

# Motions and Amendments

## Transport and Environment Committee

10.00 am Thursday, 18th August, 2022

Virtual Meeting - Microsoft Teams

### Motions and Amendments

---

#### Contacts

Email: [martin.scott@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:martin.scott@edinburgh.gov.uk) / [taylor.ward@edinburgh.gov.uk](mailto:taylor.ward@edinburgh.gov.uk)

#### Nick Smith

Service Director, Legal and Assurance

This page is intentionally left blank

## Addendum by the SNP Group

### Transport and Environment Committee

18 August 2022

#### Item 6.1 – Business Bulletin

Committee:

Notes the update – Short, Medium and Long Term Improvements at Portobello High Street/Inchview Terrace/Sir Harry Lauder Road Junction;

Recognises the importance of these changes given the tragic fatalities at this junction;

Therefore agrees to receive an update report on the medium and long term improvements in two cycles, to allow early scrutiny of the proposed plans to ensure that delivery of these improvements is on time and prioritised as much as council resources will allow.

Moved by Councillor Danny Aston

Seconded by Councillor

# Addendum by the Administration

## Transport and Environment Committee

18<sup>th</sup> August 2022

### Item 7.1 - Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2022/23

1.1.5 Notes that Green Person Authority (GPA) Pedestrian Crossings remain in the “green man” state until a vehicle approaches, and that these are suitable on routes where there are less than 7000 vehicles per day. Notes that GPAs have been trialled in London with some success. Agrees therefore that the relevant officers will meet with Living Streets Edinburgh and the Edinburgh Access Panel to discuss introducing these signal types in Edinburgh. Agrees that if implementation is feasible, all future new, upgraded and replacement crossing should be considered for GPA status.

Moved by: Cllr Scott Arthur

Seconded by: Cllr Lezley Marion Cameron

# Addendum by the Liberal Democrat Group

**Transport & Environment Committee**

**18 August 2022**

**Item 7.1 - Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2022/23**

Add;

1.1.4 notes the intention to apply for up to £830,000 from the Scottish Government's new Road Safety Improvement Fund, and agrees that the outcome of this funding application and its impact on the delivery of the prioritisation plan should be reported to committee through a future business bulletin.

**Moved by Cllr Dijkstra-Downie**

**Seconded by Cllr Kevin Lang**

# Addendum by the Conservative Group

## Committee - Transport and Environment

18.08.22

### Item 7.1 - Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2022/2023

Committee adds the following;

1.1.4 Notes that a Pedestrian crossing on its own is unlikely to solve the overall problem with all types of road traffic collisions at the Dalmahoy junction.

1.1.5 Notes that road traffic collisions continue to occur at regular intervals at this location.

1.1.6 Notes that the last estimate for the introduction of a fully signalised junction of £962,000, is significantly greater than the funding package of £455,000 approved by this committee in March 2017. And further notes that alternative road safety measures proposed in the officer recommendation and costed at £625,000 also significantly exceeded the previously approved funding package.

1.1.7 Notes that a fully signalised junction is the preferred option of local residents, the Ratho & District Community Council and ward councillors.

1.1.8 Notes that only a fully signalised junction will deal with all the safety aspects of this junction.

1.1.9 Therefore, agrees to halt the current plan of a pedestrian crossing at Dalmahoy Junction and report back to committee in one cycle with up-to-date costs for a fully signalised junction with a view to implement as such.

**Moved by: Councillor Marie-Clair Munro**

**Seconded by: Cllr Stephen Jenkinson**

# Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August 2022

### Item 7.3 - Transport Infrastructure Investment – Capital Delivery Priorities for 2022/23

Delete 1.1.2 and insert;

1.1.2 Note those schemes listed in appendix 2 which have already been delivered since the start of the financial year, and approves the remaining programme of works.

Add;

1.1.3 recognises the impact which this year's election had on the timing of this report and notes that future reports on capital delivery priorities will be tabled in March/April each year for committee approval.

1.1.4 notes with concern paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 which confirm there are currently insufficient funds to maintain Edinburgh's roads in their current condition and agrees that officers should prepare a members' briefing on what additional funding would be required to a) maintain and b) improve the overall condition of the carriageway network during this council term.

**Moved by**      **Cllr Kevin Lang**

**Seconded by**   **Cllr Dijkstra-Downie**

# Amendment by the Green Group

## Transport and Environment Committee

18 August 2022

### Item 7.4 – Delivering Scotland’s Circular Economy – Consultation responses

Amends recommendation 1.1.

Transport and Environment Committee is asked to approve the consultation responses proposed in this paper for submission to Scottish Government in advance of the consultation closing date on 22 August 2022 with the following changes to the responses:

4.1.4 The Council conditionally supports proposals that Scottish Ministers should have powers to place additional requirements on local authorities in order to increase rates and quality of household recycling, provided Scottish Ministers agree to

- take account of constraints on what authorities could reasonably be expected to achieve,
- give more powers to local authorities to incentivise household recycling, and
- make available further funding to support the implementation of these powers.

4.1.5 Similarly, the Council supports proposals that Scottish Ministers should have the power to set statutory recycling targets for local authorities or to introduce financial incentives or penalties related to these targets under the conditions named above.

4.1.6 The Council is supportive of proposals for local authorities to have more powers to enforce recycling requirements. To ensure effectiveness, Scottish Ministers should ensure powers are suited to the nature of the city’s housing stock.

**Moved by:** Cllr Jule Bandel

**Seconded by:** Cllr Claire Miller

**Amends the following responses to the consultation ‘Delivering Scotland’s Circular Economy: A Consultation on Proposals for a Circular Economy Bill’ (Appendix 1):**

**Question 4 - Do you have any comments in relation to proposals to set statutory targets?**

“Having a strong progress monitoring framework is an important part of strategy development can in principle send a signal of the seriousness of the government intent and influence decision-making on a continuing basis. However, caution is required to ensure that targets do not bring unwanted consequences from limiting local discretion and innovation. Setting statutory targets can, for instance, carry a risk of narrowing the focus of policy delivery to a degree that discourages other actions complementary to the overarching aims of the strategy. Any target setting process should include ongoing and meaningful engagement with stakeholders and local authority partners to ensure that the local bodies retain the discretion needed to respond effectively to local circumstances and opportunities. Beyond these general comments, it’s not possible to give a specific view on this without more information on what the targets are, and what “statutory” means in practice as performance versus a target can be influenced by external factors outwith the control of the stakeholders charged with delivering them. Any statutory targets such as recycling rates as additional requirements on local government should take account of what authorities can reasonably expected to achieve. Further discussion on this point is provided later in this submission.”

**Question 17 - The previous consultation showed broad support for the proposal that Scottish Ministers should have powers to place additional requirements on local authorities in order to increase rates and quality of household recycling. Is there any new context or evidence that should be taken into account in relation to the proposal?**

“Local authorities already seek to improve recycling rates by:

- redesigning collection services to encourage householders to prioritise recycling (e.g. by reducing the collection frequency and size of bins for non-recyclable waste);
- maximising the provision of recycling services, which are capable of collecting approximately 70% of household waste;
- engaging and educating residents.

With the exception of 2020, when there were widespread service disruptions due to the pandemic, local authorities have collectively been able to maintain and expand their service provision in this area despite increasingly challenging financial settlements and significant pressure on demand for other Council services such as social care and homelessness. While waste is produced by households, we do accept that local authorities should continue to find new ways to compel citizens to reduce their waste and make full use of recycling services. However, this would require further funding and additional powers tailored to the nature of Edinburgh’s waste system (see Q23).”

**Question 20 - Do you agree that Scottish Ministers should have the power to introduce statutory recycling targets for local authorities?**

“Yes [x]

No

Neither agree or disagree

**Question 21 - If you agree with Q.20, do you agree that Scottish Ministers should have the power to introduce and set financial incentives for local authorities to meet these targets, or penalties should these targets not be met?**

“Yes

No

Neither agree or disagree

**Question 22 - Please explain your answer.**

“The current system specifies the services which the local authority must provide within, most recently, the Waste (Scotland) Regulations 2012. The range of materials already collected is extremely comprehensive and covers around 70% of routine household waste, which will increase further as a result of the extended producer responsibility legislation for packaging (e.g. to encompass plastic films) and the Waste (Framework) Directive.

Local authorities already seek to improve recycling rates by:

- redesigning collection services to encourage householders to prioritise recycling (e.g. by reducing the collection frequency and size of bins for nonrecyclable waste);
- maximising the provision of recycling services, which are capable of collecting approximately 70% of household waste;
- engaging and educating residents.

With the exception of 2020, when there were widespread service disruptions due to the pandemic, local authorities have collectively been able to maintain and expand their service provision in this area despite increasingly challenging financial settlements and significant pressure on demand for other Council services such as social care.

While waste is produced by households, we accept that local authorities should continue to find new ways to compel citizens to reduce their waste and make full use of recycling services. However, we caution that current powers to increase recycling rates are limited. To be able to meet statutory recycling targets, local authorities would require further funding and additional powers tailored to the nature of their waste system. Edinburgh faces particular challenges in improving recycling rates due to the high number of households using communal bins necessitated by the city’s housing stock. Any statutory recycling targets should take account of such constraints on what authorities could reasonably be expected to achieve.

With regard to the example of Wales provided in the discussion paper, there are differences in the methodology for calculating recycling rates in different administrations. We believe that the Welsh rates in fact include (and are inflated by) incinerator bottom ash, which is not the case in Scotland.

In addition, our understanding would be that even in the main cities, the percentage of people in Wales who live in flats (and so use communal collection systems, or might have limited outdoor storage space) is much lower, certainly than in Edinburgh where it is almost 50% of households.”

**Question 25 - Please add any additional comments.**

“There are good arguments in favour of more local powers to enforce recycling requirements. The decisions of individual residents to not use or to abuse waste and recycling services, for instance, do carry costs to the wider environment and to the city as a whole. In this respect recycling activity can be viewed as analogous to other environmental issues for which enforcement powers are already in place but arguably not strong enough.

It is possible that additional powers could be effective in improving recycling rates, but only with very clear guidance and within clear limitations. For instance:

- Abuse of recycling services should clearly focus on preventing deliberate contamination of recycling bins (by bags of rubbish, nappies, etc), not taking responsibility for waste receptacles (e.g. persistently leaving them on streets or abandoning them) and not penalise innocent errors (such as putting the wrong type of plastic in a recycling bin) – this would likely require revisions to s.46 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, as have existed in England and Wales for some time.
- Clear legal and judicial advice would be needed to ensure that any system of fixed penalties were enforced. This would also require cooperation from the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service (COPFS) to ensure that relevant action is taken in the courts where FPNs are not paid and evidential tests have been satisfied.
- Resourcing for any enforcement scheme should be in place ahead of implementation, both for local authority enforcement teams and for processing of FPNs.

While these powers may be useful in principle, it is important to note that any enforcement activity will likely have limited impact in a city such as Edinburgh in which:

- Approximately 50% of housing stock use communal collection systems where identification of individual households breaching recycling guidelines would be very challenging
- Even in areas where individual kerbside bins are provided, our evidence shows these are often shared, again raising challenges in identifying breaches
- In view of these constraints it is likely that any new powers would not be practically enforceable in more than 50% of Edinburgh housing stock.

Similarly if the Government is considering use of direct variable charging, again this is likely to be challenging to operate because of our high percentage of communal bin services, and because around half of those (i.e. around 25% of total households) have an on street communal collection system due to the historic design of the buildings. In these circumstances there is therefore no direct link between the producer of the waste, and the cost of disposing of it. Considering these challenges, we would welcome any powers suited to Edinburgh’s communal collection system.”

**Amends the following responses to the consultation ‘Delivering Scotland’s Circular Economy: A Route Map to 2025 and beyond’ (Appendix 2)**

**Question 5 - To what extent do you agree with the measures proposed in this package to improve recycling from households? Please provide evidence to support your answer if possible., subheading 'Additional requirements on local authorities and statutory targets':**

We agree with the principle that local authorities should strive to find new ways to compel citizens to reduce their waste and make full use of recycling services. However, to be able to meet statutory recycling targets, local authorities must be supported through further funding and additional powers tailored to the nature of their waste system.

As a city with a high number of households using communal bins, Edinburgh cannot be directly compared to Wales where even in the large cities the percentages of flatted properties/ communal collections are low. Any statutory targets placed on local authorities should take into account such constraints on what authorities could reasonably expected to achieve. We also note that in Wales the recycling performance is significantly inflated by the inclusion of incinerator bottom ash, which is not included in Scotland.

Local authorities already seek to improve recycling rates by:

- redesigning collection services to encourage householders to prioritise recycling (e.g. by reducing the collection frequency and size of bins for non-recyclable waste);
- maximising the provision of recycling services, which are capable of collecting approximately 70% of household waste;
- engaging and educating residents.

**Proposed by Cllr Bandel, seconded by Cllr Miller**

# Addendum by the Administration

## Transport and Environment Committee

18<sup>th</sup> August 2022

### Item 7.5 - Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order

1.1.5 Notes that despite the best efforts of the Council's parking enforcement team, a minority of drivers continue to indulge in anti-social parking and that this has a disproportionate impact on our capital. The Committee therefore asks that within one cycle a Review of Parking Policy is presented for consideration. This review should draw on best practice and ensure parking policy (including enforcement) supports the Council's wider policy agenda where possible.

1.1.6 Agrees that for enforcement to be effective, penalty charges for parking in breach of any prohibitions need to be set at an appropriate level, but these have not risen in Scotland since 2001. Therefore, supports the Convener writing to the Scottish Government Minister for Transport to ask that she acts on the 2021 "Penalty Charge Notices for Parking Enforcement Consultation" results and sets a higher Penalty Charge Notice, or allows the Council to do so.

Moved by: Cllr Scott Arthur

Seconded by: Cllr Lezley Marion Cameron

# Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August, 2022

### Item 7.5 - Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order

delete 1.1.2 and insert;

1.1.2 approves the setting aside of the remaining objections in the areas of Abbeyhill, Leith Walk and Pilrig, and Shandon; and approves the making of the advertised Order for these areas with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2.

1.1.3 agrees not to make the advertised Order in the areas of Leith and North Leith, and Gorgie and Gorgie North.

1.1.4 agrees that the process of monitoring and review within the Abbeyhill colonies, as promised on page 65 of the report, should involve public consultation not later than six months after the implementation of the new controlled parking restrictions; with a subsequent committee report on the consultation results and a recommendation on whether to retain this area within N6.

Retain and renumber original recommendations 1.1.3 - 1.1.5 accordingly.

**Moved by** Cllr Dijkstra-Downie

**Seconded by** Cllr Kevin Lang

# Amendment by the Conservative Group

## Committee - Transport and Environment

18<sup>th</sup> August 2022

### Item - 7.5 - Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order

Committee agrees to delete recommendations 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 and replace with:

1.1.1 Notes the results of the formal advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SRP), the detail of the objections received and in particular, the high level of objections received from residents for the areas covering Gorgie & Gorgie North (317 objections), Leith and North Leith (399 objections).

Recognises the results of the Consultation and engagement on proposed changes to the operation of parking controls around Edinburgh City Centre – Phase 1 by the Project Centre Consultation in January 2021 that reported only 25% of residents in Gorgie felt they faced issues of parking in the area, only 38% in Gorgie North, 39% in North Leith and 46% in Leith and that overall residents did not agree with controlled parking being implemented in these areas.

1.1.2 Approves the setting aside of the remaining objections in Abbeyhill, Leith Walk and Pilrig, Shandon and the existing parking area of Lockharton (B8) and approves the making of the advertised Order for these areas with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2;

Upholds the objections for Gorgie, Gorgie North, Leith and North Leith and, noting that residents oppose the proposals in these areas agrees to go no further with implementation and to monitor parking in these areas in future.

Committee further approves recommendations 1.13 - 1.1.5

**Moved by: Councillor Christopher Cowdy**

**Seconded by: Councillor Marie-Clair Munro**

# Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August, 2022

### Item 7.6 - Objections to TRO/21/16 and TRO/21/25 – Communal Bin Review Phase 3 (Zones N1 to N5 and Zones S1 to S4)

At end of 1.1.4, insert;

“with the exception of:

- N1-15 (Bellevue Road)
- N1-13 (Bellevue Road)
- N1-16 (Bellevue Road)
- N3 06 (Comely Bank Terrace)
- N3 07 (Comely Bank Terrace)
- N3 32 (Learmonth Gardens)
- N3 24 (Learmonth Avenue)
- N3 25 (Learmonth Avenue)
- S2-31 (Greenhill Terrace)”

Add;

1.1.5 agrees that officers should work with ward councillors to develop alternative sites for the excluded bin hubs listed in 1.1.4, with new orders progressed on a similar basis to those sites covered by 1.1.3.

**Moved by** Cllr Dijkstra-Downie

**Seconded by** Cllr Kevin Lang

# Amendment by the Conservative Group

## Transport and Environment Committee

18<sup>th</sup> August 2022

### Item - 7.6 Objections to TRO/21/16 and TRO/21/25 – Communal Bin Review Phase 3 (Zones N1 to N5 and Zones S1 to S4)

Delete the recommendations and replace with:

1.1 The Transport and Environment Committee:

1.1.1 Thanks residents for their responses.

1.1.2 Regrets that the previous Council Administration failed to improve recycling rates in Edinburgh and saw them worsen.

1.1.3 Expresses its disappointment in the severe lack consultation and information available to residents in advance of launching the TRO processes.

1.1.4 Acknowledges that poorly advertised and attended information stalls during the working day during a pandemic is insufficient for such a substantial change in service.

1.1.5 Notes that the Communal Bin Review has been halted within the World Heritage Site whilst an alternative option to improve recycling is trialled.

1.2 The Transport and Environment Committee therefore:

1.2.1 Agrees to not implement TRO/21/16 and TRO/21/25 until after the trial within the World Heritage Site has concluded and results can be analysed.

1.2.2 Agrees to then launch an extensive and thorough information, engagement, and consultation process with residents and Community Councils before any further action is taken in relation to the Communal Bin Review.

1.2.3 Agrees that an alternative option to bin hubs may have to be considered.

**Moved by: Councillor Max Mitchell**  
**Seconded by: Councillor Christopher Cowdy**

# Amendment by the Administration

## Transport and Environment Committee

18<sup>th</sup> August 2022

### Item 7.7 - Active Travel Measures - Travelling Safely Update

Replaces 1.1.3 with

Notes that the Travelling Safely Programme has difficult origins. Whilst many individual schemes have been well used throughout, significant public concerns remain regarding a minority of them. These concerns can range from individual issues people face regarding a specific scheme, to the fundamental opposition to the Travelling Safely Programme as a whole.

Notes that if Travelling Safely schemes are made permanent, many have the potential to contribute to Edinburgh's Net Zero and traffic reduction targets if well used.

Notes the delay in reopening the one-way section of Braid Road to two-way traffic and the uncertainty this in generating. Notes that there is no programme yet for progressing the Braid Road proposals and asks that one is circulated to Ward Councillors and TEC members by the 1<sup>st</sup> of September.

Agrees to an ongoing commitment to rapidly progress with the bus lane on Comiston Road (7am-7pm operation) agreed in November 2021 if services are again delayed.

Notes the uncertainty regarding the Quiet Corridor - Meadows / Greenbank route and welcomes the commitment from Officers for ongoing community engagement on the issue. Asks that the engagement takes the form of a community workshop (attended by residents and Ward 8 & 10 Councillors) on the issue, and this reports back via a Traveling Safely Update Report in 2 cycles. This should include consideration of a more clearly defined cycle route between Greenbank Crossroads and the Meadows, and how this interface with Comiston Road.

Notes the ongoing material concerns regarding Silverknowes Road and the impact on businesses and asks that a community workshop (attended by residents and Ward Councillors) is held on the issue and reports back via the Traveling Safely Update Report.

Notes the points made by Lothian Buses in 4.1.4 and asks that each is considered in the Traveling Safely Update Report, and that solutions are proposed where possible. This should also consider Waverly Bridge and Comiston Road.

Notes that several pedestrians and cyclists have sustained injuries which they blame on difficulty seeing lane defender bases in low light and at junction and asks that the Traveling

Safely Update Report considers this issue and proposes any mitigation measures which may be needed.

Approves all other recommendations in Appendix 2 to make ETROs for the proposed 18-month scheme trials.

**Moved by: Cllr Scott Arthur**

**Seconded by: Cllr Lezley Marion Cameron**

# Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August, 2022

### Item 7.7 - Active Travel Measures – Travelling Safely Update

In 1.1.3, after “trials”, insert

“with the exception of:

- a) **Braid Road**; where committee agrees to implement the arrangement described as Option 1 in the November 2021 committee report, with additional pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities, and measures to reduce speeding on both Braid Road and Hermitage Drive.
- b) **the Comiston Road and Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route schemes**; where officers are asked to work with ward councillors to further consider the improvements suggested by local residents during the recent consultation as well as the implications arising from implementing ‘Option 1’ on Braid Road, recognising that current measures will remain in place until such improvements are agreed.
- c) **Silverknowes Road North**; where committee requests that officers return with a more detailed report on options to reopen the road between the Silverknowes roundabout and the promenade, and installing segregated cycling infrastructure.
- d) **Silverknowes Road South**, where committee agrees not to proceed with the ETRO, to remove the existing scheme, and asks officers to return to committee with a report on options to upgrade the path between Silverknowes and Cramond Road South into a full cycle way, recognising this as a more pressing priority for improving cyclist safety in Silverknowes.

Moved by Cllr Kevin Lang

Seconded by Cllr Dijkstra-Downie

# Amendment by the Conservative Group

## Committee - Transport and Environment

18<sup>th</sup> August 2022

### Item - 7.7 - Active Travel Measures – Travelling Safely Update

Delete the recommendations and replace with:

Committee agrees to:

1.1.1 Note the project background and updates included in this report along with;

a) The responses to the Council's resident survey reported to Committee 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021 with the results of 17,600 residents where 56% of respondents to the Councils Consultation Hub strongly opposed schemes with protected cycle lanes but 65% strongly supporting school measures.

b) A petition against these "Spaces for People" measures reported to Committee 17<sup>th</sup> June 2021 that was published on [www.change.org](http://www.change.org) with 16,809 signatories.

1.1.2 Recognise that the promotion of the latest engagement relating to the proposed ETROs was wholly inadequate resulting in a very low response rate from residents (Appendix 1) so the results should be set aside.

1.1.3 Approve the recommendations in Appendix 2, relating to school measures, to make ETROs for the proposed 18-month scheme trials; and

1.1.4 Recognise that the promotion of the latest engagement relating to the proposed ETROs was wholly inadequate for stakeholders/lobby groups following the public engagement (Appendix 3) so the results should be set aside.

1.1.5 Considers that any measures that officers seek to adapt or partly implement that were previously Spaces for People schemes and do not have public support - should be ended at the conclusion of the TTRO timescale or before where possible, including:

Waverley Bridge, Victoria St, Cockburn St, Ferry Rd, Duddingston Road, Duddingston Rd West, Comiston Rd, Silverknowes, Lanark Rd, Longstone Corridor, A1 Milton Rd W, A1 Willowbrae, A1 London Rd Dalziel, A1 London Rd Hillside, Braidburn Terrace, Meadows to Greenbank Route (including Whitehouse Loan), Braid Rd

1.1.6 Agrees that where there is a consideration by officers that traffic changes should be brought forward in any of these areas these should be brought forward to Committee for consideration as individual schemes with a full permanent design, consulted on with the public

through a full Traffic Regulation Order process with an assessment of impact on the overall transport network and a full equalities impact assessment.

**Moved by: Councillor Marie-Clair Munro**  
**Seconded by: Councillor Christopher Cowdy**

# Amendment by the SNP Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August 2022

### Item 8.1 - Evaluation of the 20mph Speed Limit Roll Out – Three Years Post-Implementation

Committee:

Agrees with the report content relating to the benefits of lowered speed limits on the city-wide road network and is encouraged by the results in both safety on our streets and in the changes of behaviour and perceptions of safety that accompanied the implementation of the current 20 mph network.

Agrees to consider the following additional streets, respecting but possibly expanding on the criteria set out in the report, for inclusion in the proposed consultation. These suggestions come directly from ward councillors reflecting local concerns about speed and its impact on their local communities, as well as building towards an even more effective network of reduced risk and enhanced environment for both sustainable transport options and necessary vehicular traffic.

Seafield Road

Sir Harry Lauder Road

Portobello Road

Newcraighall Road

The Wisp

Colinton Road

Comiston Road

Stevenson Drive

Telford Road

Orchard Drive

Queensferry Rd from Dean Bridge to Hillhouse junction

Ferry Road from the roundabout at Silverknowes Road East/ Davidson Mains Main St until Arboretum Road

Granton Crescent

Waterfront Avenue

Salamander Street

Montgomery Street

London Road

Brunswick Road

Brunswick Street

McDonald Road

Gilmerton Road

Lasswade Road

**Moved by Councillor Lesley Macinnes**

**Seconded by Councillor Danny Aston**

# Addendum by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August, 2022

### Item 8.1 - Evaluation of the 20mph Speed Limit Roll Out – Three Years Post-Implementation

Add;

1.1.4 recognises the importance of targeted traffic calming measures in terms of controlling vehicle speeds in 20mph areas, and agrees the Road Safety Action Plan before committee in October 2022 should set out a clear prioritisation plan for the delivery of physical interventions to help address excessive speeding.

1.1.5 acknowledges the ongoing concern over current levels of enforcement by Police Scotland when it comes to local speed limits, and agrees that the Convener should write to the new Area Commander to raise this concern.

**Moved by** Cllr Dijkstra-Downie

**Seconded by** Cllr Kevin Lang

# Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August, 2022

### Item 9.1 - Motion by Councillor Macinnes - Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68

- At end of 1. add;  
“or continue these services on a significantly reduced schedule”.
- In 4. after “Gyle”, insert “, Newbridge”
- Delete 6 and insert;  
6. notes the historic under provision of bus services in the rural west of Edinburgh, including the absence of any services in either Ratho and Kirkliston from the Council owned bus company, recognises this drives private car usage and related congestion and pollution impacts for West and South West Edinburgh, a situation which would be made worse with the loss of these supported bus services.
- Delete 10 and insert;  
10. Commits to working to improve overall levels of public transport for West and South West Edinburgh during this term of the Council, and agrees that any transition to a new service provider for these supported services must be as seamless as possible.

**Moved by** Cllr Kevin Lang

**Seconded by** Cllr Dijkstra-Downie

# Addendum by the Green Group

## Transport and Environment Committee

18.08.22

### Item 9.1 - Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68

Insert additional paragraph 12 as follows

"12. Calls for this report to be combined with that agreed by Council on 30 June arising from motions and amendments at items 8.8 and 8.9, in order to join up consideration of the issues surrounding supported bus services and public transport provision. "

**Moved by: Councillor Miller**  
**Seconded by: Councillor Bandel**

# Amendment by the Conservative Group

## Transport and Environment Committee

18.08.22

### Item 9.1 - Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68

Committee replaces point 4 with the following:

“Notes that the 63 bus service provides vital cross links between Balerno, Currie, Heriot-Watt University, Hermiston, Edinburgh Park, Gyle, Kirkliston and South Queensferry to employment and shopping but especially to healthcare with the link to St John’s Hospital via Hermiston P&R.

Committee adds the following:

12. Notes that communities fought to have these vital services in place.

13. Requests that officers and Transport Convenor take part in a route review with a commitment by CEC to report back to committee in one cycle for the following requests to ensure that bus services are maintained including:

(a) a full review of the current usage of the 20 route

(b) a review of previous routes and consideration of alternative routes which would take the residents of Ratho directly to city centre

(c) consideration of a hopper bus running from Ratho to Ratho Station/Gyle connecting to Tram and Railway stations

(d) that the 63 and 68 bus services are continued in their present form to serve the passengers of their respected communities and that the residents of Ratho have a reliable and frequent bus service to the city of Edinburgh.

**Moved by: Councillor Marie-Clair Munro**

**Seconded by: Councillor Christopher Cowdy**

# Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

## Transport & Environment Committee

18 August, 2022

### Item 9.2 – Motion by Councillor Macinnes - Severe Climate Change Impact

Delete 4 and insert;

4. believes the new council business plan 2022-2027 must focus on delivering the 2030 Climate Strategy, including rapid reductions in carbon emissions and action to manage the effects of our changing climate.

Add;

5. believes our 2030 Net Zero Carbon Goals should sit at the centre of the committee's decision making during this term and therefore requests that officers introduce a new standing section to all future committee reports stating the linkage to the Climate Strategy.

**Moved by** Cllr Dijkstra-Downie

**Seconded by** Cllr Kevin Lang