

Motions and Amendments

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am Monday, 18th November, 2024

Dean of Guild Court Room - City Chambers

Motions and Amendments

Contacts

Email: natalie.carter@edinburgh.gov.uk / carolanne.eyre@edinburgh.gov.uk

Tel: 0131 529 4264

Nick Smith

Service Director, Legal and Assurance

This page is intentionally left blank

Amendment by the Administration

Transport & Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 7.2 Communal Bin Review Update

Replace 1.1.3 with:

“Approve the updated review framework to be used when reviewing existing bin hub locations and/or determining the design and location of proposed bin hubs with the following amendments to (Appendix 3):

In 4.a after “crossings” add “except where a one-way street or pavement build-out has resulted in a potential hub-site that is safe for residents and workers”

In 4.c.ii after “10.5mtr” add “except where the street is a cul-de-sac, no through road or there is a safe crossing (zebra, toucan or pelican) or other safety measure such as a pavement build-out or a pedestrian island within 120 meters”

In 4.c.iv after “location” add “except where adequate mitigating improvements have been made since the incident(s)”

In 4.c.v after “pavement” insert “or verge”

Replace 4.e with “Consideration should be given to residents’ amenity (immediate outlook, noise, privacy) and whether the hub can be sensitively integrated into the streetscape without incurring disproportionate cost; any perceived impact being transferred to another property should be evaluated”

In 4.f after “optimization” add “should be considered but is secondary to resident satisfaction with the hub-sites”

Adds at the end of Appendix 3, as guidance: Framework conditions are “should” and not “must”; and where possible, bin hubs should be relocated to an existing site which does not require a TRO whilst any new TRO is being processed.”

Moved by: Councillor Stephen Jenkinson

Seconded by:

Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 7.2 – Communal Bin Review Update

“Committee

Agrees 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.4. and 1.1.5. Changes 1.1.3 and adds 1.16 and 1.1.7

1.1.3 Approve the updated review framework to be used when reviewing existing bin hub locations and/or determining the design and location of proposed bin hubs (Appendix 3) with the following alterations (**in bold**)

Updated Review Framework

This framework should be used when:

- Determining locations for new bin hubs, as part of any changes to the waste and recycling service.
- Reviewing existing bin hub locations currently installed and operational.

New and existing bin hub locations should satisfy all these requirements, where possible.

The Edinburgh Street Design Guidance (ESDG) factsheets provide guidelines on how our streets and roads should be designed regarding the usage of space, accessibility and road safety. As such, distances and measurements included in any ESDG factsheets will be preserved.

All criteria listed under 3 and 4 are to be applied with sufficient flexibility to accommodate criteria 5 and 6.

1. Range of materials collected: Non-recyclable waste (NRW), dry mixed recycling (DMR), glass and food waste. (See guidance note 1)

2. Capacity (L) provided per property per week: NRW = 140/170L, DMR = 140/170L, Glass = 5/20L, Food waste = 5/20L (See guidance note 1)

3. Walking distance: Relaxed from 100 meters to 120 meters (See guidance note 2)
4. Road safety requirements and streetscape:
 - a. bins 10mtrs away from junctions and pedestrian crossings
 - b. bins on roads (not pavements)
 - c. bin hubs can be placed on opposite side of the road/pavement if: -
 - i. it is a 20mph road
 - ii. road width does not exceed 10.5mtr - **unless the street is a cul-de-sac or safe crossings, such as build outs, pedestrian islands or zebra, pelican or toucan crossings exist within 100m.**' (Max unprotected walking crossing distance as per ESDG) (See guidance note 3)
 - iii. clear 25mtr lines of sight maintained based on derived sight stopping distances (SSD)
 - iv. No accident history within 25m radius from proposed location - **'unless adequate improvements have been made to address the issue.**
 - v. Safe space to use bins – min pavement **or grass verge** width of 1.5mtr (ESDG)
 - d. residents should not have to stand in the flow of traffic to use bins
 - e. The perceived impact is not transferred to another property
 - f. Parking optimization
5. Hospitality: Bin hubs should not be sited directly adjacent to an outdoor area currently used for tables and chairs by a hospitality venue. (See guidance note 4)
6. Resident amenity: Bin hubs should be sited in locations which minimise any negative impacts on resident amenity (if at all possible), **meaning specifically the impacts of noise and odours and the impacts on privacy and outlook.** (See guidance note 5)

The Guidance Notes remain as stated.

1.1.6 Agrees to review the number and distribution of glass bins in order to reduce noise impacts.

1.1.7 Agrees within 12 months of the completed installation of bin hubs in an area, to review capacity requirements based on collection data with a view to potentially reducing the number of hubs.”

Moved by: Cllr Neil Ross
Seconded by: Cllr Hal Osler

Amendment by the Conservative Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 7.2 - Communal Bin Review Update

Amends 1.1.3 to read:

"1.1.3 Approve the updated review framework to be used when reviewing existing bin hub locations and/or determining the design and location of proposed bin hubs (Appendix 3) **which will include the following changes to Appendix 3;**

4. c. ii. Road width does not exceed 10.5 metres **unless a refuge island or other type of crossing is present to support the full distance** (max unprotected walking crossing distance as per ESDG) (See guidance note 3)

4. c. v. Safe space to use bins – min pavement **or other hard-standing or grass/park area with width of 1.5 metres (ESDG). However, where this is not possible, a hub can be sited across a road on a 'non-residential' side of a residential street with bins arranged in such a way that allows a resident to stand in the safe space between two bins.**

Adds new 1.1.3.1:

Nevertheless, agrees the framework is a set of 'best case' guidelines and that, with agreement and collaboration between residents, councillors, and officers, can allow for discretionary siting of a hub in such a way that may not conform with the framework due to the variations and requirements within different streets.

Adds the following points to the recommendations:

1.1.6 Notes that noise complaints have formed a large subset of the myriad complaints made to the council and to elected members regarding those bin hubs which have already been implemented.

1.1.7 Notes that The Anti-Social Behaviour (Noise Control) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (SSI 2005/43) permit no more than 41 decibels between 0700hrs and 2300hrs and 31 decibels between 2300hrs and 0700hrs.

1.1.8 Notes that the council's own research regarding the mitigation of noise made by glass bins indicated that even the most effective mitigation scheme would still allow for noises between 83.9 decibels and 100.8 decibels, depending on circumstances. (Slide 12 Workshop Presentation)

1.1.9 Notes that both that the workshop held by the council suggested that residents should take overall priority when siting bin hubs (ap.2, p.1) and that point six of the updated review framework requires that bin hubs should be "sited in locations which minimise any negative impacts on resident amenity (if at all possible)"

1.1.10 Agrees that even mitigated noise levels caused by glass bins would be wholly unacceptable and severely diminish residential amenity.

1.1.11 Therefore, requests a report to the next Transport & Environment Committee (12th December 2024) detailing measures by which glass bins might be removed from bin hubs and sited instead in locations further from residential homes, in addition to all work done to date on noise mitigation, as per the Motion by Cllr Mitchell which was agreed unanimously at Full Council in February 2024, including an estimated implementation timeline and costs.

1.1.12 Further notes that although the report indicates that 133 existing bin hubs will be subject to revision, no information is provided as to which bin hubs these may be, nor the complaints received regarding them, nor the reasons for their revision.

1.1.13 Notes that in some cases, where a TRO is required, it may not be possible to remove or alter even those bin hubs scheduled for adjustment for several months.

1.1.14 Therefore, requests that within three cycles a report be brought before committee detailing:

- i. Identifies measures to alleviate identified adverse impacts whilst waiting for the bin hub to be adjusted.
- ii. A list of those bin hubs scheduled for adjustment, the complaints made against them and the reasons for which the proposed adjustments were accepted.
- iii. A list of all bin hubs which have received complaint (either directly or through ward councillors), the nature of those complaints, (where data is available) the number of residents supporting the complaint, and the reasons for which those complaints were not acted upon."

Moved by: Councillor Marie-Clair Munro
Seconded by: Councillor Iain Whyte

Addendum by the Liberal Democrat Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 7.3 - Secure On-Street Cycle Parking and Public Bike parking update

“Committee

After 1.1.2 add new

1.1.3 Notes the large unmet demand for safe cycle storage as demonstrated by the long waiting list for secure on-street cycle hangers.

1.1.4 Understands that the Dutch cities of Utrecht and Delft have a successful model of larger-capacity neighbourhood cycle stores, which are Council-owned but managed by U-Stal, the external provider that also manages on-street cycle hangers similar to those in Edinburgh.

1.1.5 Requests that officers investigate whether such a model could be implemented in Edinburgh, for example by using underused Council-owned garages or similar properties located in areas where there is a high concentration of demand, and by exploring the possibility of contracting the same external provider to manage these facilities.

1.1.6 Requests an update to be presented to the March meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee.

Renumber accordingly”

Moved by: Cllr Sanne Dijkstra-Downie

Seconded by: Cllr Kevin Lang

Amendment from the Green Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 7.3 - Secure on-street cycle parking and public bike parking update

Delete recommendations and insert:

“1) Notes the report and the review of bringing the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking Project (SSCP) in-house; further notes that this review does not appear to have considered whether advantages might be gained from VAT exemption if the council were to be the operator of the scheme;

2) Therefore agrees not to reach a decision on in-housing of the scheme at the present time, but rather to undertake a workshop with committee members exploring the issue, and returning with a further report within three cycles on whether in-housing could deliver benefits to the council and cycle hanger users;

3) Noting the financial pressure on the council and that, without changes to the council budget, further rollouts of the SSCP are dependent on external funding, committee agrees to refer the process on to the current council budget setting process with a request to officers to identify sufficient capital budget to undertake further rollouts of cycle parking, including but not limited to the SSCP, and if necessary, to consider raising fees and charges in other areas of the transport budget in order to achieve this;

4) Agrees to add a webform or other mechanism to the council website for members of the public to request locations for public cycle parking;

5) Noting the actions in the City Mobility Plan 2021-2030 implementation plan, agrees to include an update on cycle parking installations as part of the annual review of the City Mobility Plan.”

Moved by: Chas Booth

Seconded by:

Addendum by the SNP Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 8.1 Road Safety - School Travel Plan Review

ADDS:

“1.1.2.1 Agrees that a summary of the interventions taken in relation to each school travel action plan (as per paragraph 4.8) will be provided to the members of the joint review meeting for that particular school (school management teams, Parent Council representatives, ward councillors, and any other relevant stakeholders) each year to enable stakeholders to track progress of travel plan implementation.”

Moved by Cllr Danny Aston

Seconded by Cllr

Addendum by the Liberal Democrat Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 8.1 – Road Safety - School Travel Plan Review

“Committee

Add

1.1.4 Nevertheless requests an update with projected timescales for completion of the remaining school travel audits following the 2025/26 Council Budget, no later than the April meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee.”

Moved by: Cllr Sanne Dijkstra-Downie

Seconded by: Cllr Kevin Lang

Amendment from the Green Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 8.1 - Road Safety – School Travel Plan Review

In recommendations, delete 1.1.3 and insert:

“1.1.3 Noting the financial challenges mentioned in section 6 of the report, committee agrees to refer the process on to the current council budget setting process with a request to officers to:

- a) identify sufficient revenue budget to expand the school travel team to allow additional support for all schools in carrying out future School Travel Audits, and in particular those schools in low SIMD areas or where there is no active parent body;
- b) identify sufficient capital revenue to undertake the road safety improvements identified in school travel plans / school travel audits;
- c) if necessary, to consider raising fees and charges in other areas of the transport budget in order to undertake a) and b) above.”

Moved by: Chas Booth

Seconded by:

Addendum by the SNP Group

Transport & Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 8.2 – Citywide Road Coordination – Revised Charging Structure

ADDS at end of 1.1.1:

“with the exception that the ‘failure to notify’ surcharges detailed in Appendix 1 shall be set at 100%.’

ADDS new 1.2:

1.2 Committee further agrees that officers will look into the feasibility of increasing the rate of the ‘failure to notify’ surcharge by increments over the period of non-consented road occupation – e.g. 100% surcharge for week 1, 200% for week 2.”

Moved by: Cllr Danny Aston

Seconded by:

Amendment from the Green Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 8.2 - Citywide Road Coordination – Revised Charging Structure

Delete recommendations and insert:

“Committee

- 1) Notes the report and notes that an IIA has not been carried out.
- 2) Notes that IIAs should be carried out before a change is agreed in order to establish the implications of that change.
- 3) Therefore agrees not to adopt the revised charging structure set out in the report, but rather to undertake an IIA on the proposals and incorporate the proposed changes into the council’s forthcoming budget process.
- 4) In the interim agrees to retain the current set of fees and charges for road occupation and roads events.”

Moved by: Chas Booth

Seconded by:

Amendment by the Administration

Transport & Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 8.4 Internal Audit – Audit outcomes June to October 2024 - Referral from the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee

Adds 1.1:

Committee agrees to receive a quarterly Business Bulletin update on the implementation of the management actions detailed in 9.1 to 9.8 of this report until such time that all management actions have been successfully implemented.

Moved by: Councillor Stephen Jenkinson

Seconded by:

Addendum by the SNP Group

Transport & Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 8.4 – Internal Audit: Audit outcomes June to October 2024 – referral from the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee

ADDS:

“Committee:

1. Notes that there are a number of concerning findings of the audit on ‘Safety of Council HGVs’ which are graded as ‘limited assurance’ and that some of these lie within the remit of the Policy and Sustainability Committee (to which the audit findings have also been referred), and some within the remit of this Committee.
2. Notes that the Driving for the Council policy has not been reviewed in full since 2019 and therefore requests that officers commence this process, including discussion with trade union representatives and that this is reported back to this Committee as soon as possible.
3. Requests that that report also outlines how the following management actions agreed in response to the audit will be implemented:
 - I. the establishment of the performance monitoring framework;
 - II. the reintroduction of Driver Assessor Training and the restoration of ongoing completion of Professional Competence (CPC) Training spaced over a five-year period;
 - III. the improved use of the functionality of the fleet systems to reduce risk and increase compliance;
 - IV. the introduction of safety standards for new vehicles, including scope for updating the Fleet Asset Management Plan 2023-2029 to include safety standards for future HGV fleet procurement;
 - V. the introduction of the in-cab system with improved safety standards, including whether there is a digital solution available to assist with the routing of HGVs which will allow high-risk areas to be defined and vehicles to be re-routed at peak times to avoid such areas;
 - VI. improved incident and complaint monitoring, with a view to ensuring that the data collected is used effectively to improve safety outcomes;
 - VII. improved risk management processes;

VIII. and any other relevant management actions that should be brought to the attention of Committee.”

Moved by: Cllr Danny Aston
Seconded by:

Addendum by the Green Group

Transport & Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 9.1 - Motion by Councillor Aston – Improving Signalised Crossings

Inserts after 2) iii.

3) “Committee also notes:

- i. According to Sustrans Scotland, 40% of Edinburgh’s pavements don’t even meet minimum width and there are nearly 17,000 missed or substandard dropped kerbs in the city.
- ii. Research to the Scottish Road Research Board states that for the provision of walkers, wheelers, and cyclists, traffic reduction and speed reduction should be the first considerations as this not only improves provision of space but also has wider network benefits

Renumber accordingly.

After new 5) insert:

6) Requests that officers, when reporting, consider asks of RNIB, Sight Scotland and other disabled-led or disability represented organisations which include; further roll out and updating of tactile paving, revolving cones, lightboxes in crossing panels and audio signalling.”

Moved by: Councillor O’Neill

Seconded by: Councillor Booth

Amendment by the Conservative Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 9.2 Motion by Councillor McKenzie – Save The Burnside

“To note the Council is only entitled to repair the right of way to the condition it has historically maintained (ie. it may repair the path to remove the sinkhole), it is specifically not allowed to conduct improvements, still less charge the cost of those improvements to the owner. It is a public right of way, not public property. To act as Cllr. McKenzie suggests would be unlawful; the council would be liable for any costs and for damages in addition.

Therefore, deletes point 3”

Moved by: Councillor Marie-Clair Munro
Seconded by: Councillor Iain Whyte

Amendment by the SNP Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 9.3 - Motion by Councillor Booth – Speeding Parking Controls Roll-out

Amend title of motion to read: 'Speeding Up Parking Controls Roll-out'.

Insert new paragraph 3 and renumber existing paragraphs accordingly:

“3) Notes that the Council declared a nature emergency in February 2023, and that the Council's updated Biodiversity Action Plan and the Climate Ready Edinburgh Plan contain commitments to increase the use of street trees, raingardens, benches, and cycle parking, and notes that City Plan 2030 contains commitments to expand the city's blue/green networks;

Delete existing paragraph 4 and replace with:

5) Further notes the fragmented nature of existing parking controls, with 26 CPZ areas and 9 PPA areas, can make enforcement challenging;

Insert new paragraph at the end:

8) Further agrees that as part of the "City Mobility Plan annual update", due to be presented to committee in April 2025, that officers will set out options for biodiversity and climate adaptation enhancements as part of the 'Delivering Actions for Parking' appendix including, but not limited to, accelerated rollout of street trees, rain gardens, benches and cycle parking, to replace some motor vehicle parking spaces throughout the city, and in particular along corridors identified as part of the future blue-green network in City Plan 2030.”

Moved by **Cllr Danny Aston**

Seconded by **Cllr**

Amendment by the Liberal Democrat Group

Transport and Environment Committee

18 November 2024

Item 9.3 – Motion by Cllr Booth - Speeding Parking Controls Roll-out

Committee deletes all and inserts:

“Committee

- 1) notes Policy Measure 34 in the City Mobility Plan on Parking Controls which aims to “extend the coverage and operational period of parking controls in the city to manage parking availability for the benefit of local residents and people with mobility difficulties”.
- 2) recognises the importance of parking surveys and local consultation to understand the impact of commuter and other parking in local communities in order to determine if controlled parking is needed for the benefit of residents and people with mobility difficulties.
- 3) Notes that, in some cases and as a result of parking surveys and consultations, decisions have been taken not to proceed with CPZ in certain areas.
- 4) Notes that, even when the principle of extending CPZ to an area has been agreed to, a significant bottleneck has been the development and advertisement of the necessary legal traffic orders, and the consideration of any objections received.
- 5) recognises that delays in developing traffic orders has also had an impact on the delivery of other projects, including important road safety measures.
- 6) therefore, requests a committee update within three cycles on the current resourcing of the traffic orders team, how the developments of certain TROs are prioritised, and what opportunities exist to speed up the processes surrounding TROs.”

Moved by: Cllr Kevin Lang

Seconded by: Cllr Sanne Dijkstra-Downie

This page is intentionally left blank