation process has been undertaken by the Transportation team, however this strategy clearly has implications for the planning process. Is this strategy to form separate supplementary guidance, and therefore will there be a further consultation process to be followed? Alternatively, is it proposed that the existing Developer Obligations SG to be updated to reflect the final strategy?</p> <p><b>Continued below</b></p>	<p>D, DO</p>	<p><b>See response above</b></p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
As stated in our response to the Developer Obligations SG in 2016, the fragmented approach being taken by Moray Council towards developer obligations, makes it difficult for developers and communities to determine the certainty of contributions from an early stage. There needs to be more certainty to allow for an overall assessment to be made. Consistency and transparency are required at early stage and a clear method to calculate the likely financial contributions to be sought are fundamental to informing the consideration of sites and their viability. We would therefore welcome the opportunity to discuss this further with the Council and would request they provide a clear indication of the strategy of how this TS is to be implemented through the planning process.	D, DO	See response above
Funding will be the big challenge!	F	Comment noted.
Will there be further consultation following any changes to the document?	NA	Yes, if Council members instruct officers to undertake further consultation.
Remove some of the existing barriers of closed off streets and review short term parking close to the shops for local residents in the high street or south street with restricted max 1 hour parking to increase business in the main street again. Elgin is like a ghost town compared to what it was and much of that is down to the crazy transport decisions made over the last few years which this plan will compound further if not considered along with removals.	NA	Comment noted. The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.
Surely development should only be allowed if the existing infrastructure can cope with it, not massaged in an attempt to accommodate 2,700 extra homes. Even with a bypass there remain roads over capacity with the 2030 core package. Would it not first be useful to know though whether any potential bypass is to be routed north or south of the town before initiating local interventions?	P, BP	Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.
Less roundabouts and more manageable transport links	S	Comment of support noted.
Junction of Lossiemouth Road and South Lesmurdie Road is dangerous - had RTA here 1/2. This needs to be reviewed.	I	Comment noted and has been passed to Traffic team.
I think that there should	NA	Noted.
Good first draft	S	Comment of support noted.
Nope. None at all.	NA	Noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>This strategy doesn't mention roads which are currently used as 'rat runs' to avoid queuing traffic in Elgin. Institution Road - should be 20mph all the time, with sleeping policeman, to ensure the safe passage of children to and from school. Seafield Street / Duff Avenue the same - and made one way due to all the workers who park here all day for free, the residents can barely drive to their own homes only to find car upon car parked outside. To this end, you will not stop people driving from Thornhill to the centre of town if someone has a child to pick up from school, they will not leave 10 minutes earlier to walk there from the town centre if they can park the car for free all day and drive to do pickups and so on.</p>	I	<p>Measures to discourage the use of local streets in the area mentioned by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of Option I1B.</p> <p>Comment relating to on-street parking noted. The parking strategy for Elgin will be considered as part of the committee approval process.</p>
nope	NA	Noted.
<p>Traffic light controlled pedestrian crossings on A96 should be avoid. I think these are the main contributory to traffic congestion particularly on Alexandra Road.</p>	OP	<p>Comment noted. The A96 Alexandra Road has been identified as a barrier to movement. Crossing provisions for pedestrian and cyclists are required on pedestrian/cycle desire lines.</p>
<p>A plan, a vision is needed. Regardless of whether one agrees with every element of what the strategy contains, its clear. To gain something, some of us must accept we have to give a little.</p>	S	Comment of support noted.
<p>Everything should wait and be determined from where the A96 is being routed. Current and future transport movements will be influenced by this route and the strategy being planned now may be wasteful by the redirected traffic of the A96 movements.</p>	BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>
<p>Build a Bypass would solve all issues in Elgin Town, it would have a greater cost but would be a positive move for the future.</p>	BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>
<p>The strategy has lots of small improvements which are fantastic for cyclists. You should be bold with ideas and while I appreciate that money is a constraint, if you think of a joined up approach with all strands - cycle, pub transport and vehicles it will benefit everyone rather than only one group at a time.</p>	S	Comment of support noted.
A good piece of work.	S	Comment of support noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
Remove pedestrian crossings on A96 which would stop a lot of the delays and speed up traffic flow	OP	The A96 Alexandra Road has been identified as a barrier to movement. Crossing provisions for pedestrian and cyclists are required on pedestrian/cycle desire lines.
I have concerns about the Maisondieu Rd development, the increased traffic in Seafield Crescent, Maisondieu Place and Seafield Street due to rat running. Increased noise in a quiet residential area. Risks to children, the elderly and vulnerable adult due to route which passes or is close to 2 Primary schools, 2 nursing homes and an Adult Centre. Seafield Street is used for daytime workers parking, where will they park? A retail park should be developed in the Bishopmill/Lossie area to take traffic pressure off the centre of town and Edgar Road area.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Measures to discourage the use of local streets in the area mentioned by through traffic would be considered as part of the development of Option I1B.
With the Council's budget cuts it seems unlikely that the short term (by 2018) can be achieved. Can the number of pedestrian crossings be justified and how will that cut journey times? what sort of numbers are using the locations proposed? There are other locations I would have thought required crossings like Main Street New Elgin, New Elgin Road, Glen Moray Drive and Birnie Road, given the levels of traffic and they have no facilities like Thornhill Road which has been identified. and has similar traffic flows.	F, I	Comments relating to provision of additional crossing noted. The draft ETS does not preclude the provision of pedestrian islands or pedestrian crossing at individual locations within Elgin.
Edgar Road clearly needs a redesign not just zebra crossings. The access / egress from the retail parks are poor with significant queues. Bring back Wittet Drive.	SP, SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.
Leave Moss Street as it is because at the bottom of the street this is where The Laichmoray Hotel gets their deliveries of beer, spirits etc delivered. There is a Royal Mail post box at the Sam location. Why not make Reidhaven Street and South Guildry Street one way.	OP, I	Comment noted. Partial one-way on Moss Street would require provision of a turning facility. Access to Moss Street for deliveries would still be possible. Suggestion relating to one-way for other streets in the Moss Street area noted.
Tesco roundabout could be altered to make it safer by having only 2 lanes from Alexander Road - one to High St and one for Haugh Rd & Tesco. I have seen many near misses in the section from Tesco roundabout to High St roundabout with people in wrong lanes. Very difficult for visitors. Water always seems to gather at drop kerbs only so wheelchair users are forced to get wheels wet and thus gloves/hands when pushing. Surely this should be able to be sorted e.g. crossing of Moray Street near top of Reidhaven St and Culbard Street.	I	Suggested junction improvements noted.  Comments relating to existing road infrastructure have been passed to Roads Maintenance.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
1.) Provide a cycle/pedestrian bridge west of the railway station over the railway line. 2.) Ban parents from delivering/collecting pupils from primary schools. Their cars block access and congest the roads.	I	Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.
The Smarter Choices, Smarter Places (SCSP) Programme is Paths for All's grant scheme to support behaviour change initiatives to increase active and sustainable travel. Moray Council have received grants through this programme and we would hope to support suitable work in future.	S	Comment in support noted.
Need to stop parents delivering /collecting kids to West End Primary by car - their parking blocks accesses and creates a hazard	S	Options I2J and M4D which seek to improve congestion around schools.
Central transport hub rail, bus and taxi. All located close to the Rail Station.	I	Comment noted. The relocation of the bus station was not taken forward as a proposal as the key destination for most users of bus services is the town centre.
So disappointed in the new road proposal. It is not suitable for buses and HGVs. On the other proposals I think many are worthwhile though some need more work thought and consultation with potential users.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Buses and heavy goods vehicles already utilise the Ashgrove Bridge.
The proposed rail crossing at the Ashgrove area was first thought about twenty years ago, so nothing new there, it was rejected then and begs the question, where does the traffic go once it has crossed the bridge, Answer, into already crowd streets and roundabouts. Greater imagination should be used instead of churning out previous failed routes.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Option I1B provides an alternative route for traffic which would use the A941 New Elgin Road railway crossing. Traffic using either the existing or proposed rail crossing would continue to travel via Maisondieu Road, Station Road or Moss Street.
I feel that not enough effort was made to inform the public of the proposals. Many people I talk to know nothing about them. A public meeting would be good where we could have things explained by area in plain English and with a question and answer session where we could find out peoples concerns and how people would be affected. I did attend display in Bishopmill School but found much more information online but it is difficult for public to understand. More consultation is required before any decisions are taken.	A	Comment relating to communication of proposals noted. Articles in the local press and social media posts have been used to raise awareness of the consultation.



## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
I appreciate that the plan is really for Elgin but residents of Elgin make regular trips to Aberdeen and Inverness particularly the airports. Public transport provision to the airports is woefully inadequate.	NA	Comment noted.
why is there no improvements to A96 / Morrison road , people from the north of elgin will come through elgin rather than try to get out at the Jct . there are no improvements to wards road / the ward jct would there be the same or more if you are upgrading the edgar road jct	I	Option I3I is a development specific scheme for the A96/Morrison Road junction which would be taken forward as part of the development on Site BPOPP in the Moray Local Development Plan. Comment relating to no improvement at Wards Road/The Wards noted.
It comes across as hastily pulled together for short term purposes like considering planning applications rather than a coherent strategy in itself. There are no decent cycling facilities on orbital routes and railway and A96 crossings appear weak. However this might improve once more information is available on junction improvements.	P	Comment noted. Draft ETS has been developed to keep Elgin moving, taking into consideration development in the Moray Local Development Plan and would be used to inform the development of the next Local Development Plan.
no	NA	Noted.
Have you checked who actually owns the end of the gardens at Ashgrove Cottages. I think you will find our title deeds show an area owned by the railway is rather large from No5 upwards but at the Gleaner Oil side it tapers to a very small strip. Nos' 4 to Nos 1 tapering down to next to nothing. To get a bridge & road wide enough without compulsory purchase would be hugely difficult & very expensive	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Design of this option would consider any third party land requirements.
As a resident of Ashgrove Cottages we already have heavy traffic passing on Ashgrove Road in addition to the trains . This would mean much more traffic passing at the foot of our properties. The old Ashgrove Bridge cannot sustain a heavier flow of lorries etc.	OP	Objection to Option I1B noted. Design of this option would consider any improvement required to existing infrastructure.
Not at this time.	NA	Noted.
The proposed transport strategy is totally unbalanced by the exclusion of the western relief road including the building of a new railway bridge at the west end. Any strategy which excludes the west end is fatally flawed.	SR	Comment relating to north-south movements in western part of Elgin noted.

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

Comment	Type of Comment	Response
<p>1) I would have thought that rather than another "makeover" of the existing bus station it should be relocated to a point adjacent to the railway station - to allow interconnectivity of transport modes (hub). Also they could both benefit from shared/increased parking capacity. Also that would reduce traffic on the currently overloaded section of Alexandra Road. For the Long Term Plan. 2) - Given 1 above, you could run a constant small shuttle bus (free?) between the town centre and bus station. Possibly even picking up from the pedestrianized area in front of St. Giles Shopping Centre. 3) - Increase bus network coverage and reduce traffic congestion within Elgin city, by using smaller buses. Also more versatile. Obviously larger coaches would still be required on certain routes. 4) The Strategy places far too much weight on cycling. A 10% increase on cars could serve hundreds of people, but a 10% increase in cyclists could be achieved by adding only 1 or 2 bike journeys. I think it is obvious which one the Council should invest in, if you want 'real return'.</p>	I	<p>Comment noted. The relocation of the bus station was not taken forward as a proposal as the key destination for most users of bus services is the town centre.</p>
<p>We need a bypass.</p>	BP	<p>Delivery of a bypass for Elgin is expected as part of the A96 dualling, which is a Transport Scotland project.</p>
<p>lack of space in the boxes above for comments</p>	NA	<p>Note: this response was on a paper copy of the survey. Additional comments were provided on a separate attached sheets.</p>
<p>The main concerns we have are above, overall we support easing congestion at the major snagging points. Refurbishing the bus station would certainly support the idea of encouraging people to use public transport. At the moment it is fairly unpleasant place and quite threatening/uncomfortable in the evening. Our major concern and the area we know there would be resistance to is the proposals for South Street, Batchen &amp; Commerce Street. The changes to Batchen Street have had a detrimental impact on the trade of that street and passing trade (even in a vehicle) does allow businesses to promote their services and stock.</p>	S, OP	<p>Comments relating to Option I2E noted any design would take into consideration the access requirements for local businesses/residents.</p>
<p>No</p>	NA	<p>Noted.</p>

## Annex B – Draft Elgin Transport Strategy Free Text Responses to Questionnaire

### Key for Types of Comment

<b>A</b>	Lack of public awareness of ETS
<b>BP</b>	A96 dualling/bypass
<b>D</b>	Lack of detail on proposals
<b>DO</b>	Developer obligation comment from house builder or agent
<b>F</b>	Financial constraints to delivery of ETS
<b>I</b>	Idea for additional scheme in ETS
<b>NA</b>	Not Applicable
<b>O</b>	Objection to ETS
<b>OP</b>	Objection to specific proposal in ETS
<b>P</b>	Planning related comment
<b>PB</b>	Public behavior/opinion
<b>S</b>	Supports ETS
<b>SP</b>	Support for a specific proposal in ETS
<b>SR</b>	Support for crossing of railway in another location
<b>T</b>	Timescales