

Roddinglaw Road
Proposed Closure of Roddinglaw Road and alternative route proposal

Feedback on questions received by tie

1. My questionnaire arrived late. Why did this happen?

The letter and questionnaire were intended to be with the respondents by Monday 24th October. However due to a problem with Royal Mail the letters were not delivered until later in the week. This was outwith our control, and unfortunately did not allow as much time as we would have liked for respondents to attend the drop in day on the 27th October.

2. I did not receive a questionnaire. Why did this happen?

Progressive purchased a list of names and addresses from a company with the census data in order to distribute the questionnaire to as many people in the local area as possible. According to the 2001 census there are 2,962 households in the postal areas EH28 and EH12 9. Due to the 'opt out' clause now included in the census it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to obtain a list of all residents in any given area. Progressive sent out a questionnaire to 2,320 of these households (78%). We can only assume therefore that 22% of the target population 'opted out' of receiving any additional information via the census at the time of filling in the census.

3. Could a Level Crossing be provided to allow the railway to be crossed?

Three railway lines at varying levels carrying high speed services would need to be crossed by cars and pedestrians using a level crossing at this location. Thus, a safety assessment of this option would rule it out as a safer alternative exists in the form of an alternative road keeping the general public and trains apart.

4. Have you considered the impact on Emergency services using the existing Roddinglaw Road?

The various emergency services have been consulted on the details of a scheme, and although there is an increase in journey times with the current proposal of the westerly bypass of Roddinglaw Road, there have been no concerns raised by any of the emergency services in our discussions to date.

5. Why is a bridge needed for SASA? And why can this not be used by the general public?

The EARL rail alignment will sever existing Scottish Agricultural Science Agency (SASA) land. The bridge is required to provide a new access to enter SASA land.

The bridge will not be designed to compliant standards for public use as this would require more land and a significantly larger bridge structure over EARL (approximately 9.5 m in height from existing road level) to replace the existing Roddinglaw Bridge.

6. Why is the EARL railway South Chord needed?

The 2003 Sinclair Knight Mertz report recognised that to achieve the linking of the Fife lines with the E&G lines through the Airport Station, additional operational flexibility and track capacity would be required. They considered that 4-tracking the section from Saughton to Edinburgh Park would achieve this. In developing the design, tie looked at this option, but rejected it because it would have involved the compulsory purchase and demolition of private houses, plus severe disruption of the City Bypass during construction. The South Chord provides the required additional capacity and flexibility at a much lower cost both financially and in terms of disruption to the local community.