

# Minutes

## Transport and Environment Committee

**10am, Thursday 18 August 2022**

### **Present 18 August 2022**

Councillors Arthur (Convener), Aston, Bandel, Cameron (substituting for Councillor Graham), Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Lang, Macinnes, Miller, Munro and Work.

### **Present 1 September 2022**

Councillors Arthur (Convener), Aston, Bandel, Cameron (substituting for Councillor Graham), Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Lang, Macinnes, Miller, Mitchell (substituting for Councillor Munro, Item 7.6), Munro (Items 1.1-7.5 & 7.7-9.2) and Work.

## **1. Adjournment**

---

### **Motion for Adjournment**

Councillor Arthur proposed in terms of Standing Order 21(1) that the meeting be adjourned due to industrial action.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Miller

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the adjournment - 8 votes

Against the adjournment - 3 votes

(For the adjournment – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Cowdy, Cameron, Macinnes, Miller and Work

Against the adjournment - Councillors Dijkstra-Downie, Lang and Munro.)

### **Decision**

To adjourn this meeting in terms of Standing Order 21.1 and continue the remaining business of the meeting to an adjourned meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee to take place on 1 September 2022.

## **2. Resumption**

---

The Convener reconvened the meeting adjourned from 18 August on 1 September 2022.

### 3. Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin

---

a) **Deputation – Blackford Safe Routes**

Committee considered a deputation from Blackford Safe Routes. The deputation outlined their support for the implementation of a new right-hand turn from Home Street into Brougham Street as part of the Low Emissions Zone. The deputation explained that they had proposed this right-hand turn to be included at Tollcross so that through-motor-traffic could be removed from Warrender Park Road, as they explained Warrender Park Road was the second key route to school in the area. They explained that families would like to travel safely on foot or by bike along the Warrender Park Road corridor to and from school, however it was currently heavily used by vehicles from Bruntsfield to Melville Drive and was therefore subject to unnecessary through-traffic by non-residents.

The deputation urged the need for the right-hand turn to be reinstated at Tollcross, so it would be possible to remove through-traffic on Warrender Park Road and proposed Low-Traffic Neighbourhoods in the area could be completed.

b) **Deputation - Scotsman Holdings**

Committee considered a deputation from Scotsman Holdings. The deputation advised that since the beginning of their ownership of The Scotsman Hotel, they have never been able to trade unencumbered. This was due to refurbishment of the hotel, the Covid-19 pandemic, and due to the ongoing works to north Bridge which continued to exacerbate their ability to trade normally. The deputation explained that despite the works causing water leaks into lower levels which included bedrooms and diesel fumes from generators from under the Plant Areas were able to be maintained, however the impact the works were having now were significant enough that the hotel's landmark 'Grand Café' was threatened with closure potentially making staff redundant.

The deputation went on to explain pedestrian footfall had fallen since the works on the North Bridge started, and that members of the public could not see the entrance to the hotel or the Grand Café due to lack of pedestrian access caused by the works. They also noted a lack of signage to the hotel entrances, which meant members of the public could not see how to get in to the hotel. The deputation explained the front of the hotel was now blocked by hoardings, fencing, temporary containers and work materials from Balfour Beattie.

The deputation also noted that third party channels took 75-80% of bookings, and therefore they did not have access to guests data from these bookings to invite them to stay again or allow them to notify guests booking on these channels of the disruption at the bridge. The deputation asked Committee to provide a pedestrian walkway from the east to the west side of the North Bridge to allow access to the Grand Café and the Scotsman hotel, replacement of the

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

Heras fencing behind hoardings with a wire of Perspex holding so guests could see the hotel, allow for signage and temporary lighting to advertise the hotel. The deputation also asked Committee to make allowances to move the site set up to another location, more interaction with the Council between them and residents/owners, reinstate the previous crossing point at North Bridge to allow access, to move Balfour Beattie's site elsewhere and finally to request that Committee cancel the 1 year extension to 2023 for the re-opening of the pedestrian route and open it sooner.

**c) Business Bulletin**

The Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin for August 2022 was presented.

**Decision**

- 1) To note the Business Bulletin.
- 2) To note the update – Short, Medium and Long Term Improvements at Portobello High Street/Inchview Terrace/ Sir Harry Lauder Road Junction.
- 3) To recognise the importance of these changes the tragic fatalities at this junction.
- 4) To agree 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.
- 5) To engage with Ward Members regarding the Petition on Station Road, Ratho Station.
- 6) To circulate breakdown of spending for the Smarter Choices, Smarter Places programme to members.
- 7) To circulate the Bus Partnership Update – Strategic Appraisal Business Casework briefing note to members.

(Reference – Business Bulletin, submitted.)

## **4. Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2022/23**

---

**a) Ward Councillor Osler**

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed to a written submission from Ward Councillor Osler in relation to the Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2022/23 – Report by the Executive Director of Place.

Councillor Osler highlighted that Queensferry Road towards Dean Bridge in Learmonth Terrace needed improving. She noted that this was first consulted in

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

2016 and was scheduled to be delivered in 2022/23 but was now being pushed back to 2025/26. Residents of the area had been waiting more than a decade for change in the area. It was a major route to many schools and the main route for getting to town. Cllr Osler noted that to cross the junction, traffic had to be navigated from behind, from the left and turning traffic from town. Cllr Osler explained how she had noticed individuals who stepped out who thought they had checked the traffic but had not taken in to account the right turning traffic from Dean Bridge. Cllr Osler also explained that the same issue of pushbacks was happening at Henderson Row, and that residents, Stockbridge Primary School and Ward Councillors were all dissatisfied that there were delays in this area until 2025/26.

Councillor Osler also noted that there were issues at Orchard road and Queensferry Road at Orchard Road to Orchard Road South. She explained that it had taken a huge amount of pressure from Ward Councillors and residents to get assessments done and schemes brought forward. Residents had been told by Officers that if they struggled to cross the Queensferry Road when taking their children to school they could walk up to the lights at Craigleith junction. Councillor Osler argued this did not support Council policy on Safer Routes to School and was not in line with pedestrians being top of the transport hierarchy.

Councillor Osler explained that she was frustrated that much needed safety improvements asked for by residents, who had been consulted and were eagerly anticipated, were being delayed. Councillor Osler asked Committee to provide a real commitment and focus on achieving the new “estimated” construction dates, and a determined effort for schemes to be brought forward which had already been agreed to.

**b) Report by the Executive Director of Place**

Approval was sought for an updated prioritised programme of pedestrian crossing improvements. On 28 July 2009, the former Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee, approved a report titled “Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation Process”, which set out a system for evaluating potential pedestrian crossing locations and developing and maintaining a prioritised programme of crossing improvements.

Committee was asked to note the results of assessments for locations that failed to meet the criteria for pedestrian crossing improvements and to note that the pedestrian crossing programme sits alongside other initiatives summarised in the report, which aimed at improving conditions for people walking in Edinburgh.

**Motion**

- 1) To approve the updated 2022/23 prioritised pedestrian crossing programme, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

- 2) To note the results of assessments for locations that failed to meet the criteria for pedestrian crossing improvements in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note that the pedestrian crossing programme sat alongside other initiatives, which were summarised in the report, aimed at improving conditions for people walking in Edinburgh.
- 4) To note that Green Person Authority (GPA) pedestrian crossings remained in the “green man” state until a vehicle approached, and that those were suitable on routes where there was less than 7000 vehicles per day. To note that GPA’s had been trialled in London with some success, and therefore agree that relevant Officers would meet with Living Streets Edinburgh and the Edinburgh Access Panel to discuss introducing those signal types in Edinburgh, and that if implementation was feasible, all future, new, upgraded and replacement crossings should be considered for GPA status. This would be included in the Pedestrian Crossing prioritisation report and brought to Committee within the next 12 months.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

#### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To approve the updated 2022/23 prioritised pedestrian crossing programme, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the results of assessments for locations that failed to meet the criteria for pedestrian crossing improvements in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note that the pedestrian crossing programme sat alongside other initiatives, which were summarised in the report, aimed at improving conditions for people walking in Edinburgh.
- 4) To note that the intention apply for up to £830,000 from the Scottish Government’s new Road Safety Improvement Fund, and agreed 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 Councillor Dijkstra-Downie seconded by Councillor Lang

#### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To approve the updated 2022/23 prioritised pedestrian crossing programme, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the results of assessments for locations that failed to meet the criteria for pedestrian crossing improvements in Appendix 2 of the report.

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

- 3) To note that the pedestrian crossing programme sat alongside other initiatives, which were summarised in the report, aimed at improving conditions for people walking in Edinburgh.
- 4) To note that a Pedestrian crossing on its own was unlikely to solve the overall problem with all types of road traffic collisions at the Dalmahoy Junction.
- 5) To note that road traffic collisions continued to occur at regular intervals at Dalmahoy Junction.
- 6) To note that the last estimate for the introduction of a fully signalised junction of £962,000, was significantly greater than the funding package of £455,000 approved by the Committee in March 2017. To also note that alternative road safety measures proposed in the Officers recommendations and costed at £625,000 also significantly exceeded the previously approved funding package.
- 7) To note that a fully signalised junction was the preferred option of local residents, the Ratho & District Community Council and ward councillors.
- 8) To note that only a fully signalised junction would deal with all the safety aspects of this junction.
- 9) To agree to half the current plan of a pedestrian crossing at Dalmahoy Junction, and to 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 Munro, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1 and 2 were adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To approve the updated 2022/23 prioritised pedestrian crossing programme, as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the results of assessments for locations that failed to meet the criteria for pedestrian crossing improvements in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note that the pedestrian crossing programme sat alongside other initiatives, which were summarised in the report, aimed at improving conditions for people walking in Edinburgh.
- 4) To note that Green Person Authority (GPA) pedestrian crossings remained in the “green man” state until a vehicle approached, and that those were suitable on routes where there was less than 7000 vehicles per day. To note that GPA’s

had been trialled in London with some success, and therefore agree that relevant Officers would meet with Living Streets Edinburgh and the Edinburgh Access Panel to discuss introducing those signal types in Edinburgh, and that if implementation was feasible, all future, new, upgraded and replacement crossings should be considered for GPA status. This would be included in the Pedestrian Crossing prioritisation report and brought to Committee within the next 12 months.

- 5) To note that the intention apply for up to £830,000 from the Scottish Government's new Road Safety Improvement Fund, and agreed 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.
- 6) To note that road traffic collisions continued to occur at regular intervals at Dalmahoy Junction.
- 7) To note that the last estimate for the introduction of a fully signalised junction of £962,000, was significantly greater than the funding package of £455,000 approved by the Committee in March 2017. To also note that alternative road safety measures proposed in the Officers recommendations and costed at £625,000 also significantly exceeded the previously approved funding package.
- 8) To note that a fully signalised junction was the preferred option of local residents, the Ratho & District Community Council and ward councillors.
- 9) To note that only a fully signalised junction would deal with all the safety aspects of this junction.
- 10) To report back to Committee in two cycles with up-to-date costs for a fully signalised junction with a view to implement as such.

(Reference – Report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## 5. Delivering Scotland's Circular Economy – Consultation Responses

---

### a) Deputation – Friends of Braidburn Valley Park

Committee considered a written deputation from Friends of Braidburn Valley Park. The deputation advised they wanted the Council to reassess the policy of having bins for recycling only in Premier Parks such as Princes Street, Inverleith Park or Saughton Park. The deputation explained that Braidburn Valley Park was well maintained by the Parks department and the Friends of the Park, however there was an issue with overflowing bins. The deputation noted that Mike Shields, who managed the park, had installed new bins at the entrances but said that Council policy was just to collect non-recyclable waste at present.

The deputation asked Committee to introduce separate larger bins at each site in the park (one for bottles, one for recyclable material and one for landfill), as although it would come as a cost it would save on the cost of emptying a single bin more often. The deputation also asked Committee to consider upgrading other parks, such as Braidburn Valley Park, to Premier Park status – or to introduce a status below Premier Park status which had recycling facilities.

b) **Report by the Executive Director of Place**

Committee considered a report which outlined the Council's response to two Scottish Government consultations which related to actions and policies that were needed to promote a circular economy in Scotland. On 30 May 2022, the Scottish Government launched two consultations to guide the development of future actions to promote a circular economy in Scotland. Those included a consultation on proposals for a circular economy bill, inviting views from stakeholders on the Scottish Government powers which would be imbedded within new legislation. They also included a separate consultation which sought views on a 'route map' with proposed priorities and actions to reach waste, recycling and emissions reduction targets. Actions and powers discussed in each consultation covered a range of policy areas aligned to Scottish Government objectives, which also aligned closely with the Council's 2030 Climate Strategy and Edinburgh Economy Strategy both of which set out actions to support the transition towards a more circular economy business model in Edinburgh.

**Decision**

To note the consultation responses, approved by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Convener under urgency provisions set out in A4.1 of the Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions, which were submitted to the Scottish Government in advance of the consultation closing date on 22 August 2022. This amended the version which was circulated previously, following engagement from the Green Group.

(Reference – report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

**6. Motion by Councillor Macinnes – Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68**

---

a) **Deputation – Low Traffic Corstorphine**

The deputation showed written support for Councillor Macinnes' motion on the withdrawal extensions for supported bus services 20, 63 and 68. They noted that although there was a dominance in Edinburgh of private vehicles, 40% of Edinburgh's population did not own a private car. They recognised the diversity within the community, and advised they strongly supported 'active' travel and public transport modes as a crucial way to get around the community. The deputation was dismayed to be advised of the FirstBus plans to withdraw

crucial bus routes 20, 63 and 68 from service, and supported the motion for extension and investment in these services to maintain essential access for a wide range of residents across the West and South West Edinburgh Areas. The deputation also asked Committee that any future transport reviews in the West of Edinburgh to fully consider wider support in services and routes to better provide public transport links to the growing housing and business needs existing and coming to that area.

b) **Deputation – Ratho and District Community Council (RADCC)**

The deputation showed support of Councillor Macinnes' motion on the withdrawal extensions for supported bus Services 20, 63 and 68. The deputation explained that Ratho had no pedestrianised routes to be able to enter or leave the village and vehicles must be used. The deputation advised that despite this, they did not want the number 20 bus service to be retendered due to the service being not fit for purpose. The deputation advised they wanted a bus service that was reliable, efficient and was better for the climate. They advised that the number 20 service increased car usage in Ratho as the bus service was not efficient due to the long bus routes and times. The deputation advised they would like a direct service between Ratho and Edinburgh, as this would decrease car usage and allow for better and more efficient travel to and from the village.

c) **Ward Councillor Glasgow**

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed to hear a presentation from Ward Councillor Glasgow on Councillor Macinnes' motion – Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68.

Ward Councillor Glasgow advised that she was in support of the previous deputations, particularly the contribution from Ratho District Community Council. She advised that she supported the deputations comments, and thought that improved services in Ratho would benefit those travelling to school, medical services and other amenities. She asked Committee for an improved bus service in the area.

d) **Ward Councillor Macinnes**

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed that Councillor Macinnes could speak in support of her Motion - Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68.

Ward Councillor Macinnes spoke in support of Ward Councillor Glasgow's comments, and in support of her motion. She advised that the Council and Bus Service Operators should be providing services in this area for residents. She noted that the issues surrounding these services being pulled was around driver shortage, and thanked Officers for their efforts in finding solutions for these issues. However, she expressed concern that driver shortages were

becoming a real issue and this is why she brought this motion to Committee so the Transport and Environment Convener and Officers could do work to find out more solutions to this problem and to provide bus services in Edinburgh.

e) **Motion by Councillor Macinnes - Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68**

The following motion by Councillor Macinnes was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Committee

- 1) Notes the recent officer briefing regarding the decision by First Bus to withdraw from the contract extensions for the supported bus services 20, 63 and 68.
- 2) Notes that these services all operate in West and South West Edinburgh and offer vital transport links, particularly to rural West and South West Edinburgh and the negative impact on residents if they cease.
- 3) Notes the 20 service provides vital links to Ratho and Ratho Station and the Calders.
- 4) Notes the 63 service provides vital cross links between Balerno, Currie, Hermiston, Edinburgh Park, Gyle, Kirkliston and Queensferry to healthcare, employment and shopping.
- 5) Notes the current and planned level of housing construction in West Edinburgh served by the 68, and the impact on public transport requirements that this will bring.
- 6) Notes that without effective public transport links that there will be a subsequent increase in private car usage and related congestion and pollution impacts for West and South West Edinburgh, which is likely to undermine efforts to reduce car use inside the city.
- 7) Thanks officers for their ongoing work to deliver alternative options for the impacted communities.
- 8) Requests that, alongside work to deliver these contract extensions, officers consider whether budgets would allow temporary investment in community transport options to help keep the impacted communities served in the short term.
- 9) Requests that officers and the Transport Convener meet with the affected Community Councils to inform them of what actions the Council might take or encourage to help meet community needs.
- 10) Commits to ensuring that the current level of public transport service for West and South West Edinburgh continues and that any transition to a new service provider is as seamless as possible.

- 11) Requests that the Transport Convener meets and discusses the issue of industry wide driver shortage with the CPT and provides a detailed report to the next Transport and Environment Committee which outlines the key issues and what positive steps can be taken, industry wide and locally, to encourage greater recruitment and retention of public transport drivers.”

### **Motion**

- 1) To note that recent officer briefings regarding the decision by First Bus to withdraw from the contract extensions for the supported bus services 20, 63 and 68.
- 2) To note that those services all operate in West and South West Edinburgh and offered vital transport links, particularly to rural West and South West Edinburgh and the negative impact on resident if they ceased.
- 3) To note the 20 service provided vital links to Ratho Station and the Calders.
- 4) To note the 63 service provided vital cross links between Balerno, Currie, Hermiston, Edinburgh Park, Gyle, Kirkliston and Queensferry to healthcare, employment and shopping
- 5) To note the current and planned level of housing construction in West Edinburgh served by the 68, and the impact on public transport requirements that this would bring
- 6) To note that without effective public transport links that there would be a subsequent increase in private car usage and related congestion and pollution impacts for West and South West Edinburgh, which would likely undermine efforts to reduce car use inside the city
- 7) To thank officers for their ongoing work to deliver alternative options for the impacted communities
- 8) To request that, alongside work to deliver these contract extensions, officers considered whether budgets would allow temporary investment in community transport options to help keep the impacted communities served in the short term.
- 9) To request that officers and the Transport Convener met with the affected Community Councils to inform them of what actions the Council might take or encourage to help meet community needs.
- 10) To commit to ensuring that the current level of public transport service for West and South West Edinburgh continued and that any transition to a new service provider was as seamless as possible.
- 11) To request that the Transport Convener met and discussed the issue of industry wide driver shortage with the CPT and Officers and provided a detailed report to the next Transport and Environment Committee which outlined the key issues and

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

what positive steps could be taken, industry wide and locally, to encourage greater recruitment and retention of public transport drivers.

- moved by Councillor McFarlane, seconded by Councillor Aston

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To call 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 2**

- 1) To note that recent officer briefings regarding the decision by First Bus to withdraw from the contract extensions for the supported bus services 20, 63 and 68 or continue these services on a significantly reduced schedule.
- 2) To note the 63 service provided vital cross links between Balerno, Currie, Hermiston, Edinburgh Park, Gyle, Newbridge, Kirkliston and Queensferry to healthcare, employment and shopping.
- 3) To note 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, recognised this drove 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 those supported bus services
- 4) To commit to working to improve overall levels of public transport for West and South West Edinburgh during this term of the Council, and agreed that any transition to a new service provider for these supported areas must be as seamless as possible.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

### **Amendment 3**

- 1) To note that the 63 bus service provided vital cross links between Balerno, Currie, Heriot-Watt University, Hermiston, Edinburgh Park, Gyle, Kirkliston and South Queensferry to employment and shopping but especially healthcare with the link to St John's Hospital via Hermiston P&R.
- 2) To note that communities fought to have these vital services in place.
- 3) To request that officers and the Transport Convener 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 were 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 the City centre
- c) consideration of a hopper bus running from Ratho to Ratho Station/Gyle that connected to Tram and Railway stations
- d) that the 63 and 68 bus services were continued in their present form to serve the passengers and their respected communities and that the residents of Ratho would have a reliable and frequent bus service to the city of Edinburgh

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1, 2, and 3 were accepted as an addendum to the motion

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McFarlane:

- 1) To note that recent officer briefings regarding the decision by First Bus to withdraw from the contract extensions for the supported bus services 20, 63 and 68. or continue these services on a significantly reduced schedule.
- 2) To note that those services all operate in West and South West Edinburgh and offered vital transport links, particularly to rural West and South West Edinburgh and the negative impact on resident if they ceased.
- 3) To note the 20 service provided vital links to Ratho Station and the Calders.
- 4) To note that the 63 bus service provided vital cross links between Balerno, Currie, Heriot-Watt University, Hermiston, Edinburgh Park, Gyle, Newbridge, Kirkliston and South Queensferry to employment and shopping but especially healthcare with the link to St John's Hospital via Hermiston P&R.
- 5) To note the current and planned level of housing construction in West Edinburgh served by the 68, and the impact on public transport requirements that this will bring.
- 6) To note 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, recognised this drove 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 those supported bus services
- 7) To thank officers for their ongoing work to deliver alternative options for the impacted communities

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

- 8) To requests that, alongside work to deliver these contract extensions, officers considered whether budgets would allow temporary investment in community transport options to help keep the impacted communities served in the short term.
- 9) To request that officers and the Transport Convener met with the affected Community Councils to inform them of what actions the Council might take or encourage to help meet community needs.
- 10) To commit to working to improve overall levels of public transport for West and South West Edinburgh during this term of the Council, and agreed that any transition to a new service provider for these supported areas must be as seamless as possible.
- 11) To request that the Transport Convener meets and discussed the issue of industry wide driver shortage with the CPT and Officers and provided a detailed report to the next Transport and Environment Committee which outlined the key issues and what positive steps could be taken, industry wide and locally, to encourage greater recruitment and retention of public transport drivers.
- 12) To call 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.
- 13) To note that communities fought to have these vital services in place.
- 14) To request that officers and the Transport Convener 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 were 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 the City centre
  - c) consideration of a hopper bus running from Ratho to Ratho Station/Gyle that connected to Tram and Railway stations
  - d) that the 63 and 68 bus services were continued in their present form to serve the passengers and their respected communities and that the residents of Ratho would have a reliable and frequent bus service to the city of Edinburgh

## **7. Minutes**

---

### **Decision**

To continue for consideration of the minute of 31 March 2022 to the Transport and Environment Committee meeting on the 6 October 2022.

## 8. Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme was presented.

### Decision

- 1) To note the work programme.
- 2) To note that consideration would be given to providing briefings to groups prior to Agenda Planning Meetings.

(Reference – Work Programme, submitted)

## 9. Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log for August 2022 was presented.

### Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:
  - **Action 7** – Electric Vehicle Business Case: Implementation Plan
  - **Action 12** – Evaluation of the 20mph Speed Limit Roll Out
  - **Action 24(2)** – Communal Bin Review Update
  - **Action 32** – George Street and First New Town – Final Concept Design
  - **Action 34**– Petition for Consideration: Resurfacing Particularly Noisy Cobbles Streets
  - **Action 37(1 -3)** – City Mobility Plan – Citywide Mode Share Targets
  - **Action 38(1-9)** – Motion by Councillor Lang – Edinburgh Recycling Centres
  - **Action 40(1-3&5)** – Transport and Environment Business Bulletin
  - **Action 43(1-9)** – Motion by Councillor Neil Ross – Call for Action on Zebra Markings for Side Streets
  - **Action 44(1-6)** – Motion by Councillor Burgess – Household Recycling Charter
  - **Action 45** – Motion by Councillor Howie – Cameron Toll Bridge Strikes
  - **Action 46** – Business Bulletin – Communal Bin Review
  - **Action 48** – Rolling Actions Log – Strategic Review of Parking Consultation and Timescales and Trial Closure of Cammo Road
  - **Action 49(1-11)** – Low Emission Zone – Carbon Impact
  - **Action 52(1-4)** – Place Directorate Internal Audit Actions
  - **Action 53(1-5)** – Emergency Motion by Councillor Burgess – Sciennes Primary Playground on Sciennes Road
  - **Action 57**– Deputation – Keep Morningside Moving – Closure of Whitehouse Loan
- 2) To agree that Officers would review actions 1 – Transport for Edinburgh Strategic Plan 2017-2021 and Lothian Buses Plan 2017-2019, 3 – Proposed

Increase in Scale of Rollout and Amendment to Contract for On-Street Secure Cycle Parking, 9 – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell – Strategic Transport Analysis North West Locality, 25 – Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures and 31 – Active Travel Measures – Travelling Safely (Formerly Spaces for People), and to circulate an update to members.

- 3) To otherwise note the outstanding actions.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, submitted.)

## **10. Proposed Changes to Charging Mechanism for Road Construction Consent Inspections**

---

As part of the Road Construction Consent process the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 permitted Roads Authorities to recover costs associated with inspecting new roads that were built to adoptable standards by developers. Benchmarking of costs and processes against other Scottish local authorities had identified an opportunity to revise how the function was delivered that would reduce the administration involved in doing so, by changing a predominantly manually processed timesheet and invoice system to a more straightforward process based on road bond values. It had been calculated that this proposal could generate an additional income of £375,192 per annum (based on road bond values from 2020).

### **Decision**

- 1) To approve the proposal to revise the way that charges for inspections for Road Construction Consents (RCC) were calculated and received.
- 2) To note that the proposal was in-line with the process adopted by many other Councils across Scotland.
- 3) To refer the report to Council to approve the amendment to current fees and charges.

(References – report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **11. Transport Infrastructure Investment – Capital Delivery Priorities for 2022/23**

---

Approval was sought for the allocation of the Transport Infrastructure Capital budgets and programme works for 2022/23. These included carriageways, footways, street lighting and traffic signals and structures. The budget figures listed in the report included the 2022/23 Council approved budget and an additional £1m capital investment in transport infrastructure.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the breakdown of the allocation of the capital budget for 2022/23 shown in Appendix 1 of the report.

- 2) To approve the programme of proposed works for 2022/23, as detailed in section 3 of the report, and in Appendices 1 and 2 of the report.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

### **Amendment**

- 1) To note those schemes listed in appendix 2 of the report which had already been delivered since the start of the financial year and approved the remaining programme of works.
- 2) To recognise the impact which the election had in 2022 on the timing of the report and noted that future reports on capital delivery priorities would be tabled in March/April each year for Committee approval.
- 3) To note with concern paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 which confirmed there were insufficient funds to maintain Edinburgh's roads in their current condition and agreed 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 the current Council term.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra Downie

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), the Amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the breakdown of the allocation of the capital budget for 2022/23 shown in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note those schemes listed in appendix 2 of the report which had already been delivered since the start of the financial year and approve the remaining programme of works.
- 3) To recognise the impact which the election had in 2022 on the timing of the report and note that future reports on capital delivery priorities would be tabled in March/April each year for Committee approval.
- 4) To recognise the causes of road condition deterioration included the greatly increased kilometres driven inside the city as well as the volume and increased weight of cars and other vehicles over the last few decades.
- 5) To note with concern paragraphs 4.7 and 4.8 of the report which confirmed there were insufficient funds to maintain Edinburgh's roads in their current condition and agreed 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 the current Council term.

(Reference – report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## 12. Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order

---

### a) Deputation Requests

The Committee considered deputation requests on behalf of Leith Independent Garages Association and Abbeyhill Colonies Residents Association in relation to a report by the Executive Director of Place regarding the Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order.

#### Decision

Not to hear the deputations.

### b) Report by the Executive Director of Place

Committee considered a report detailing the outcome of the advertisement of the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) which introduced a controlled parking zone (CPZ) in six new areas and considered the content of the objections made by respondents and made recommendations based on the analysis of those results. The report also sought the authority to make the advertised TRO, with amendments, and to proceed to implement the introduction of parking controls in the Phase 1 area.

#### Motion

- 1) To note the results of the formal advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SRP), the denial of the objections received and the Council's response.
- 2) To approve the setting aside of the remaining objections and approve the making of the advertised Order, with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note that an amendment to the advertised prices for resident, retail, business and trades permits, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, bringing prices in the new zones into line with those that will operate in the extended zones of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in 2022/23.
- 4) To note that an amendment to the advertised charges for pay-and-display parking, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

by Full Council on 24 February 2022, that set those prices at the same rates as operate in the extended zones of the CPZ and noted that Visitor Permit prices (which were set as a percentage of pay-and-display would also be amended as a result of the process.

- 5) To note 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. Therefore Committee was asked that within two cycles a Review of Parking Policy was presented for consideration. The review would draw on best practice and insured parking policy (including enforcement) supported the Council's wider policy agenda where possible.
- 6) To agree that for enforcement to be effective, penalty charges for parking in breach of any prohibitions needed to be set at an appropriate level, but they had not risen in Scotland since 2001. Therefore, Committee supported the Convener writing to the Scottish Government Minister for Transport to ask that she acted on the 2021 "Penalty Charge Notices for Parking Enforcement Consolation" results and set a higher Penalty Charge Notice or allowed the Council to do so.
- 7) To refer to the amendment to the advertised charges to Council for approval.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

### **Amendment**

- 1) To note the results on 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 the Council's response.
- 2) To approve the setting aside of the remaining objections in the areas of Abbeyhill, Leith Walk and Pilrig, and Shandon; and approved the making of the advertised Order for these areas with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2.
- 3) To agree not to make the advertised Order in the areas of Leith and North Leith, and Gorgie and Gorgie North.
- 4) To agree that the process of monitoring and review within the Abbeyhill colonies as promised on page 65 of the report, should involve public consultation no later than twelve 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.
- 5) To note that an amendment to the advertised prices for resident, retail, business and trades permit, under statutory notice procedure, is required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, bringing prices in the new zones into line with those that will operate in the extended zones of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in 2022/23

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

- 6) To that an amendment to the advertised charges for pay-and-display parking, under statutory notice procedure, is required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, that will set those prices at the same rates as operate in the extended zones of the CPZ, and notes that Visitor Permit prices (which are set as a percentage of pay-and-display) will also be amended as a result of this process
- 7) To refer the amendment to the advertised charges to Council for approval.

- moved by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie seconded by Councillor Lang

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), paragraph 4 of the Amendment was adjusted and accepted as an amendment to the motion

### **Voting**

For the Motion (as adjusted)-	7 votes
For the Amendment	- 4 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Cameron, McFarlane, Miller and Work.

For the Amendment: Councillors Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Lang and Munro)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the results of the formal advertising of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Phase 1 of the Strategic Review of Parking (SRP), the denial of the objections received and the Council's response.
- 2) To approve the setting aside of the remaining objections and approve the making of the advertised Order, with the proposed amendments as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note that an amendment to the advertised prices for resident, retail, business and trades permits, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, bringing prices in the new zones into line with those that will operate in the extended zones of the controlled parking zone (CPZ) in 2022/23.
- 4) To note that an amendment to the advertised charges for pay-and-display parking, under statutory notice procedure, was required to reflect the prices set by Full Council on 24 February 2022, that set those prices at the same rates as operate in the extended zones of the CPZ and noted that Visitor Permit prices (which were set as a percentage of pay-and-display would also be amended as a result of the process.

- 5) To note 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. Therefore Committee was asked that within two cycles a Review of Parking Policy was presented for consideration. The review would draw on best practice and insured parking policy (including enforcement) supported the Council's wider policy agenda where possible.
- 6) To agree that for enforcement to be effective, penalty charges for parking in breach of any prohibitions needed to be set at an appropriate level, but they had not risen in Scotland since 2001. Therefore, Committee supported the Convener writing to the Scottish Government Minister for Transport to ask that she acted on the 2021 "Penalty Charge Notices for Parking Enforcement Consolation" results and set a higher Penalty Charge Notice or allowed the Council to do so.
- 7) To agree that the process of monitoring and review within the Abbeyhill colonies as promised on page 65 of the report, should involve public consultation no later than twelve 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.
- 8) To refer to the amendment to the advertised charges to Council for approval.

(References - report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted)

### **13. Objections to TRO/21/16 and TRO/21/25 – Communal Bin Review Phase 3 (Zones N1 to N5 and Zones S1 to S4)**

---

Committee considered a report which detailed consultation responses of the changed parking and loading restrictions on zones N1, N2, N3, N5, S1, S2, S3 and S4 of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). On 2 July 2021 a report authorised by the Executive Director of Place under Delegated Powers commended the legal process to promote and change parking and loading restrictions in these areas.

The draft Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) detailed the extent of the scheme and were advertised on 12 November 2021 at which point those interested in the scheme were invited to make their views known to the Council. The report detailed the results of the consultation and addressed the objections, and Committee were asked to proceed with the TROs with 395 out of the 405 changes advertised.

#### **Motion**

- 1) To note that the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) was fundamental for the delivery of Phase 3 of the Communal Bin Review (CBR) project.
- 2) To set aside the objections that do not relate to TROs matters as outlined in Appendix 4 of the report.

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

- 3) To note that the project team had considered the feedback received and taken on board comments and objections with 10 locations proposed to not being progressed under the TROs as detailed in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of the report.
  - 4) Having considered the objections received to the advertised TROs, approve the making of the TROs as advertised with some amendments contained within the report and detailed in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of the report.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

#### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note that the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) was fundamental for the delivery of Phase 3 of the Communal Bin Review (CBR) project.
  - 2) To set aside the objections that do not relate to TROs matters as outlined in Appendix 4 of the report.
  - 3) To note that the project team had considered the feedback received and taken on board comments and objections with 10 locations proposed to not being progressed under the TROs as detailed in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of the report.
  - 4) Having considered the objections received to the advertised TROs, approved the making of the TROs as advertised with some amendments contained within the report and detailed in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of the report 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)
  - 5) To agree 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 Councillor Dijkstra-Downie, seconded by Councillor Lang

#### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To thank residents for their responses.
- 2) To regret that the previous Council Administration failed to improve recycling rates in Edinburgh and saw them worsen.
- 3) To express disappointment in the severe lack of consultation and information available to residents in advance of launching the TRO processes.
- 4) To acknowledge that poorly advertised and attended information stalls during the working day during a pandemic was insufficient for such a substantial change in service.
- 5) To note that the Communal Bin Review had been halted within the World Heritage Site while an alternative option to improve recycling was trialled.
- 6) To agree to not implement TRO/21/16 and TRO/21/25 until after the trial within the World Heritage Site had concluded and results could be analysed.
- 7) To agree to then launch an extensive and thorough information, engagement and consultation process with residents and Community Councils before any further action was taken in relation to the Communal Bin Review.
- 8) To agree that an alternative option to bin hubs may have to be considered.
  - moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	7 votes
For Amendment 1	-	2 votes
For Amendment 2	-	2 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Cameron, McFarlane, Miller, and Work.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Dijkstra-Downie and Lang.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Cowdy and Mitchell.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Arthur.

(References –report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted)

## **14. Active Travel Measures – Travelling Safely Update**

---

### **a) Deputation Requests**

The Committee considered deputation requests on behalf of Blackford Safe Routes, Keep Morningside Moving, Spokes Edinburgh, South West Edinburgh in Motion, Better Edinburgh Sustainable Transports and South West Edinburgh 20 Minute Neighbourhoods in relation to a report by the Executive Director of Place regarding the Active Travel Measures – Travelling Safely Update.

### **Decision**

Not to hear the deputations.

#### **b) Report by the Executive Director of Place**

Committee considered a report which provided an update on the Travelling Safely programme and included details of the recent non-statutory engagement undertaken for the proposed introduction of Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs) over an 18-month trial period and made recommendations for scheme trials. The report also provided a summary of the proposed monitoring and evaluation programme which was due to commence during the statutory six-month consolation period.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the project background and updates which were included in the report.
- 2) To note the feedback received during the recent public engagement relating to the proposed ETROs in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 3) To note that the Travelling Safely Programme had difficult origins. Whilst many individual schemes had been well used throughout, significant public concerns remained regarding a minority of them. These concerns ranged from individual issues people faced regarding a specific scheme, to the fundamental opposition to the Travelling Safely Programme as a whole.
- 4) To note feedback from stakeholders following the public engagement in Appendix 3 of the report.
- 5) To note that if Travelling Safely schemes were made permanent, many had the potential to contribute to Edinburgh's Net Zero and traffic reduction targets if well used.
- 6) To note the delay in reopening the one-way section of Braid Road to two-way traffic and the uncertainty that this was generating. Noted that there was no programme yet for progressing the Braid Road proposals and asked that one is circulated to Ward Councillors and TEC members by the 1<sup>st</sup> of September.
- 7) To agree 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.

Thursday, 18th August, 2022

- 8) To note the uncertainty regarding the Quiet Corridor - Meadows / Greenbank route and welcomed the commitment from Officers for ongoing community engagement on the issue. Asked that the engagement took the form of a community workshop (attended by residents and Ward 8 & 10 Councillors) on the issue, and this was reported back via a Traveling Safely Update Report in 2 cycles. This would include consideration of a more clearly defined cycle route between Greenbank Crossroads and the Meadows, and how this interface with Comiston Road.
  - 9) To note the ongoing material concerns regarding Silverknowes Road and the impact on businesses and asked that a community workshop (attended by residents and Ward Councillors) was held on the issue and reported back via the Traveling Safely Update Report.
  - 10) To note the points made by Lothian Buses in 4.1.4 and asked that each was considered in the Traveling Safely Update Report, and that solutions were proposed where possible. This would also consider Waverly Bridge and Comiston Road.
  - 11) To note that several pedestrians and cyclists had sustained injuries which they blamed on difficulty seeing lane defender bases in low light and at junction and asked that the Traveling Safely Update Report considers this issue and proposes any mitigation measures which may be needed.
  - 12) To approve all other recommendations in Appendix 2 to make ETROs for the proposed 18-month scheme trials.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the project background and updates which were included in the report.
- 2) To note the feedback received during the recent public engagement relating to the proposed ETROs in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 3) To approve the recommendations in Appendix 2 of the report to make ETROs for the proposed 18-month scheme trials with the exception:
  - 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.

4) To note feedback from stakeholders following the public engagement in Appendix of the report.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the project background and updated included in the 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 Council's 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.
- 2) To recognise that the promotion of the latest engagement relating to the proposed ETROs was wholly inadequate which resulted in a very low response rate from residents (Appendix 1) so the results to be set aside.
- 3) To approve the recommendations in Appendix 2 of the report, relating to school measures, to make ETROs for the proposed 18-month scheme trials.
- 4) To 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.
- 5) To consider 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, which included: Waverley Bridge, Victoria St, Cockburn St, Ferry Rd,

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

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.

- 6) To agree that where there was 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 Cowdy, seconded by Councillor Munro.

### **Amendment 3**

- 1) To note the project background and updates included in this report
  - 2) To note the feedback received during the recent public engagement relating to the proposed ETROs in Appendix 1 of the report.
  - 3) To approve the recommendations in Appendix 2 of the report to make ETROs for the proposed 18-month scheme trials.
  - 4) To note feedback from stakeholders following the public engagement in Appendix 3.
  - 5) To note that if Travelling Safely schemes are made permanent, many have the potential to contribute to Edinburgh's Net Zero and traffic reduction targets.
  - 6) To asks that programme for progressing the Braid Road proposals is circulated to Ward Councillors and Transport and Environment Committee members within 2 weeks.
  - 7) Notes the points made by Lothian Buses in 4.14 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.
- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Bandel.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

#### **First Vote**

For the Motion	-	2 votes
For Amendment 1	-	2 votes

For Amendment 2 - 2 votes

For Amendment 3 - 5 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur and Cameron.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Dijkstra-Downie and Lang.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Cowdy and Munro.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Aston, Bandel, Mcfarlane, Miller and Work.)

In accordance with Standing Order 24.6, the Convener used his casting vote, Amendment 1 fell and a third vote was taken between the Motion, Amendment 2 and Amendment 3.

### **Second Vote**

For the Motion - 4 votes

For Amendment 2 - 2 votes

For Amendment 3 - 5 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur, Cameron Dijkstra-Downie and Lang.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Cowdy and Munro.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Aston, Bandel, Mcfarlane, Miller and Work.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendment 3.

### **Third Vote**

For the Motion - 4 votes

For Amendment 3 - 5 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur, Cameron, Dijkstra-Downie and Lang.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Aston, Bandel, Mcfarlane, Miller and Work.

Abstain: Cowdy and Munro.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Miller.

(References –report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted)

## **15. Evaluation of the 20mph Speed Limit Roll Out – Three Years Post-Implementation**

---

An evaluation of the roll out of 20mph speed limits in Edinburgh, three years after completion of the final phase of the 20mph network was presented. The evaluation examined changes to traffic speeds, road traffic collisions, walking and cycling and air quality.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the positive outcomes of the Council's monitoring programme for the 20mph network, as detailed in the report.
  - 2) To note that Council Officers would continue to monitor the 20mph network to establish speed and casualty trends over a longer period of time.
  - 3) To approve the proposed consultation on extending the 20mph network, as outlines in 5.3 and 5.8 of the report, and the consultation network extension shown in the map in Appendix 2 of the report.
  - 4) To agree that Officers would examine existing research on driver Behavioural Trends to understand why driver's do not adhere to the 20mph speed.
  - 5) To agree that Officer would check if Ferry Road West of Arboretum Road was a 20mph speed limit and if it would be changed to a 30mph speed limit in the future.
  - 6) To provide an update to Committee on the motion from Councillor Lang on Reducing Speed Limits on Rural Roads.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

### **Amendment**

To note the recommendations in the report and add the following:

- 1) To recognise the importance of targeted traffic calming measures in terms of controlling vehicle speeds in 20mph areas, and agreed 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.
  - 2) To acknowledge the ongoing concern over current levels of enforcement by Police Scotland when it came to local speed limits, and agreed the Convener should write to the new Area Commander to raise this concern.
- moved by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie, seconded by Councillor Lang

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), the Amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the positive outcomes of the Council's monitoring programme for the 20mph network, as detailed in the report.

Thursday, 18th August, 2022

- 2) To note that Council Officers would continue to monitor the 20mph network to establish speed and casualty trends over a longer period of time.
- 3) To approve the proposed consultation on extending the 20mph network, as outlines in 5.3 and 5.8 of the report, and the consultation network extension shown in the map in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 4) To recognise the importance of targeted traffic calming measures in terms of controlling vehicle speeds in 20mph areas, and agreed 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.
- 5) To acknowledge the ongoing concern over current levels of enforcement by Police Scotland when it came to local speed limits, and agreed the Convener should write to the new Area Commander to raise this concern.
- 6) To agree that Officers would examine existing research on driver Behavioural Trends to understand why driver's do not adhere to the 20mph speed limit.
- 7) To agree that Officers would check if Ferry Road West of Aboretturn Road was a 20mph speed limit and if it would be changed to a 30mph speed limit in the future.
- 8) To provide an update to Committee on the motion from Councillor Lang on Reducing Speed Limits on Rural Roads.

(References –report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted)

## 16. Motion by Councillor Macinnes – Severe Climate Change Impact

---

### a) Ward Councillor Macinnes

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed that Councillor Macinnes could speak in support of her Motion - Motion by Councillor Macinnes – Severe Climate Change Impact.

Ward Councillor Macinnes spoke in support of her motion. She expressed concern about the impact that climate change was having on people's lives, and noted that the root problems of climate change have to be identified and tackled to stop the destruction of the planet. She advised that the news from Pakistan regarding climate change had identified that immediate action should be taken there and across the planet. She noted that she brought forward her motion so that work could be done quickly and efficiently, and recommendations from strategic plans such as the City Mobility Plan and the Low Emission Zone could be implemented as soon as possible. She advised that short-term solutions were no longer a viable option, and long-term solutions should be implemented as soon as possible.

**b) Motion by Councillor Macinnes – Severe Climate Change Impact**

The following motion by Councillor Macinnes was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Committee:

- 1) acknowledges that Summer 2022 has brought the UK many reminders of the devastating climate changes being created by how we live our lives. We have seen, for example, fires and flooding, as well as extreme weather events, occurring worldwide and close to home.
- 2) recognises the urgent need to move quickly towards the goals expressed in the city’s 2030 Net Zero Carbon Goals and to prevent any disruption towards that progress.
- 3) reaffirms its commitment to see the measures already agreed in key strategies, such as the City Mobility Plan, the Water Management Vision and the City Centre Transformation, acted upon as quickly as possible to help ensure that, here in Edinburgh, we do what we can to contribute to a better, more sustainable way of life which reduces the negative impact we have on our environment and the subsequent future of this city and its residents.
- 4) calls on this administration, and all councillors, to act effectively on matters of climate change and to keep our 2030 Net Zero Carbon Goals at the centre of decision-making at every level, alongside poverty reduction and the reduction of inequalities in the city.”

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes

- moved by Councillor McFarlane, seconded by Councillor Aston

**Amendment**

- 1) To acknowledge that Summer 2022 brought the UK many reminders of the devastating climate changes being created by how we lived our lives. We had seen, for example, fires and flooding, as well as extreme weather events, occurring throughout Europe and close to home.
- 2) To recognise the urgent need to move quickly towards the goals expressed in the city’s 2030 Net Zero Carbon Goals and to prevent any disruption towards that progress.
- 3) To reaffirm its commitment to see the measures already agreed in key strategies, such as the City Mobility Plan, the Water Management Vision and the City Centre Transformation, acted upon as quickly as possible to help ensure that, in Edinburgh, we do what we can to contribute to a better, more

sustainable way of life which reduced the negative impact we had on our environment and the subsequent future of this city and its residents.

- 4) To believe 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.
  - 5) To believe our 2030 Net Zero Carbon Goals should sit at the centre of the Committee's decision making during this term and therefore requested that Officers consider introducing a new standing section to all future Committee reports stating the linkage to the Climate Strategy.
- moved by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie, seconded by Councillor Lang

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McFarlane:

- 1) To acknowledge that Summer 2022 brought the UK many reminders of the devastating climate changes being created by how we lived our lives. We had seen, for example, fires and flooding, as well as extreme weather events, occurring worldwide and close to home.
- 2) To recognise the urgent need to move quickly towards the goals expressed in the city's 2030 Net Zero Carbon Goals and to prevent any disruption towards that progress.
- 3) To reaffirm its commitment to see the measures already agreed in key strategies, such as the City Mobility Plan, the Water Management Vision and the City Centre Transformation, acted upon as quickly as possible to help ensure that, in Edinburgh, we do what we can to contribute to a better, more sustainable way of life which reduced the negative impact we had on our environment and the subsequent future of this city and its residents.
- 4) To believe 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.
- 5) To believe our 2030 Net Zero Carbon Goals should sit at the centre of the Committee's decision making during this term and therefore requested that Officers consider introducing a new standing section to all future Committee reports stating the linkage to the Climate Strategy.

## **17. Emergency Motion by the SNP Group – Post-Strike Clean Up**

---

The Convener ruled that Standing Order 17(a) be suspended for the item to give consideration to the matter.

The Convener ruled that the following item, be considered as a matter of urgency to allow the Committee to give early consideration to the matter, in accordance with Standing Order 22.3(d).

The following motion by Councillor McFarlane was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Committee requests an urgent briefing for Councillors detailing what plans have been made to carry out the post-strike clean-up, the timeline of those plans, and how well execution is adhering to the plan so far.

The briefing should be issued to all Councillors by close of play Friday 2<sup>nd</sup> September and should set out:

- 1) A street cleansing work programme so that residents outwith the city centre and town centre high streets can establish when their neighbourhood is scheduled for additional cleansing.
  - 2) What additional council resource will be required to bring waste and cleansing operation back to regular service.
  - 3) How such plans will be reset or reimplemented following any subsequent strike.
  - 4) What are the current financial implications of such a clean-up on department budgets, and a further projection how may these be affected by further strikes.”
- moved by Councillor McFarlane, seconded by Councillor Aston

### **Amendment**

- 1) To note that industrial action was underway in Local Authorities across Scotland.
- 2) To thank staff for the commitment and professionalism that was shown in tackling the backlog of work that had arisen from the first period of strike action in Edinburgh.
- 3) To note the failure of the COSLA leadership and the Scottish Government to make a fair offer to trade unions.
- 4) To note that Unison was now balloting its member in City of Edinburgh Council for strike action, and this would impact on schools if successful.
- 5) To recognise the efforts of Officers to keep all elected members fully informed and updated, both on the impact of the strikes and the recovery plan, and asked that this proactive communication was maintained.

**Thursday, 18th August, 2022**

- 6) To agree that a recovery timeline could only be established once the industrial action was over.
  - 7) Believed it was critical for all steps to be taken to clear the backlog of waste and to return services to business-as-usual as soon as possible once the strike action was over.
  - 8) Calls on the COSLA leadership and the Scottish Government to make a fair offer to trade unions.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	5 votes
For Amendment	-	6 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Aston, Bandel, McFarlane, Miller and Work.

For the Amendment: Councillors Arthur, Cameron, Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Lang and Munro.)

### **Decision**

To approve the amendment by Councillor Arthur.