

Minutes

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday 23 May 2024

Present

Councillors Arthur (Convener), Aston, Bandel, Bruce (Substituting for Councillor Whyte, item 7.7), Dijkstra-Downie (except item 7.3), Dobbin, Faccenda, Hyslop, Lang, Mitchell (substituting for Councillor Whyte, except items 7.5, 7.7 & 9.3) Munro, O'Neill, Thornley (substituting for Councillor Dijkstra-Downie, item 7.3) and Whyte (Items 7.5 & 9.3).

In attendance

Councillor Beal (as Ward member in respect of item 7.1)

1. Deputations

(a) **Ratho Bus Working Group** (in relation to item 7.7 – Supported Bus Services)

The deputation expressed their disappointment with the proposal advising that they have not been provided with evidence that the proposal meets the supported bus criteria and whether the communities effected have been consulted and support the proposal. The deputation raised that the cost would be increased due to the need to purchase multiple tickets to complete a single trip. It was further raised that the proposal would create a risk to vulnerable public transport users being required to wait for buses in the dark or having to walk to a tram stop in the dark.

(b) **Scottish Youth Parliament** (in relation to item 7.7 – Supported Bus Services)

The deputation noted that a number of villages are separated with no public transport connecting them and without an accessible and reliable bus service the youth population would be required to rely on lifts from parents and guardians which may limit the ability for youth to take part in extracurricular activities and social activities. The deputation requested that the committee review the request for a direct bus route between the affected villages.

(c) **South Meadows Action Group** (in relation to item 8.2 – Communal Bin Review Update and item 9.2 -

Motion by Councillor Osler - Changes to Communal Bin Hub Location Criteria)

The deputation expressed concerns regarding the impacts that communal bins have such as; noise pollution, smell and pest nuisance, visual intrusion, loss of amenity, a change in the character of a conservation area, reduction in property values, and a severe increase in anxiety and stress as a result of these issues. The deputation raise a number of questions in their written submission for the committee and demanded a review to ensure proper mitigation of the issues and questions raised.

**(d) George Street Association
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation expressed a desire to see high quality changes while addressing the challenges in creating a net zero city. The deputation highlighted two aspects that they sought clarification over, the details of the proposed one-way system and the details on Experimental Traffic Regulation Order. The deputation also raised disappointment regarding those affected by the construction phase.

**(e) Scottish Private Hire Association
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation expressed concern regarding the pre-booked access element of the plan. It was felt that the requirement to pre-book access to the area by hirers who held a blue badge would add unnecessary complexity. The deputation raised that drivers believed the system proposed would be unworkable. Concerns were raised over whether a driver would be fined or face enforced action if a hirer has not pre-booked access or can't/won't provide proof of a blue badge, further acknowledging that not all with a disability have a blue badge. The deputation stated that the Scottish Private Hire Association is opposed to taxis and private hire cars being restricted from carrying out their lawful licensable activities.

**(f) Essential Edinburgh
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation raised concerns regarding the build phase and the impact on businesses in the city centre. The deputation expressed disbelief in the timeframes set out in the plan and requested that realistic timeframes be communicated to business that will be affected to allow for planning in reduced business. The deputation also requested rebates to assist business who loss income during the build phase.

**(g) Intercontinental Edinburgh The George
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation raised that the proposed plan has a hugely detrimental impact on the operation of The George highlighting that guests will not be able to get to the front door of the hotel and urged the committee to consider how guests arriving to stay at the hotel would access the hotel with luggage should they not be able to be dropped off at the entrance of the hotel. The deputation also raised that there are often a number of coaches required for their guests and if only one coach is permitted on George Street other coaches will be required to wait on Hanover Street adding to congestion. The deputation further raised that the construction phase of the plan will have a detrimental affect on the business of The George and requested the plan is paused until further consultation has taken place to identify a workable solution.

**(h) Kimpton Charlotte Square
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation noted that the work on Goerge Street is welcomed though raised issues regarding where coaches waiting for access to George street will wait and what impact will that have on other street; raised concerns regarding the times taxis and private hire cars will have access to George street as those proposed times do not reflects check in and check out times and that taxis using alternative streets to drop off or pick up will result in traffic congestion on surround streets.

**(i) Uber
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation raised concerns regarding the pre-booking system that will introduce an additional process for passengers creating a barrier to passengers booking private hire. The deputation noted that users with accessibility needs may not necessarily be eligible to hold a Blue Badge, may be unable to obtain one, or may choose not to obtain one and this may therefore have as adverse impacts on accessibility and equality.

**(j) Capital Cars
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation expressed positivity to the content of the report noting that there has been continued dialogue with users and stakeholders. The deputation raised concerns regarding accessibility during the daytime hours and accessibility for those with mobility issues. The deputation noted that there are a number of view some of which are conflicted and noted that not all views can

be addressed and the committee will have to find a compromise between the views.

**(k) GMB Union
(in relation to Item 7.5 – George Street and First New Town – Operational Plan and Project update.)**

The deputation requested that the time period for permitted access for all taxi and private hire car users be extended to 10am to accommodate hotel guests with heavy luggage. The deputation requested that there is consultation with drivers. Also raised concerns with the pre-booking system and advised that it would be unworkable. The deputation noted that they echoed the concerns raised by the other deputation regarding accessibility for those who do not hold a Blue Badge.

2. Petition for Consideration: Make Ellersly and Kinellan Roads Safer for Everyone

(a) Speakers for the petition

The speakers for the petition highlighted that Ellersly road is narrow with unfinished pavements with no safe crossing on the street. It was further noted that traffic has increased on the street leaving pedestrians at risk. The speakers raised that there is no speed limit enforcement increasing the risk. The speakers called for three actions to mitigate the risks; traffic calming, widening of the footway during the carriageway resurfacing scheduled in 2024, and develop a plan for a pedestrian crossing. The Speaker noted that community has expressed fear and frustration that little progress has been made to address safety concerns. The speakers requested that there be engagement with the residents of the roads to address the concerns raised.

(b) Councillor Beal (Ward Councillor)

Councillor Beal expressed his support for the petition and highlighted the concerns raised regarding the speed, amount of traffic and lack of safe crossing on Ellersly and Kinellan Road and that these presented a high risk to those using the road. Councillor Beal supported the three actions requested in the petition.

(c) Petition for consideration: Make Ellersly and Kinellan Roads Safer for Everyone

The committee was asked to consider a petition calling on the Council to implement traffic calming measures on both roads, widen the narrow footway on the north side of Ellersly Road and develop a plan for a pedestrian crossing

Decision

- 1) To request a report in two cycles on how the following changes could be delivered:

- 1.1) Traffic calming on Ellersly Road and Kinellan Road, recognising how this was an agreed commitment in the road safety report presented to committee in December 2022.
- 1.2) Widening the footway on the north side of Ellersly Road on a temporary basis pending any redetermination order for a permanent widening.
- 1.3) A new pedestrian crossing at the eastern end of Ellersly Road, including whether this could be considered through the new Local Traffic Improvement Programme, given this was identified in the pedestrian crossing prioritisation report to committee in August 2022.

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

3. Petition for Consideration: Existing bus service does not have enough capacity to take children to and from Lieth to Holy Rook High School

The committee was asked to consider a petition calling on the Council to reconsider the existing service and to provide a more reliable and timely service going forward.

Decision

- 1) To agree the Convener of Transport & Environment should write on behalf of the committee to Lothian Buses to make it aware of the petition and seek feedback on what options exist to improve bus services between Holy Rood High School and Leith.
- 2) To agree an officer report should return to the committee once a response has been received from Lothian Buses.

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

4. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 25 April 2024 as a correct record.

5. Work Programme

The Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme was presented.

Decision

To note the Work Programme.

(Reference – Work Programme 23 May 2024, submitted.)

6. Rolling Actions Log

The Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log was presented.

Motion

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:
 - Action 20 (2) – Strategic Business Case for an Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy
 - Action 23 (3) – Secure on-Street Cycle Parking Project – Progress Report
 - Action 24 – Communal Bin Review Update
 - Action 25 – Response to Motion by Councillor Osler - Flooding
 - Action 26 – Under 22 Concessionary Travel on Trams
 - Action 30 (1)– Response to Motion by Councillor Mowat – West Edinburgh Parking Dispensation
 - Action 31 (2) – George Street and First New Town Operation Plan and Project Update
 - Action 37(1&3)– Response to motion by Councillor Cowdy – Better Buses for Ratho
 - Action 38 (1)– Phased Reduction in use of Glyphosate
 - Action 43 – Litter Bin Siting
 - Action 46 (4) – Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions
 - Action 56 – Business Bulletin – Trams to Newhaven Update
 - Action 62 (2) – Incorrect Parking on the Tram Line
 - Action 66 (4) – Our Future Streets – a circulation plan for Edinburgh
 - Action 75 – Motion by Councillor Nicolson – Craigleith Green Blue Network
 - Action 77 – Motion by Councillor Caldwell – Reporting Broken Communal Bin Lids
 - Action 80 (1) – Work Programme
 - Action 81 (1) – Rolling Actions Log
 - Action 82 (1&7) – Business Bulletin (1)
- 2) To note the remaining outstanding actions.
 - moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:
 - Action 20 (2) – Strategic Business Case for an Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy
 - Action 23 (3) – Secure on-Street Cycle Parking Project – Progress Report
 - Action 24 – Communal Bin Review Update

- Action 25 – Response to Motion by Councillor Osler - Flooding
- Action 26 – Under 22 Concessionary Travel on Trams
- Action 30 (1)– Response to Motion by Councillor Mowat – West Edinburgh Parking Dispensation
- Action 31 (2) – George Street and First New Town Operation Plan and Project Update
- Action 37(1&3)– Response to motion by Councillor Cowdy – Better Buses for Ratho
- Action 38 (1)– Phased Reduction in use of Glyphosate
- Action 43 – Litter Bin Siting
- Action 46 (4) – Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions
- Action 56 – Business Bulletin – Trams to Newhaven Update
- Action 62 (2) – Incorrect Parking on the Tram Line
- Action 66 (4) – Our Future Streets – a circulation plan for Edinburgh
- Action 75 – Motion by Councillor Nicolson – Craighleith Green Blue Network
- Action 77 – Motion by Councillor Caldwell – Reporting Broken Communal Bin Lids
- Action 80 (1) – Work Programme
- Action 81 (1) – Rolling Actions Log
- Action 82 (1&7) – Business Bulletin (1)

2) To note the remaining outstanding actions.

3) To note the commitment made by the Convener at the 9 May 2024 Council meeting in response to a supplementary question on item 10.7 on pedestrian crossings, and requested that the business bulletin update be added as an action for the June 2024 meeting.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, the Amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:
 - Action 20 (2) – Strategic Business Case for an Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy
 - Action 23 (3) – Secure on-Street Cycle Parking Project – Progress Report
 - Action 24 – Communal Bin Review Update
 - Action 25 – Response to Motion by Councillor Osler - Flooding
 - Action 26 – Under 22 Concessionary Travel on Trams

- Action 30 (1)– Response to Motion by Councillor Mowat – West Edinburgh Parking Dispensation
 - Action 31 (2) – George Street and First New Town Operation Plan and Project Update
 - Action 37(1&3)– Response to motion by Councillor Cowdy – Better Buses for Ratho
 - Action 38 (1)– Phased Reduction in use of Glyphosate
 - Action 43 – Litter Bin Siting
 - Action 46 (4) – Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions
 - Action 56 – Business Bulletin – Trams to Newhaven Update
 - Action 62 (2) – Incorrect Parking on the Tram Line
 - Action 66 (4) – Our Future Streets – a circulation plan for Edinburgh
 - Action 75 – Motion by Councillor Nicolson – Craigleith Green Blue Network
 - Action 77 – Motion by Councillor Caldwell – Reporting Broken Communal Bin Lids
 - Action 80 (1) – Work Programme
 - Action 81 (1) – Rolling Actions Log
 - Action 82 (1&7) – Business Bulletin (1)
- 2) To note the remaining outstanding actions.
- 3) To note the commitment made by the Convener at the 9 May 2024 Council meeting in response to a supplementary question on item 10.7 on pedestrian crossings, and requested that the business bulletin update be added as an action for the June 2024 meeting.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, 23 May 2024, submitted)

7. Business Bulletin

Business Bulletin

The Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin was submitted.

Motion

To note the business Bulletin.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

Trams to New Haven – Tree planters

- 1) To note that there were concerns about the condition of the newly installed stone/concrete benches along the TTN route and that these were not in good condition even when first installed.

- 2) To agree that the condition of these benches would be assessed and reported back in the next six-monthly updated on TTN

7/7/7 Bus Lane – Development of a Trial

- 3) To welcome the update on what is a long-anticipated policy which has cross-party support.
- 4) To recognise however that trialling 7/7/7 operation on only bus route, while every other bus lane in the city continues to operate only at existing peak hours, could potentially cause substantial confusion and therefore requests that signage along the 44 route is not only updated but I also enhance and expanded to minimise this.

Circulation Plan – Our Future Streets

- 5) To note the disappointing update that a competitive bidding round for Sustrans funding may lead to delays in progressing this important project but noted that when the report was presented to Committee in February 2024 senior officers expressed the view that most of the measures required could be done through relatively low cost interventions such as TROs.
- 6) To recognise the enormous contribution that delivering the Circulation Plan – Our Future Street will have to reaching the CMP target of 30% reduction in car km by 2023
- 7) To therefore request a Business Bulletin update featuring a breakdown of the costs of the interventions required to deliver the Circulation Plan – Our Future Streets, in two cycles. Agreed that this update can instead form part of the report requested in the SNP amendment at item 7.5.

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

Amendment 2

Trams to New Haven – Tree planters

- 1) To recognise that this would materially impact the 'Incorrect Parking on the Tram Line' report at Rolling Action Log Item 62 and requested that Trams to Newhaven officers engage with Network Enforcement in advance of the publication of that report.
- 2) To recognise that trees were removed from the tram route and the planters were to meet a commitment at the start of the Project to ensure that trees are replaced, and therefore instructed officers that the 'vicinity' as outlined in 3. must include along the route where physically possible and access allows, including along the southern section of the route which has seen a significant reduction of trees notably at Balfour Street, Smith's Place and the Foot of the Walk.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, amendment 1 and amendment 2 were accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the Business Bulletin.

Trams to New Haven – Tree planters

- 2) To note that there were concerns about the condition of the newly installed stone/concrete benches along the TTN route and that these were not in good condition even when first installed.
- 3) To agree that the condition of these benches would be assessed and reported back in the next six-monthly updated on TTN
- 4) To recognise that this would materially impact the ‘Incorrect Parking on the Tram Line’ report at Rolling Action Log Item 62 and requested that Trams to Newhaven officers engage with Network Enforcement in advance of the publication of that report.
- 5) To recognise that trees were removed from the tram route and the planters were to meet a commitment at the start of the Project to ensure that trees are replaced, and therefore instructed officers that the ‘vicinity’ as outlined in 3. must include along the route where physically possible and access allows, including along the southern section of the route which has seen a significant reduction of trees notably at Balfour Street, Smith’s Place and the Foot of the Walk.

7/7/7 Bus Lane – Development of a Trial

- 6) To welcome the update on what is a long-anticipated policy which has cross-party support.
- 7) To recognise however that trialling 7/7/7 operation on only bus route, while every other bus lane in the city continues to operate only at existing peak hours, could potentially cause substantial confusion and therefore requests that signage along the 44 route is not only updated but I also enhance and expanded to minimise this if feasible.

Circulation Plan – Our Future Streets

- 8) To note the disappointing update that a competitive bidding round for Sustrans funding may lead to delays in progressing this important project but noted that when the report was presented to Committee in February 2024 senior officers

expressed the view that most of the measures required could be done through relatively low cost interventions such as TROs.

- 9) To recognise the enormous contribution that delivering the Circulation Plan – Our Future Street will have to reaching the CMP target of 30% reduction in car km by 2023
- 10) To therefore request a Business Bulletin update featuring a breakdown of the costs of the interventions required to deliver the Circulation Plan – Our Future Streets, in two cycles. Agreed that this update can instead form part of the report requested in the SNP amendment at item 7.5.

(Reference – Business Bulletin, 23 May 2024, submitted.)

8. Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy – Engagement Results

This report provided an update on the engagement on the Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy (WPL). Committee was asked to note the findings and agree the next steps.

Motion

- 1) To note the results of the public engagement exercise on the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy in Edinburgh.
- 2) To note the feedback which has been summarised in Appendix 1 of the report, and further feedback from discussions with businesses and representative groups in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note the proposed timescale for further consideration of a WPL.
- 4) To consider the proposed next steps (paragraph 5.1 of the report) and the funding options available to continue this work with the allocation of up to £100,000. If Committee agreed to support progressing to the next stage, this report would be referred to Finance and Resources Committee to identify funding for this (as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.6 of the report). If the use of reserves was agreed by Finance and Resources Committee, this would require referral to the Council for ratification.
- 5) To thank officers for a balanced report in answers to the request made by SNP/Green/Lib-Dem Councillors in September 2023.
- 6) To recommit Edinburgh to a just transition – it must move to a net-zero economy in a way that is fair and equitable for all, including workers, communities and the environment.
- 7) To note that the Labour Administration opposed this work progressing in September 2023 due to concerns that the predictable and non-trivial negative

impacts of a Workplace Parking Levy were not being adequately addressed by the Committee.

- 8) To regret, therefore, that other parties decided to proceed without addressing these.
- 9) To welcome, however, that the report provided an opportunity to pause and robustly address these concerns before spending £100,000 on the work described.
- 10) To agree that no further work should be undertaken on the Workplace Parking Levy until a plan is developed in partnership with Trade Unions, Employers and Community Councils to address the predictable and non-trivial negative impacts such as displacement parking and the impact of shift workers.

- Moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the results of the public engagement exercise on the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy in Edinburgh.
- 2) To note the feedback which has been summarised in Appendix 1 of the report, and further feedback from discussions with businesses and representative groups in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note the proposed timescale for further consideration of a WPL.
- 4) To consider the proposed next steps (paragraph 5.1 of the report) and the funding options available to continue this work with the allocation of up to £100,000. If Committee agreed to support progressing to the next stage, this report would be referred to Finance and Resources Committee to identify funding for this (as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.6 of the report). If the use of reserves was agreed by Finance and Resources Committee, this would require referral to the Council for ratification.
- 5) To note the results of the consultation, including that a majority of respondents support some form of WPL being introduced in Edinburgh.
- 6) To note that the report had identified many considerable benefits including progress towards the aims of CMP, including the target of 30% reduction in car km by 2030, and investment in sustainable projects for public transport and active travel.
- 7) to acknowledge the concerns of employee representative groups and recognises that there remained work to be done in collaborating with trade unions and other to address these concerns and to seek to resolve them, particularly as they relate to low paid workers and shift workers and that this will

- be tested in the development of an outline of a recommended Edinburgh WPL proposal.
- 8) to note that the report provided no disaggregation of different types of respondents (members of the public, employee representative groups, employers, representatives supporting sustainable travel, ect.) in the topline figures.
- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the results of the public engagement exercise on the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy in Edinburgh.
- 2) To note the feedback which has been summarised in Appendix 1 of the report, and further feedback from discussions with businesses and representative groups in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note the proposed timescale for further consideration of a WPL.
- 4) To note the committee believes that, following the commencement of new powers for local authorities to introduce a WPL, it was right that the Council undertook an open public consultation so residents, commuters, and businesses could express their views, and thanks those who responded.
- 5) To note that, while a WPL would likely generate some additional revenue for the Council, it remains unclear as to whether such a scheme would deliver a significant reduction in commuter car use given the statutory and voluntary exemptions, and the fact many employers will likely cover the cost for their employees.
- 6) To note that many parts of Edinburgh continue to suffer from a lack of available and frequent public transport, which is essential to providing an alternative to private car use for those affected by a WPL, and that there is no guarantee of any new bus services following the introduction of a WPL scheme.
- 7) To note the committee believes that the issues around the displacement of parking from places of work onto residential street remains a significant and unaddressed challenge from any citywide WPL scheme.
- 8) To note that while the vast majority of set-up costs for the Low Emission Zone were paid for by way of Scottish Government grant funding, no such funding currently exists for the next of future stages of introducing a WPL, and that the next immediate costs would have to come from reserves at a time of huge strain on public finances and likely further cuts from the Scottish Government.
- 9) To therefore agree, on the basis of the issues highlighted above, that a citywide WPL is no appropriate for Edinburgh at this time.

- 10) To note that committee nevertheless, believed the Council must continue to focus on effective measures which can encourage a shift from private car use towards more sustainable modes of travel, and therefore seeks a report in two cycles setting out the other legal and financial options available to the Council which can address, in particular, the substantial number of vehicles travelling into Edinburgh from outside of the local authority area each day.

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

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the results of the public engagement exercise on the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy in Edinburgh.
- 2) To note the results of the public engagement exercise were not fully representative to the city's demographic and future consultation should consider the inclusion of market research and in-depth consultation with trade unions (TUs) across the city and across different sectors.
- 3) To note the feedback which has been summarised in Appendix 1 of the report, and further feedback from discussions with businesses and representative groups in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 4) To note the proposed timescale for further consideration of a WPL.
- 5) To welcome the WPL which has the power to limit congestion, cut emissions and raise funds that can go towards strengthening the sustainable transport hierarchy.
- 6) To, from an equalities perspective, welcome that a WPL works towards levelling the playing field for those who already use public transport (for example, currently private car users park for free whilst employees who commute via bus in Edinburgh can pay up to £650 for an Adult Annual Advance Purchased Ridacard).
- 7) To request an independently facilitated forum to allow trade unions, officers and other appropriate stakeholders to engage in a dialogue about how a WPL can be designed to benefit workers with a view to finding a solution to outstanding TU concerns.
- 8) To request that funding decision are deferred until after the forum discussion – this would be in no later than four cycles.
- 4) To consider, with the above, the proposed next steps (paragraph 5.1 of the report) and the funding options available to continue this work with the allocation of up to £100,000. If Committee agreed to support progressing to the next stage, this report would be referred to Finance and Resources Committee to identify funding for this (as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.6 of the report).

If the use of reserves was agreed by Finance and Resources Committee, this would require referral to the Council for ratification.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor O'Neill

Amendment 4

- 1) To note the results of the public engagement exercise on the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy in Edinburgh.
 - 2) To note the feedback which has been summarised in Appendix 1 of the report, and further feedback from discussions with businesses and representative groups in Appendix 2 of the report.
 - 3) To note the proposed timescale for further consideration of a WPL.
 - 4) To consider that the introduction of a WPL would introduce additional and unnecessary costs for employers and potentially low paid workers acting as a further tax on jobs in Edinburgh.
 - 5) To consider that the use of £100,000 of taxpayers' money from reserves to further develop these unnecessary and damaging proposals would be a reckless and wasteful use of funds given the financial circumstances the Council faces over the coming years.
 - 6) To agree to take no further action on the development of a WPL.
- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 2, as adjusted, was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 3 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting – Round 1

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	–	4 votes
For Amendment 3 (as adjusted)	–	5 votes
For Amendment 4	–	2 votes

For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Arthur, Faccenda, Lang and Thornley
For Amendment 3 (as adjusted) – Councillors Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Hyslop and O'Neill

For Amendment 4 – Councillors Mitchell and Munro

Voting – Round 2

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted) – 6 votes
For Amendment 3 (as adjusted) – 5 votes

For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Arthur, Faccenda, Lang, Mitchell, Munro and Thornley

For Amendment 3 (as adjusted) – Councillors Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Hyslop and O’Neil

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the results of the public engagement exercise on the introduction of a Workplace Parking Levy in Edinburgh.
- 2) To note the feedback which has been summarised in Appendix 1 of the report, and further feedback from discussions with businesses and representative groups in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note the proposed timescale for further consideration of a WPL.
- 4) To consider the proposed next steps (paragraph 5.1 of the report) and the funding options available to continue this work with the allocation of up to £100,000. If Committee agreed to support progressing to the next stage, this report would be referred to Finance and Resources Committee to identify funding for this (as outlined in paragraphs 6.4 and 6.6 of the report). If the use of reserves was agreed by Finance and Resources Committee, this would require referral to the Council for ratification.
- 5) To note the results of the consultation, including that a majority of respondents support some form of WPL being introduced in Edinburgh.
- 6) To note that the report had identified many considerable benefits including progress towards the aims of CMP, including the target of 30% reduction in car km by 2030, and investment in sustainable projects for public transport and active travel.
- 7) To acknowledge the concerns of employee representative groups and recognises that there remained work to be done in collaborating with trade unions and other to address these concerns and to seek to resolve them, particularly as they relate to low paid workers and shift workers and that this will be tested in the development of an outline of a recommended Edinburgh WPL proposal.
- 8) To note that the report provided no disaggregation of different types of respondents (members of the public, employee representative groups, employers, representatives supporting sustainable travel, ect.) in the topline figures.

- 9) To note that, while a WPL would likely generate some additional revenue for the Council, it remains unclear as to whether such a scheme would deliver a significant reduction in commuter car use given the statutory and voluntary exemptions, and the fact many employers will likely cover the cost for their employees.
- 10) To note that many parts of Edinburgh and the surrounding area continue to suffer from a lack of available and frequent public transport, which is essential to providing an alternative to private car use for those affected by a WPL, and that there is no guarantee of any new bus services following the introduction of a WPL scheme.
- 11) To note the committee believes that the issues around the displacement of parking from places of work onto residential street remains a significant and unaddressed challenge from any citywide WPL scheme.
- 12) To note that while the vast majority of set-up costs for the Low Emission Zone were paid for by way of Scottish Government grant funding, no such funding currently exists for the next of future stages of introducing a WPL, and that the next immediate costs would have to come from reserves at a time of huge strain on public finances and likely further cuts from the Scottish Government.
- 13) To therefore agree, on the basis of the issues highlighted above, that a citywide WPL is not appropriate for Edinburgh at this time.
- 14) To note that committee nevertheless, believed the Council must continue to focus on effective measures which can encourage a shift from private car use towards more sustainable modes of travel, and therefore seeks a report in two cycles setting out the other legal and financial options available to the Council which can address, in particular, the substantial number of vehicles travelling into Edinburgh from outside of the local authority area each day.

In accordance with Standing Order 31.1, the recommendation was referred to Council for decision.

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

9. Secure On Street Cycle Parking Progress update

The report updated Committee on the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking project. This included an update on Phase One and Two installation, details of management and future contract arrangements, and details of the proposed subsidy trial.

Motion

- 1) To note the update on the Secure Street Cycle Parking project.
- 2) To agree to take forward the proposed “subsidy trial” but to rebrand this as a “marketing promotion” for one year only, noting that no later funding is currently

available after 2024/25, and being clear with residents that this may be a one-off exercise to encourage uptake of the scheme.

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

Amendment

- 1) To note the update on the Secure Street Cycle Parking project.
- 2) To agree the proposed subsidy trial, noting that funding is available in 2024/2025

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor O'Neil

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	–	2 votes
For the Amendment	–	9 votes

For the motion – Councillors Mitchell and Munro

For Amendment 1 – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Dijkstra-Downie, Hyslop, Faccenda, Lang and O'Neil

Decision

To approve the following Amendment by Councillor Bandel:

- 1) To note the update on the Secure Street Cycle Parking project.
- 2) To agree the proposed subsidy trial, noting that funding is available in 2024/2025

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

10. Goerge Street and First New town – Operational Plan

The report provided an update on the George Street and First New Town (GNT) project and sought approval for final amendments to the Operational Plan for George Street following the recommendations agreed at Transport and Environment Committee on 15 June 2023. The report also provided an update on the “Cross Streets” consultation (Hanover Street North, Fredrick Street and North Castle Street) and the independent accessibility work undertaken.

Motion

- 1) To note the update on the George Street and First New Town project.

- 2) To approve the amended Operational Plan for George Street with the following changes:
 - 2.1) 24/7 access for Blue Badge/ Taxicard holder using Licenced Taxi (Taxi) and Licensed Private Hire Cars (PHC) and permitted access for all Taxi and PHC users between the hours of 7pm and 6am (Monday-Sunday) to support nighttime safety and local economy;
 - 2.2) A maximum of one coach per block at any one times to serve hotels and venues on George Street; and
 - 2.3) A one-way system
 - 3) To approve that “access” arrangements for Taxi, PHC and Coaches be tested under an 18-month Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). The duration of the Loading and Servicing windows will also be included as part of the ETRO.
 - 4) To note the committee understands the concerns related to the proposed higher than originally envisaged numbers of Taxi and PHC vehicles entering the area as part of the trial.
 - 5) To agree that a mechanism would be put in place to allow the public, visitors and businesses to easily and rapidly report instances of poor driver behaviour observed during the trail, and that this would include the possibility of submitting images and video clips.
- moved be Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the update on the George Street and First New Town project.
- 2) To note the changes which are proposed to the design in the Operational Plan, and the compromises on the original design principles of prioritising pedestrian movement and active travel.
- 3) To further note the increased costs, with current projections of a further increase of £7.04m up to a total of £39.45m, making current estimates a 30% increase on the original costs estimated at design principles stage of £28m.
- 4) To recognise increasing capital costs to the council across all projects and the pressure this was putting on the capital programme.
- 5) To therefore agree to receive a further report, before proceeding to the next stage, which includes:
 - 5.1) An analysis of the current Operational Plan which compares the original design principles to the current proposals, noting clearly which principles

and outcomes will not be achieved or that will be compromised, including the impact on pedestrian movement and active travel.

- 5.2) A detailed financial breakdown of the current projected costs, the sunk costs, the opportunities for value engineering, and the expectations around funding partners or any funds already committed, alongside the expected capital costs which would be met by the council.
 - 5.3) Acknowledging that it is only partly a transport initiative with very strong placemaking and economic development dimensions, alternative funding models which could be used to deliver the George Street and First New Town, such as potential for a Growth Accelerator Model, drawing in developer contributions and private sector funding, and possibly Transient Visitor Levy revenue.
 - 5.4) A cost-benefit analysis focusing on deliverable outcomes from this project, and an opportunity cost analysis which sets out what alternative projects could be delivered if funding was reallocated, including an assessment of what these other projects will contribute to the aims of CMP such as modal shift/30% reduction in car km by 2030.
- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the update on the George Street and First New Town project.
 - 2) To note the concern expressed over the unfunded elements of the project when committee last considered this item in June 2023, and the impact this could have on the delivery of other active travel projects.
 - 3) To note the financial analysis section which confirms how estimated construction costs have risen by a further £7 million in less than a year, bringing further financial pressures on the project.
 - 4) To continue to recognise the considerable benefits of the project as a whole, but believes the projects represents a significant and growing financial risk on the Council's limited budget.
 - 5) To therefore agree it would be inappropriate to progress further with this project at this stage when such financial uncertainty exists.
- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the update on the George Street and First New Town project.

- 2) To note that the George Street project is a key element of the City Centre West East Link (CCWEL) and was designed to be a cycle street where “cars are guests”.
 - 3) To express concern that granting access to all Taxi and PHC users between the hours of 7pm and 6am (Monday-Sunday) would compromise this principle as well as cyclists’ safety and the street’s attractiveness.
 - 4) To further express concern that the controlled bollards would not be operational between the hours of 7pm and 6am which risks opening up the street to general traffic in the evenings and at night.
 - 5) To note that construction is not projected to finish until late 2028, more than four years from now. Therefore, requested officers to bring forward proposals for an alternative temporary cycle route that will link up CCWEL in the interim and report back within six months.
 - 6) To approve the amended Operational Plan for George Street with the following changes:
 - 6.1) 24/7 access for Blue Badge/ Taxicard holders using Licenced Taxi (Taxi) and Licensed Private Hire Cars (PHC).
 - 6.2) A maximum of one coach per block at any one times to serve hotels and venues on George Street; and
 - 6.3) A one-way system
 - 7) To approve that “access” arrangements for Taxi, PHC and Coaches be tested under an 18-month Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO). The duration of the Loading and Servicing windows will also be included as part of the ETRO.
- moved by Councillor Bandel seconded by Councillor O’Neil

Amendment 4

- 1) To note the update on the George Street and First New Town project
- 2) To note with concern that the Background Reading section of the report showed that the project has been ongoing for over eight years and that the projected Programme at this stage indicates at least another five years to completion: even this 13-year timeframe, spanning four Council terms, remains plagued with risk and uncertainty.
- 3) To further note with concern that the projected cost of the scheme has escalated by an additional 22% when the Council has scarce Capital and Revenue funding available and alternative priorities are unfunded such as repair/replacement of buildings affected by RAAC concrete, recasting of the Council estate to be the right size and fit for purpose while contributing to Net

Zero targets and provide for much needed maintenance and repair of current assets such as footways and roads throughout the City.

- 4) To notes that there remained considerable business concerns about the potential for disruption and delay in construction over at least two years, the operation of the scheme in relation to access for deliveries and servicing, and the operation of hotels in the area. These concerns over potential loss of income offset unfavourably with the projected Value Add of £95m given that this would take 20 years to develop post implementation and is likely to only be twice the cost of the project.
 - 5) To agree to discontinue work on the scheme to undertake a full review of alternative, significantly less costly measures, that ensure access for New Town residents and businesses is unharmed and that those with Blue Badge or other mobility issues have unfettered access that does not require a complex and untested booking system.
- moved by Councillor Whye, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1 and Amendment 3, as adjusted were accepted as addenda to the adjusted motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	–	7 votes
For Amendment 2	–	2 votes
For Amendment 4	–	2 votes

For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Faccenda, Hyslop and O’Neil

For Amendment 2 – Councillors Dijkstra-Downie and Lang

For Amendment 4 – Councillors Munro and Whyte

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the update on the George Street and First New Town project.
- 2) To agree to progress works to stage 4. TROs will be prepared but not promoted. There will be no ETROs at present. As per the below there will be a further report in 2 cycles. This report will address Best Value, the funding source and where the project sits in relation to other strategies such as the city mobility plan.
- 3) To note that the George Street project is a key element of the City Centre West East Link (CCWEL) and was designed to be a cycle street where “cars are guests”.

- 4) To express concern that granting access to all Taxi and PHC users between the hours of 7pm and 6am (Monday-Sunday) would compromise this principle as well as cyclists' safety and the street's attractiveness.
- 5) To further express concern that the controlled bollards would not be operational between the hours of 7pm and 6am which risks opening up the street to general traffic in the evenings and at night.
- 6) To note that construction is not projected to finish until late 2028, more than four years from now. Therefore, requested officers to bring forward proposals for an alternative temporary cycle route that will link up CCWEL in the interim and report back within six months.
- 7) To note the changes which are proposed to the design in the Operational Plan, and the compromises on the original design principles of prioritising pedestrian movement and active travel.
- 8) To further note the increased costs, with current projections of a further increase of £7.04m up to a total of £39.45m, making current estimates a 30% increase on the original costs estimated at design principles stage of £28m.
- 9) To recognise increasing capital costs to the council across all projects and the pressure this was putting on the capital programme.
- 10) To therefore agree to receive a further report, in two cycles, which includes:
 - 10.1) An analysis of the current Operational Plan which compares the original design principles to the current proposals, noting clearly which principles and outcomes will not be achieved or that will be compromised, including the impact on pedestrian movement and active travel.
 - 10.2) A detailed financial breakdown of the current projected costs, the sunk costs, the opportunities for value engineering, and the expectations around funding partners or any funds already committed, alongside the expected capital costs which would be met by the council.
 - 10.3) Acknowledging that it is only partly a transport initiative with very strong placemaking and economic development dimensions, alternative funding models which could be used to deliver the George Street and First New Town.
 - 10.4) A cost-benefit analysis focusing on deliverable outcomes from this project, and an opportunity cost analysis which sets out what alternative projects could be delivered if funding was reallocated, including an assessment of what these other projects will contribute to the aims of CMP such as modal shift/30% reduction in car km by 2030.

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

11. Review of London Road Junction and Picardy Place

The report sought approval to implement proposed changes where were designed to improve capacity at Picardy Place and provide an eastward movement from Leith Walk at the London Road junction using the Tram to Newhaven Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO).

Additionally the report sought approval to commence the necessary legal processes to implement the changes permanently through a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).

Motion

- 1) To note that a review had been ongoing since Tram to Newhaven open for revenue service commenced in June 2023 of the London Road junction and Picardy Place area
 - 2) To note that the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is fundamental to both the design of the tram scheme and its operation.
 - 3) To approve changes to London Road at the junction with Leith Walk following ongoing monitoring of Picardy Place with the use of current Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) in the short term
 - 4) To approve the commencement of the statutory procedures for the TRO necessary to introduce the left hand turn from Leith Walk to London Road.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the impact that the current arrangements are having on public transport, in particular bus services entering the junction from Leith Street.
 - 2) To note however that the report does not address the issue of road safety, particularly for pedestrians, at the London Road junction and recognises that this is concerning because the crossing infrastructure at that junction has been considerably altered since prior to the left turn from Leith Walk being banned.
 - 3) To agree therefore to continue the report for one cycle to allow for that additional information to be added so that Committee can make a fully informed decision on proposed changes to the TTRO.
 - 4) To note concerns that patchy enforcement of existing restrictions on vehicles, particularly coaches and delivery vehicles, at Baxter's Place/Greenside Place is also contributing to difficulties with operation of the current layout and agrees that these issues will be raised with the DPE contractor.
- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

- 1) To note that a review had been ongoing since Tram to Newhaven open for revenue service commenced in June 2023 of the London Road junction and Picardy Place area
 - 2) To note that the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is fundamental to both the design of the tram scheme and its operation.
 - 3) To note committee believed that approving changes at this stage would be premature, therefore requested monitoring Information on bus delays and pedestrian volumes at the junction to later make a decision in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy.
 - 4) To request that further information comes back in a report (alongside the proposed changes to the Trams to Newhaven TRO) detailing evidence for the stated impact on public transport
 - 5) To note committee recognised this route as an incredibly busy active travel route, also asks that officers considered increasing the minimum green time for pedestrians and cyclists crossing at London Road to improve safety and maximise the sustainable transport hierarchy
- moved by Councillor O'Neil, seconded by Councillor Bandel

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion – 6 votes

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) – 5 votes

For the motion – Councillors Arthur, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Lang, Munro and Whyte

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) – Councillors Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Hyslop and O'Neil

Decision

To approve the following motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note that a review had been ongoing since Tram to Newhaven open for revenue service commenced in June 2023 of the London Road junction and Picardy Place area
- 2) To note that the implementation of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is fundamental to both the design of the tram scheme and its operation.
- 3) To approve changes to London Road at the junction with Leith Walk following ongoing monitoring of Picardy Place with the use of current Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) in the short term

- 4) To approve the commencement of the statutory procedures for the TRO necessary to introduce the left hand turn from Leith Walk to London Road.

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

12. Supported Bus Services – West Edinburgh

The report provided detailed of tender returns for supported bus services in West Edinburgh.

Motion

- 1) To approve the following contracts for supported bus services in West Edinburgh (note route reference numbers in Appendix 2 of the report):
 - 1.1) SBSR_1A – The Gyle to Hermiston P&R via Ratho, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.2) SBSR_4A – Queensferry to The Gyle, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.3) SBSR_5A – Cramond to Balerno, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.4) SBSR_6A – Wester Hailes to Chesser, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.5) SBSR_7A – The Gyle to Clermiston, 75 minute frequency - Handicabs Lothian.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To approve the following contracts for supported bus services in West Edinburgh (note route reference numbers in Appendix 2 of the report):
 - 1.1) SBSR_1A – The Gyle to Hermiston P&R via Ratho, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.2) SBSR_4A – Queensferry to The Gyle, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.3) SBSR_5A – Cramond to Balerno, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.4) SBSR_6A – Wester Hailes to Chesser, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.5) SBSR_7A – The Gyle to Clermiston, 75 minute frequency - Handicabs Lothian.
- 2) To note disappointment that details relating to the tendering of supported bus contracts had been published with insufficient time for changes to be made and that the process had provided neither a direct bus link from Ratho to the city

centre, even only at peak times, nor a more frequent service than the hourly one proposed, because of the proximity to the end of the existing contract. Furthermore, noted that the nature of the indirect service proposed may lead to safety concerns and did not adequately reflect gender budgeting priorities, given that the Gyle Centre, the location of the proposed interchange, closes at 8pm during the week and at 6pm at the weekends.

- 3) To note that this is despite the fact that Ratho is among the communities most poorly served by public transport in the city.
 - 4) To ask officers to continue engaging with the residents of Ratho and other communities affected by this report and to investigate what options there are for addressing concerns about proposed services, such as the continued lack of direct Ratho to city centre service, within the framework of the DPS.
 - 5) To agree that securing a direct Ratho to city centre service will be a key aim when these contracts are retendered
- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

- 1) To approve the following contracts for supported bus services in West Edinburgh (note route reference numbers in Appendix 2 of the report):
 - 1.1) SBSR_1A – The Gyle to Hermiston P&R via Ratho, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.2) SBSR_4A – Queensferry to The Gyle, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.3) SBSR_5A – Cramond to Balerno, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.4) SBSR_6A – Wester Hailes to Chesser, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.5) SBSR_7A – The Gyle to Clermiston, 75 minute frequency - Handicabs Lothian.
- 2) To note how these routes can be delivered within the overall funding allocated for supported services but recognises how this will continue to leave Ratho without a direct bus into Edinburgh city centre, a situation which cannot be considered acceptable.
- 3) To note that, while the 2024/29 budget framework for the Council assumed no expectation of receipt of an annual Lothian Buses dividend, Lothian Buses announced on 28 March 2024 that it would return dividends of £3.2 million to its shareholders this year.
- 4) To therefore request that the report on appointing tenders for the remaining supported buses is used to include information on how unbudgeted monies

received from Lothian Buses dividends could be reinvested to help widen the range of supported services, including a direct Ratho-city centre link.

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

Amendment 3

- 1) To approve the following contracts for supported bus services in West Edinburgh (note route reference numbers in Appendix 2 of the report):
 - 1.1) SBSR_1A – The Gyle to Hermiston P&R via Ratho, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.2) SBSR_4A – Queensferry to The Gyle, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.3) SBSR_5A – Cramond to Balerno, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.4) SBSR_6A – Wester Hailes to Chesser, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.5) SBSR_7A – The Gyle to Clermiston, 75 minute frequency - Handicabs Lothian.
 - 2) To note regret that a direct bus from Ratho to the city centre is not possible at this present time.
 - 3) To note Council will revisit this option when more funding becomes available.
 - 4) To note Council acknowledged that passengers in other outlying areas of the city including East and Midlothian council areas can travel on Lothian buses to the city centre for a single fare of £2.
 - 5) To agree Council will therefore look to investigate the possibility of a combined bus/tram through ticket from Ratho to the city centre via A8/Gyle and combined bus through ticket via Hermiston Park and Ride that will only cost £2, and report back to committee within one cycle.
- moved by Councillor Bruce, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1, as adjusted, Amendment 2 and Amendment 3, as adjusted, were accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To approve the following contracts for supported bus services in West Edinburgh (note route reference numbers in Appendix 2 of the report):
 - 1.1) SBSR_1A – The Gyle to Hermiston P&R via Ratho, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;

- 1.2) SBSR_4A – Queensferry to The Gyle, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.3) SBSR_5A – Cramond to Balerno, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.4) SBSR_6A – Wester Hailes to Chesser, hourly frequency - Lothian Buses;
 - 1.5) SBSR_7A – The Gyle to Clermiston, 75 minute frequency - Handicabs Lothian.
- 2) To note that this is despite the fact that Ratho is among the communities most poorly served by public transport in the city.
 - 3) To ask officers to continue engaging with the residents of Ratho and other communities affected by this report and to investigate what options there are for addressing concerns about proposed services, such as the continued lack of direct Ratho to city centre service, within the framework of the DPS.
 - 4) To agree that securing a direct Ratho to city centre service will be a key aim when these contracts are retendered.
 - 5) To note how these routes can be delivered within the overall funding allocated for supported services but recognises how this will continue to leave Ratho without a direct bus into Edinburgh city centre, a situation which cannot be considered acceptable.
 - 6) To note that, while the 2024/29 budget framework for the Council assumed no expectation of receipt of an annual Lothian Buses dividend, Lothian Buses announced on 28 March 2024 that it would return dividends of £3.2 million to its shareholders this year.
 - 7) To therefore request that the report on appointing tenders for the remaining supported buses is used to include information on how unbudgeted monies received from Lothian Buses dividends could be reinvested to help widen the range of supported services, including a direct Ratho-city centre link.
 - 8) To note regret that a direct bus from Ratho to the city centre is not possible at this present time.
 - 9) To note Council will revisit this option when more funding becomes available.
 - 10) To note Council acknowledged that passengers in other outlying areas of the city including East and Midlothian council areas can travel on Lothian buses to the city centre for a single fare of £2.
 - 11) To agree Council will therefore look to investigate the possibility of a combined bus/tram through ticket from Ratho to the city centre via A8/Gyle and combined bus through ticket via Hermiston Park and Ride that will only cost £2, and update committee via the Business Bulletin.

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

13. Neighbourhood Environmental Services Policy Assurance Statement

The report provided an update on the latest annual review of the Neighbourhood Environmental Services policy guidebook, in line with the Council's policy assurance procedures to ensure that it remains accurate and relevant, and that it continues to support the efficient and equitable delivery of the front-line services.

Motion

- 1) To note that the current policies detailed in the report had been reviewed and were considered as being current, relevant and fit for purpose
 - 2) To approve the updates to the policies.
- Moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment

- 1) To note that the current policies detailed in the report had been reviewed and were considered as being current, relevant and fit for purpose
 - 2) To note that fly tipping is a scourge across the city but that the report does not mention fly tipping explicitly.
 - 3) To note committee understood that NES would directly clear fly tipping from public domain, roadside, footpath, etc, but it is Housing's responsibility to raise requests for clearing fly tipping from HRA land, and that Housing is re-charged accordingly. As a result, fly tipping from HRA land can build up before being cleared.
 - 4) To request that prior to the next iteration of the Policy Assurance Update, Officers prepare a report proposing a policy/sub-policy in respect of addressing fly tipping across all estates, including potential enforcement options.
 - 5) To request that the Interim Weeds Control Sub-Policy is further updated to include how the Council might promote and support the benefits of adopting the pesticide free approach (as adopted by Pesticide Free Balerno) to other residents, resident groups and resident associations across the city.
 - 6) To approve the other updates accordingly.
- moved by Councillor Dobbin, seconded by Councillor Aston

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, the Amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note that the current policies detailed in the report had been reviewed and were considered as being current, relevant and fit for purpose
- 2) To note that fly tipping is a scourge across the city but that the report does not mention fly tipping explicitly.
- 3) To note committee understood that NES would directly clear fly tipping from public domain, roadside, footpath, etc, but it is Housing's responsibility to raise requests for clearing fly tipping from HRA land, and that Housing is re-charged accordingly. As a result, fly tipping from HRA land can build up before being cleared.
- 4) To request that prior to the next iteration of the Policy Assurance Update, Officers prepare a report proposing a policy/sub-policy in respect of addressing fly tipping across all estates, including potential enforcement options.
- 5) To request that the Interim Weeds Control Sub-Policy is further updated to include how the Council might promote and support the benefits of adopting the pesticide free approach (as adopted by Pesticide Free Balerno) to other residents, resident groups and resident associations across the city.
- 6) To approve the other updates accordingly.

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

14. Communal Bin Review Update

The report provided an update on the delivery and monitoring of the Communal Bin Review project and the implementation of increased collection schedules. The report also provided an update on the timelines for implementation and seeks approval to revise the timescale of the project to allow the roll-out to continue in the areas of Phase 5.

The report also provided an update on the outcome of the review of bin hub locations for Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and A as per Appendix 3 of the report, in-line with the review framework approved by Committee in May 2023. The report also responds to the motion agreed by Council (21 March 2024) in regard to reporting broken communal bin lids.

Motion

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring update for Phase 1, 2 and 3.
- 2) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out.

- 3) To note that bin hub location in Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and A had been reviewed inline with the Review Framework agreed in May 2023 and the outcomes are illustrated in Appendix 3 of the report.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring update for Phase 1, 2 and 3.
- 2) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out.
- 3) To note that bin hub location in Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and A had been reviewed inline with the Review Framework agreed in May 2023 and the outcomes are illustrated in Appendix 3 of the report.
- 4) To agree that the final recommendation (expected in the Autumn) following the gull proof bag trial in the New Town should take cognisance and assess any unintended impact on those residents with communal bin provision on the borders of the trial area including, if necessary, potential long term mitigations that could be incorporated in their waste provision.
- 5) To agree that Officers recommend an additional location criterion for siting a bin hub at sufficient distance from hospitality venues (café, restaurant, bar, etc) so that there is no impact on the operation of the venue.

- moved by Councillor Dobbin, seconded by Councillor Aston

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring update for Phase 1, 2 and 3.
- 2) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out.
- 3) To note that bin hub location in Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and A had been reviewed inline with the Review Framework agreed in May 2023 and the outcomes are illustrated in Appendix 3 of the report.
- 4) To note that while the review has been successful in addressing the lack of capacity for residents to recycle, the level of recyclable material found in the non-recyclable bins continues to be high.
- 5) To request that officers bring forward proposals for behavioural change initiatives to educate householders and encourage them to recycle more as part of the next report on waste and recycling.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor O'Neill

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring update for Phase 1, 2 and 3.
- 2) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out.
- 3) To note that bin hub location in Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and A had been reviewed inline with the Review Framework agreed in May 2023 and the outcomes are illustrated in Appendix 3 of the report.
- 4) To nevertheless agree a further review of the Review Framework is necessary to allow consideration for:
 - 4.1) Allowing the use of the crossing the road parameter in conjunction with the walking distance parameter;
 - 4.2) Accepting there can be exceptional or pertaining circumstances for siting a hub across a road, away from homes without a formalised footway or marginally beyond the existing framework's walking distances, which could be agreed with residents, councillors, and officers.
 - 4.3) Taking into account the impact of hub locations on amenity for residential houses and flats as well as businesses with a tables/chairs permit for outdoor eating and drinking.
- 5) To agree to launch an engagement exercise, akin to Phases 4 and 5A, for Phases 1, 2, 3, and A to understand residents' and businesses' feelings and experiences towards the existing and reviewed hubs whilst remaining open to a further review any locations.
- 6) To note that on the 8th of February 2024, the full Council agreed:

'To ask officers to investigate whether routing demands could allow for emptying of bin hubs to start later in the morning, and/or whether routes could be amended, rotated or reversed so that the same residents' bins were not always collected first, and the early collections were distributed more equitably.'

'To agree that adjustments and/or interventions should be urgently considered to mitigate against the noise generated by glass recycling bins'

'To agree that noise mitigations for all bin lids should be considered as well.'

'... that an update should be provided to Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles via the Business Bulletin or as part of a Communal Bin Review report.'

- 6.1) To note that neither the Business Bulletin nor Communal Bin Review Update report addressed any of these issues, and therefore agreed that officers would bring an interim update report to Transport & Environment Committee on 20th June 2024 to satisfy the request of Council.
 - 7) To agree to consult with the residents and businesses of each area noted in 5C (Broughton, Dean, Learmonth, St Stephen, The Atholls, and West End) before any TRO is launched, and agree continued engagement with Ward councillors, Group spokespeople, and Community Councils during the development of proposals.
 - 8) To note the content of Appendix 1 of the report and agree that the next full update report on the Communal Bin Review to Transport and Environment Committee would break down the comparisons per Phase to gain a clearer understanding of whether areas are improving or declining.
- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1 as adjusted and Amendment 2 as adjusted were accepted as addenda to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted) – 7 votes

For Amendment 3 – 4 votes

For the motion – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Faccenda, Hyslop and O'Neil

For Amendment 3 – Councillors Dijkstra-Downie, Lang, Mitchell and Munro

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring update for Phase 1, 2 and 3.
- 2) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out.
- 3) To note that bin hub location in Phases 1, 2, 3, 4 and A had been reviewed inline with the Review Framework agreed in May 2023 and the outcomes are illustrated in Appendix 3 of the report.

- 4) To agree that the final recommendation (expected in the Autumn) following the gull proof bag trial in the New Town should take cognisance and assess any unintended impact on those residents with communal bin provision on the borders of the trial area including, if necessary, potential long term mitigations that could be incorporated in their waste provision.
- 5) To agree that Officers recommend an additional location criterion for siting a bin hub at sufficient distance from hospitality venues (café, restaurant, bar, etc) which reflects the potential impact on the venue within the context of residential amenity.
- 6) To note that while the review has been successful in addressing the lack of capacity for residents to recycle, the level of recyclable material found in the non-recyclable bins continues to be high.
- 5) To request that officers bring forward proposals for behavioural change initiatives to inform householders and encourage them to recycle more as part of the next report on waste and recycling.

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

15. Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2022/23

The report provided an overview of the 2022/23 benchmarking data provided by the Scottish Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) and reflects the recovery of Environmental services post Covid-19.

Decision

- 1) To note the report setting out the detailed analysis of the Local Government Benchmarking Framework (LGBF) Environmental dataset for the 2022/23 financial year

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

16. Motion by Councillor McKenzie – Roseburn to Union Canal

The following motion by Councillor McKenzie was submitted in terms of Standing Order 32:

Motion

- 1) To note that the Roseburn to Union Canal project is due to be completed in July and requests that the June Business Bulletin provides an update on the project timeline.
- 2) To note that the project did not provide an active travel connection between the West Approach Road/ Telfer Subway and the Union Canal, with this section

due to be delivered as part of the 'Dundee Street / Fountainbridge Active Travel Improvements Project'.

- 3) To note that it is believed that this gap would have a significant impact on the utility of the route, and requested that officers bring forward proposals for temporary measures to improve safety for walking, wheeling and cycling in the affected area, particularly in relation to the crossing of Dundee Street at Gibson Terrace.

- moved by Councillor McKenzie, seconded by Councillor Aston

Amendment 1

- 1) To note that the Roseburn to Union Canal project is due to be completed in July and requests that the June Business Bulletin provides an update on the project timeline.
- 2) To note that the project did not provide an active travel connection between the West Approach Road/ Telfer Subway and the Union Canal, with this section due to be delivered as part of the 'Dundee Street / Fountainbridge Active Travel Improvements Project'.
- 3) To note that it is believed that this gap would have a significant impact on the utility of the route, and requested that officers consult local Councillors (Ward 7 & 9) and Community Councils on the matter and table the Business Bulletin on the feasibility of installing temporary measures to improve safety for walking, wheeling and cycling in the affected area, particularly in relation to the crossing of Dundee Street at Gibson Terrace.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 2

- 1) To note that the Roseburn to Union Canal project is due to be completed in July and requests that the June Business Bulletin provides an update on the project timeline.
- 2) To note that the project did not provide an active travel connection between the West Approach Road/ Telfer Subway and the Union Canal, with this section due to be delivered as part of the 'Dundee Street / Fountainbridge Active Travel Improvements Project'.
- 3) To note that it is believed that this gap would have a significant impact on the utility of the route, and requested that officers bring forward proposals in one cycle via Business Bulletin for temporary measures to improve safety for walking, wheeling and cycling in the affected area, particularly in relation to the crossing of Dundee Street at Gibson Terrace.
- 4) To request officers consider and include in the Business Bulletin update:

- 4.1) How this work could be adopted under the existing Active Travel Improving Projects
- 4.2) Why this particular area was left out of the existing project work
- 4.3) What mitigation measures – temporary or permanent – could be discussed with Ward Councillors and relevant community council contacts, where appropriate.

- moved by Councillor O’Neil, seconded by Councillor Bandel

In accordance with Standing order 22.13, the Amendment 1 and Amendment 2 were accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McKenzie:

- 1) To note that the Roseburn to Union Canal project is due to be completed in July and requests that the June Business Bulletin provides an update on the project timeline.
- 2) To note that the project did not provide an active travel connection between the West Approach Road/ Telfer Subway and the Union Canal, with this section due to be delivered as part of the ‘Dundee Street / Fountainbridge Active Travel Improvements Project’.
- 3) To note that it is believed that this gap would have a significant impact on the utility of the route, and requested that officers consult local Councillors (Ward 7 & 9) and Community Councils on the matter and table the Business Bulletin on the feasibility of installing temporary measures to improve safety for walking, wheeling and cycling in the affected area, particularly in relation to the crossing of Dundee Street at Gibson Terrace.
- 4) To request officers consider and include in the Business Bulletin update:
 - 4.1) How this work could be adopted under the existing Active Travel Improving Projects
 - 4.2) Why this particular area was left out of the existing project work
 - 4.3) What mitigation measures – temporary or permanent – could be discussed with Ward Councillors and relevant community council contacts, where appropriate.

17. Motion by Councillor Osler – Changes to Communal Bin Hub Location Criteria

The following motion by Councillor Osler was submitted in terms of Standing Order 32:

- 1) To note that locations for bin hubs were selected via a desktop exercise.
 - 2) To note that there were minimal attempts to consult with residents in Phases 1, 2 & 3.
 - 3) To note that changes to the location criteria agreed by Committee in May 2023 relaxed the rules on distances but did not take into account the impact on residential amenity.
 - 4) To note that since May 2023 a number of bin hub locations in Phases 3 & 4 have been reviewed under the current May 2023 criteria. These reviews highlighted issues with the desktop exercise, the lack of consultation in Phase 3 and the negative impact on some residents' amenity.
 - 5) To agree, based on residents' feedback and lived experience, to instruct officers to take account of residential amenity as one of the review criteria, for any of the following:
 - 5.1) single aspect properties;
 - 5.2) main door properties;
 - 5.3) properties in cul-de-sacs, where there is no through traffic;
 - 6) To agree to permit a further review of phase 1-4 disputed bin hub locations, that meet any of the following:
 - 6.1) single aspect properties;
 - 6.2) main door properties;
 - 6.3) properties in cul-de-sacs, where there is no through traffic
- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment

- 1) To note that locations for bin hubs were selected via a desktop exercise.
- 2) To note that there were minimal attempts to consult with residents in Phases 1, 2 & 3.
- 3) To note that changes to the location criteria agreed by Committee in May 2023 relaxed the rules on distances but did not take into account the impact on residential amenity.
- 4) To note that since May 2023 a number of bin hub locations in Phases 3 & 4 have been reviewed under the current May 2023 criteria. These reviews highlighted issues with the desktop exercise, the lack of consultation in Phase 3 and the negative impact on some residents' amenity.

- 5) To note the committee respects residents' feedback and lived experience but notes officers' concerns about the workability of adding a residential amenity review criteria.
 - 6) To request therefore, a workshop with officers to investigate if a workable way to consider residential amenity as part of the review framework can be found.
- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor O'Neil

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion – 4 votes
 For the Amendment – 7 votes
 For the motion – Councillors Dijkstra-Downie, Lang, Mitchell and Munro

For the Amendment – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Faccenda, Hyslop and O'Neil

Decision

To approve the Amendment by Councillor Bandel:

- 1) To note that locations for bin hubs were selected via a desktop exercise.
- 2) To note that there were minimal attempts to consult with residents in Phases 1, 2 & 3.
- 3) To note that changes to the location criteria agreed by Committee in May 2023 relaxed the rules on distances but did not take into account the impact on residential amenity.
- 4) To note that since May 2023 a number of bin hub locations in Phases 3 & 4 have been reviewed under the current May 2023 criteria. These reviews highlighted issues with the desktop exercise, the lack of consultation in Phase 3 and the negative impact on some residents' amenity.
- 5) To note the committee respects residents' feedback and lived experience but notes officers' concerns about the workability of adding a residential amenity review criteria.
- 6) To request therefore, a workshop with officers, Community Council, Residents Groups and Ward Councillots to investigate if a workable way to consider residential amenity as part of the review framework can be found.

18. Motion by Councillor Lang – Grant to BioQuarter Tram and Funding Consultation

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

Motion

- 1) To note the committee's decision on 1 February 2024 to initiate a consultation on delivering a new tram line between Granton and BioQuarter.
 - 2) To note the decision was made on the basis of the financial impact analysis in section 6 of the report which stated that:
 - 2.1) £44 million was required for the development of an outline and final business case,
 - 2.2) "the Council has no funding allocated at present for such costs" and,
 - 2.3) it was "expected that Scottish Government / Transport Scotland would allocate funding".
 - 3) To note the publication of the 1 May 2024 letter from the Cabinet Secretary for Transport to Angus Robertson MSP, in which the Minister said financial support from the Scottish Government for the tram extension was "not affordable in the current fiscal climate nor in line with the recommendations of the tram inquiry."
 - 4) To note the committee believes this public position from the Scottish Government represents a material change of circumstances from the February committee decision in terms of how the significant costs of developing a business case for the Granton to Bioquarter tram line could be funded.
 - 5) To note the committee reaffirms its belief that further extensions to the tram are important to improving public transport and delivering modal shift but nevertheless believes it would be wrong to spend Council resource, both on a public consultation and on reviewing and evaluating responses to that consultation, in the absence of clarity on how the £44 million cost of developing an outline and final business case could be funded.
 - 6) To therefore agree to pause plans for the public consultation, and asks that officers return to committee at the earliest opportunity with a report on how the development of a final business case can be funded in the absence of Scottish Government funding.
- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment

- 1) To note the committee's decision on 1 February 2024 to initiate a consultation on delivering a new tram line between Granton and BioQuarter.
- 2) To note the decision was made on the basis of the financial impact analysis in section 6 of the report which stated that:
 - 2.1) £44 million was required for the development of an outline and final business case,

- 2.2) “the Council has no funding allocated at present for such costs” and,
 - 2.3) it was “expected that Scottish Government / Transport Scotland would allocate funding”.
- 3) To note the publication of the 1 May 2024 letter from the Cabinet Secretary for Transport to Angus Robertson MSP, in which the Minister said financial support from the Scottish Government for the tram extension was “not affordable in the current fiscal climate nor in line with the recommendations of the tram inquiry.”
 - 4) To notes that since the letter was sent, Council Officers have had constructive discussions with the Scottish Government on how to take foreword the mass rapid transit ambition detailed in their Strategic Transport Projects Review. As part of this process, different funding models are being considered to ensure the best outcome for the regional economy.
 - 5) To agree Scotland is at a crossroads where it’s response to the climate emergency is concerned, and investing in mass rapid transit in our capital city would be a massive step in the right direction.
 - 6) To agree that a meeting should be arranged with TEC members on this issue ASAP, and an update provided to the June Committee meeting.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	–	4 votes
For the Amendment	–	7 votes

For the motion – Councillors Dijkstra-Downie, Lang, Mitchell and Munro

For the Amendment – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dobbin, Faccenda, Hyslop and O’Neil

Decision

To approve the Amendment by Councillor Arthur

- 1) To note the committee’s decision on 1 February 2024 to initiate a consultation on delivering a new tram line between Granton and BioQuarter.
- 2) To note the decision was made on the basis of the financial impact analysis in section 6 of the report which stated that:
 - 2.1) £44 million was required for the development of an outline and final business case,
 - 2.2) “the Council has no funding allocated at present for such costs” and,

- 2.3) it was “expected that Scottish Government / Transport Scotland would allocate funding”.
- 3) To note the publication of the 1 May 2024 letter from the Cabinet Secretary for Transport to Angus Robertson MSP, in which the Minister said financial support from the Scottish Government for the tram extension was “not affordable in the current fiscal climate nor in line with the recommendations of the tram inquiry.”
 - 4) To notes that since the letter was sent, Council Officers have had constructive discussions with the Scottish Government on how to take foreword the mass rapid transit ambition detailed in their Strategic Transport Projects Review. As part of this process, different funding models are being considered to ensure the best outcome for the regional economy.
 - 5) To agree Scotland is at a crossroads where it’s response to the climate emergency is concerned, and investing in mass rapid transit in our capital city would be a massive step in the right direction.
 - 6) To agree that a meeting should be arranged with TEC members on this issue ASAP, and an update provided by September at the latest Committee meeting.

18. Cargo Bike Movement Funding

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

Motion

- 1) Notes with concern reports about Cargo Bike Movement (CBM) which has faced a £71k cut in funding from the Council and as a result will be forced to give staff notice of redundancy on 12th June 2024 and wind up operations unless emergency funding can be found.
 - 2) Notes and celebrates CBM’s significant contribution to the Council’s priorities to deliver net zero, promote sustainable travel, and promote the circular economy, including by:
 - Providing 2,500 days of cargo bike loans across the city
 - Redistributing Over 75 tonnes of food to organisations across Edinburgh
 - Saving 56 tonnes of carbon through the use of bikes in place of motorised transport
 - 3) Requests officers to urgently meet with and explore options for supporting CBM and provide an update to committee in one cycle.
- moved by Councillor Bandell, seconded by Councillor O’Neill

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Bandel.