

# Minutes

## Transport and Environment Committee

**10.00am, Thursday 18 November 2024**

### Present

Councillors Jenkinson (Convener), Aston, Booth, Osler (substituting for Councillor Lang for item 7 & 11), Dalglish (substituting for Councillor Faccenda (items 1-5), Dijkstra-Downie (except item 7), Glasgow, Hyslop, Lang (except item 7 & 11), Munro, O'Neill, Ross (substituting for Councillor Dijkstra-Downie for item 7 only), Watt (substituting for Councillor Faccenda items 6 onwards) and Whyte.

Also present: Councillors McKenzie (item 16) and Mitchell (item 7)

### 1. Deputation

---

**(a) Spokes Planning Group (in relation to item 6.1 on the agenda – Business Bulletin - Annual Update on Car Kilometres)**

The deputation noted that the statistics referred to in the “Annual update on car kilometres” showed that, unless something radically changed, it was now incredibly unlikely that the council would meet the 30% reduction by 2030 target. They believed that the figures clearly made the case for increased levels of active travel investment, and much faster implementation of projects in the pipeline such as the City Centre West East Link route, Meadows-George Street and Meadows-Canal.

The deputation indicated that there were cheaper and quicker interventions which were known to reduce car usage and enable people to walk, wheel and cycle more which included Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, which they felt should be rolled out citywide. They urged the Committee to consider increasing the reallocation of road space from private motor vehicles to sustainable modes of transport as a matter of course in all resurfacing projects, with particular importance at junctions which was to provide the space needed to create a continuous and coherent network of safe cycling routes.

(see item 5 below).

**(b) Citizen-led Bin Hub Committee (in relation to item 7.2 on the agenda – Communal Bin Hub Review)**

The deputation asked the Committee for flexible parameters and criteria allowing to review a bin case on individual basis instead of a robotic 'No' and welcomed the relaxation of rules: the 100m walking distance, crossing of a road, standing on the road, using wide pavements in certain instances and a 10m distance away from junctions and pedestrian crossing in a case of the dead-end streets with no traffic.

The deputation indicated that the five key elements they wished the Committee to consider were, alternative suitable locations, glass bins, food bins, overprovision and other reasonable adjustments. They urged the Committee to be open to becoming a community partner who designed similar projects to the bin hub one with a community collaboration, namely, a selected working group of residents who had an expertise/knowledge/experience relevant to a project so the best possible outcomes were achieved straight away for all the parties involved and the city and in return, the residents who participated in an initial project stage, could possibly be offered a council tax discount.

(see item 7 below).

**(c) South Meadows Action Group (in relation to item 7.2 on the agenda – Communal Bin Hub Review)**

The deputation indicated that the large number of Bin Hubs, their noisy, unsightly nature across dwelling entries and the general visual intrusion in a Conservation Area were serious issues to Marchmont Residents. They felt that all of the rules so far established by the Council were overly constricting, and had resulted in Bin Hub locations that were seriously upsetting to their members' health and well-being.

The deputation believed that the Council was currently failing in its statutory duties to protect the health, wellbeing and residential amenity of the people of Edinburgh and asked that it take immediate action to work with residents to improve what they felt was the flawed criteria.

(see item 7 below).

**(d) Bruntsfield Gardens Resident Group (in relation to item 7.2 on the agenda – Communal Bin Hub Review)**

The deputation felt that the planning criteria were not fair, were undemocratic and do not take enough account of the environmental impact of the barricade of six bins in a hub and asked the Committee to consider relaxing the one objection to relocation suggestions as part of the extra relocation criteria and to consider how the hub size could be reduced or modified to take account of the loss of amenity for residents and businesses.

The deputation indicated that they would prefer less bins as the current scheme had a detrimental impact on the resident community, was a waste of resources

and an unnecessary loss of parking and asked that a test be carried out with the removal and reduction of any unnecessary bins.

(see item 7 below).

**(d) Stair Association for 10-14 Bruntsfield Gardens (in relation to item 7.2 on the agenda – Communal Bin Hub Review)**

The deputation felt that the planning criteria were not fair/undemocratic in tenement locations and did not take enough account of the environmental impact of the barricade of six bins in a hub in Conservation Areas and asked the Committee to consider relaxing the one objection to relocation suggestions as part of the extra relocation criteria in the November 18th review framework 4.e. "The perceived impact is not transferred to another property." and to consider more fully how the hub size could be reduced or modified to take account of the loss of amenity for residents and businesses.

(see item 7 below).

**(e) LS Productions (in relation to item 8.2 on the agenda – Citywide Road Co-ordination – Revised Charging Structure)**

The deputation were concerned that the report named filming as an example of a 'complex event', requiring a £6,000 fee and a 6 month minimum lead time as they currently collaborated with Film Edinburgh and the council to obtain the correct permissions when filming on public roads, paid fees for permits (and any other associated costs) and adhered to lead times currently set out. They felt that inflating lead time requirements and cost would rule filming in the city out for most productions and Edinburgh would lose its ability to attract production to the city if it increased prices and lead times out of line with industry expectations and indicated that it was vital that Edinburgh continued to be attractive as a base for filming when productions were reviewing options across the UK.

The deputation urged the Committee to engage in a dialogue with Film Edinburgh and other representatives of the local film industry as required to consult on permissions, lead times and a charging structure in relation to filming activity on public roads and felt confident that a conclusion could be reached that solidified Edinburgh's popularity and reputation as a world class destination for filming whilst also contributing to the council's wider goals for road coordination.

(see item 11 below).

**(f) Living Streets Edinburgh (in relation to the Late Report – City Centre Ward Councillor – Cowgate)**

The deputation welcomed the motion by Councillor Mowat and the subsequent report to committee following the dreadful incident on the Cowgate on 2 November 2024. They indicated that the Cowgate had long been recognised as a dangerous street owing to its unique features and uses which was why the ban of traffic after 10pm was introduced more than 20 years ago.

The deputation also welcomed Police Scotland's recommendation to bring forward the traffic ban to start earlier than 10.00pm which would be a quick and cheap way to reduce some risks pedestrian-vehicle conflict and stressed that they had also long argued for much more stringent traffic restrictions in key Old Town streets including the Cowgate during the summer festivals when the mix of vehicles and pedestrians was often totally unsuitable. They urged the Committee to seize this moment to act quickly to ensure that people could use Cowgate and other Old Town streets safely.

(see item 9 below).

**(g) Longstone Community Council (in relation to item 9.2 on the agenda – Motion by Councillor McKenzie – Save the Burnside)**

The deputation indicated that Longstone has a mile -long barrier between themselves and the east of the city which was the Water of Leith and currently the Burnside path was the only link from them to the community in Stenhouse. They stressed that it was a well used path by people locally, had been there for a long time and was an important link locally that they wanted to see preserved.

The deputation was concerned that the footing of the retaining embankment wall was now badly undercut now and that the full force of the river, when it's in spate, was going to be battering into that cavity that was under the retaining wall. They felt that that there had not been a proper assessment done of the risk of what was happening to the foundations of the wall and that if the path itself, which was quite a narrow path, continued to erode, the land might become unusable.

The deputation urged the Committee to bring the path into a condition that was serviceable and protected it for the future.

(see item 16 below).

**(h) Spokes Planning Group (in relation to item 9.2 on the agenda – Motion by Councillor McKenzie – Save the Burnside)**

The deputation asked the Committee to consider liaising with the landowners to enable them to carry out the repairs to the path. They urged the Committee to carry out temporary repairs to the sinkhole so that there was no further erosion and to stabilise the wall which had been built to stop the river eroding the land any further until a more solid barrier could be installed.

(see item 16 below).

## 2. Minutes

---

### Decision

To approve the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 10 October 2024 as a correct record.

## 3. Work Programme

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme for November was presented.

### Decision

To note the Work Programme.

(Reference – Work Programme 18 November 2024, submitted.)

## 4. Rolling Actions Log

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log for November October was presented.

### Decision

1) To agree to close the following actions:

- **Action 15-** – Business Bulletin (School Travel Plans Workshop)
- **Action 17** – Response to motion by Councillor McFarlane – Tollcross Clock
- **Action 36(1) and (2)** – Motion by Councillor Mitchell – Bin Hubs Noise Mitigation
- **Action 43** – Rolling Actions Log (Trams From Granton to Bioquarter and Beyond)
- **Action 44(6b)** – Business Bulletin (Road Closure of Cammo Road)
- **Action 55** – Secure On-street Cycle Parking Progress Update
- **Action 60(3)** – Motion by Councillor McKenzie – Roseburn to Union Canal
- **Action 61** – Motion by Councillor Osler – Changes to Communal bin Hub Locations Criteria
- **Action 62** – Urgent Motion by Council Lang – Grant to BioQuarter Tram – Funding and Consultation
- **Action 70** – Motion by Councillor Flannery - Causey's non inclusion in current ATInP
- **Action 73** – Business Bulletin (Travel Tracker Update)

- **Action 79(4)** – Local Traffic Improvement delivery Programme
  - **Action 81** – Motion by Councillor Ross – Road Resurfacing and Resident Co-ordination
  - **Action 86 (1) and (2)** – Motion by Councillor Rust – Colinton Dell Footpath
  - **Action 89** – Rolling Actions Log (Travel Tracker)
  - **Action 90(2)** – Business Bulletin (Supported Bus Services)
  - **Action 97** – Motion by Councillor Thornley – West Edinburgh Link
  - **Action 100(1)** – Work Programme (Options for minimizing private vehicles traveling into Edinburgh daily)
  - **Action 100(1)** – Business Bulletin (Supported Bus Services – Dumbiedykes)
  - **Action 103** – Parkgrove Drive
- 2) **Action 88** - to agree that an update report be submitted to Committee in January 2025 based on the current draft proposals
- 3) To otherwise note the remaining outstanding actions.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, 18 November 2024, submitted)

## 5. Business Bulletin

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin for November was submitted.

### Decision

To note the Business Bulletin

(Reference – Business Bulletin, 18 November 2024, submitted.)

### Declaration of Interests

Councillor Booth made a transparency statement in regard to the above item (Annual Update on Car Kilometres) as a member of Spokes.

## 6. Petition for Consideration – Bellevue and Broughton Street Cleaning Service

---

- (a) The speakers for the petition indicated that they found the city uniformly dirty and on occasion filthy throughout time and were aware that the city council's street cleaning services were independently audited by Keep Scotland Beautiful using the LEAMS framework which presented extrapolations and generalizations about the effectiveness of the street cleaning service throughout Edinburgh. The petitioners had found the audit report and the generalizations about the effectiveness of the street cleaning service enshrined within that report absurd and risible and felt that it lacked internal validity

The petitioners contended that a higher standard of street cleaning was likely to be achieved if each cleaner was individually responsible for keeping a patch of streets clean to a specified benchmark standard and that the collective working practices of street cleaning teams made it impossible for managers at the council to hold individual workers to account for poor work and underperformance.

The petitioners proposed the creation of a street cleaning working party set up where representatives from perhaps every community council in Edinburgh came together, where councillors participated in it and by the exchange of ideas, by the exchange of thoughts, by listening to people, a street cleaning service that was something to be proud of could be achieved.

**(b) Report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services**

The Committee was asked to consider a petition calling on the Council to make revisions to the Bellevue and Broughton Street Cleaning Service to address concerns about the roads, litter, weeds, and broken paving stones in the Bellevue and Broughton areas.

**Decision**

To agree that the issues raised by the petitioner be addressed in the December Street Performance Report and that the wider geographical areas as identified by the Committee be included.

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

## **7. Communal Bin Review Update**

---

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed to hear a presentation from Ward Councillor Mitchell.

An update was provided on the Communal Bin Review (CBR) project which highlighted the engagement approach taken for Phase 5 Area A – Old Town and George Street corridor and responded to actions agreed by Committee in relation to the implementation of bin hubs. An updated review framework had been produced based on feedback from attendees at two workshops which sought to review the existing criteria and consider additional criterion relating to hospitality venues and resident amenity, including noise from glass recycling.

**Motion**

- 1) To note the engagement undertaken in Phase 5 Area A (Old Town and George Street Corridor) (Appendix 1 to the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place).

- 2) To note the outcomes from workshops arranged in response to actions previously agreed by the Council (Appendix 2 to the report).
- 3) Approve the updated review framework to be used when reviewing existing bin hub locations and/or determining the design and location of proposed bin hubs with the following amendments to (Appendix 3):

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

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

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

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

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

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

Adds at the end of Appendix 3, as guidance: Framework conditions are “should” and not “must”; and where possible, bin hubs should be relocated to an existing site which does not require a TRO whilst any new TRO is being processed.”
- 4) To approve the engagement approach and timeline for Phase 5 - Area B and C (New Town, West End and other areas within the World Heritage Site) (Appendix 4 to the report).
- 5) To approve the revised timeline for project delivery (Appendix 5 to the report).

- moved by Councillor Jenkinson, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment 1**

Committee:

- 1) To note the engagement undertaken in Phase 5 Area A (Old Town and George Street Corridor) (Appendix 1 to the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place),



- 2) To note the outcomes from workshops arranged in response to actions previously agreed by the Council (Appendix 2 to the report),
- 3) Approve the updated review framework to be used when reviewing existing bin hub locations and/or determining the design and location of proposed bin hubs (Appendix 3) with the following alterations (**in bold**)

### **Updated Review Framework**

This framework should be used when:

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

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

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

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

- 1) Range of materials collected: Non-recyclable waste (NRW), dry mixed recycling (DMR), glass and food waste. (See guidance note 1)
- 2) Capacity (L) provided per property per week: NRW = 140/170L, DMR = 140/170L, Glass = 5/20L, Food waste = 5/20L (See guidance note 1)
- 3) Walking distance: Relaxed from 100 meters to 120 meters (See guidance note 2)
- 4) Road safety requirements and streetscape:
  - a) bins 10mtrs away from junctions and pedestrian crossings
  - b) bins on roads (not pavements)
  - c) bin hubs can be placed on opposite side of the road/pavement if:
    - i) it is a 20mph road
    - ii) road width does not exceed 10.5mtr - **unless the street is a cul-de-sac or safe crossings, such as build outs, pedestrian islands or zebra, pelican or toucan**

**crossings exist within 100m.'** (Max unprotected walking crossing distance as per ESDG) (See guidance note 3)

- iii) clear 25mtr lines of sight maintained based on derived sight stopping distances (SSD) iv. No accident history within 25m radius from proposed location - **'unless adequate improvements have been made to address the issue.**
- v) Safe space to use bins – min pavement **or grass verge** width of 1.5mtr (ESDG)
- d) residents should not have to stand in the flow of traffic to use bins
- e) The perceived impact is not transferred to another property
- f) Parking optimization
- 5) Hospitality: Bin hubs should not be sited directly adjacent to an outdoor area currently used for tables and chairs by a hospitality venue. (See guidance note 4)
- 6) Resident amenity: Bin hubs should be sited in locations which minimise any negative impacts on resident amenity (if at all possible), **meaning specifically the impacts of noise and odours and the impacts on privacy and outlook.** (See guidance note 5)

The Guidance Notes remain as stated.

- 4) To approve the engagement approach and timeline for Phase 5 - Area B and C (New Town, West End and other areas within the World Heritage Site) (Appendix 4 to the report).
- 5) To approve the revised timeline for project delivery (Appendix 5 to the report).
- 6) Agrees to review the number and distribution of glass bins in order to reduce noise impacts.
- 7) Agrees within 12 months of the completed installation of bin hubs in an area, to review capacity requirements based on collection data with a view to potentially reducing the number of hubs.”

- moved by Councillor Ross, seconded by Councillor Osler

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the engagement undertaken in Phase 5 Area A (Old Town and George Street Corridor) (Appendix 1 to the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place),

- 2) To note the outcomes from workshops arranged in response to actions previously agreed by the Council (Appendix 2 to the report),
- 3) Approve the updated review framework to be used when reviewing existing bin hub locations and/or determining the design and location of proposed bin hubs (Appendix 3) **which will include the following changes to Appendix 3;**
  - 4.c.ii Road width does not exceed 10.5 metres **unless a refuge island or other type of crossing is present to support the full distance** (max unprotected walking crossing distance as per ESGD) (See guidance note 3)
  - 4.c.v. Safe space to use bins – min pavement **or other hard-standing or grass/park area with** width of 1.5 metres (ESDG). **However, where this is not possible, a hub can be sited across a road on a ‘non-residential’ side of a residential street with bins arranged in such a way that allows a resident to stand in the safe space between two bins.**

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

- 4) To approve the engagement approach and timeline for Phase 5 - Area B and C (New Town, West End and other areas within the World Heritage Site) (Appendix 4 to the report).
- 5) To approve the revised timeline for project delivery (Appendix 5 to the report).
- 6) Notes that noise complaints have formed a large subset of the myriad complaints made to the council and to elected members regarding those bin hubs which have already been implemented.
- 7) Notes that The Anti-Social Behaviour (Noise Control) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (SSI 2005/43) permit no more than 41 decibels between 0700hrs and 2300hrs and 31 decibels between 2300hrs and 0700hrs.
- 8) Notes that the council’s own research regarding the mitigation of noise made by glass bins indicated that even the most effective mitigation scheme would still allow for noises between 83.9 decibels and 100.8 decibels, depending on circumstances. (Slide 12 Workshop Presentation)
- 9) Notes that both that the workshop held by the council suggested that residents should take overall priority when siting bin hubs (ap.2, p.1) and that point six of

the updated review framework requires that bin hubs should be “sited in locations which minimise any negative impacts on resident amenity (if at all possible)”

- 10) Agrees that even mitigated noise levels caused by glass bins would be wholly unacceptable and severely diminish residential amenity.
- 11) Therefore, requests a report to the next Transport & Environment Committee (12<sup>th</sup> December 2024) detailing measures by which glass bins might be removed from bin hubs and sited instead in locations further from residential homes, in addition to all work done to date on noise mitigation, as per the Motion by Cllr Mitchell which was agreed unanimously at Full Council in February 2024, including an estimated implementation timeline and costs.
- 12) Further notes that although the report indicates that 133 existing bin hubs will be subject to revision, no information is provided as to which bin hubs these may be, nor the complaints received regarding them, nor the reasons for their revision.
- 13) Notes that in some cases, where a TRO is required, it may not be possible to remove or alter even those bin hubs scheduled for adjustment for several months.
- 14) Therefore, requests that within three cycles a report be brought before committee detailing:
  - i) Identifies measures to alleviate identified adverse impacts whilst waiting for the bin hub to be adjusted.
  - ii) A list of those bin hubs scheduled for adjustment, the complaints made against them and the reasons for which the proposed adjustments were accepted.
  - iii) A list of all bin hubs which have received complaint (either directly or through ward councillors), the nature of those complaints, (where data is available) the number of residents supporting the complaint, and the reasons for which those complaints were not acted upon.

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, the Motion was adjusted and Amendments 1 and 2 were adjusted and accepted as amendments to the adjusted Motion.

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jenkinson:

- 1) To note the engagement undertaken in Phase 5 Area A (Old Town and George Street Corridor) (Appendix 1 to the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place),
- 2) To note the outcomes from workshops arranged in response to actions previously agreed by the Council (Appendix 2 to the report),
- 3) To approve the updated review framework to be used when reviewing existing bin hub locations and/or determining the design and location of proposed bin hubs with the following amendments to Appendix 3 in the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place:
  - In 4.a after “crossings” add “except where a one-way street or pavement build-out has resulted in a potential hub-site that is safe for residents and workers”
  - In 4.c.ii after “10.5mtr” add “except where the street is a cul-de-sac, no through road or there is a safe crossing (zebra, toucan or pelican) or other safety measure such as a pavement build-out or a pedestrian island within 120 metres”
  - In 4.c.iv after “location” add “except where adequate mitigating improvements have been made since the incident(s)”
  - In 4.c.v Safe space to use bins – min pavement or other hard-standing or grass/park area with width of 1.5 metres (ESDG). However, where this is not possible, a hub can be sited across a road on a ‘non-residential’ side of a residential street with bins arranged in such a way that allows a resident to stand in the safe space between two bins.
  - Replace 4.e with “Consideration should be given to residents’ amenity (immediate outlook, noise, privacy) and whether the hub can be sensitively integrated into the streetscape without incurring disproportionate cost; any perceived impact being transferred to another property should be evaluated”
  - In 4.f after “optimization” add “should be considered but is secondary to resident satisfaction with the hub-sites”
  - 6. Resident amenity: Bin hubs should be sited in locations which minimise any negative impacts on resident amenity (if at all possible), meaning specifically the impacts of noise and odours and the impacts on privacy and outlook. (See guidance note 5)
- 4) Nevertheless, to agree the framework was a set of ‘best case’ guidelines and that, with agreement and collaboration between residents, councillors, and officers, could allow for discretionary siting of a hub in such a way that might

- not conform with the framework due to the variations and requirements within different streets.
- 5) To approve the engagement approach and timeline for Phase 5 - Area B and C (New Town, West End and other areas within the World Heritage Site) (Appendix 4 to the report).
  - 6) To approve the revised timeline for project delivery (Appendix 5 to the report).
  - 7) To agree within 12 months of the completed installation of bin hubs in an area, to review capacity requirements based on collection data with a view to potentially reducing the number of hubs.
  - 8) To note that noise complaints had formed a large subset of the myriad complaints made to the council and to elected members regarding those bin hubs which had already been implemented.
  - 9) To note that The Anti-Social Behaviour (Noise Control) (Scotland) Regulations 2005 (SSI 2005/43) permitted no more than 41 decibels between 0700hrs and 2300hrs and 31 decibels between 2300hrs and 0700hrs.
  - 10) To note that the council's own research regarding the mitigation of noise made by glass bins indicated that even the most effective mitigation scheme would still allow for noises between 83.9 decibels and 100.8 decibels, depending on circumstances. (Slide 12 Workshop Presentation)
  - 11) To note that both that the workshop held by the council suggested that residents should take overall priority when siting bin hubs (ap.2, p.1) and that point six of the updated review framework required that bin hubs should be "sited in locations which minimise any negative impacts on resident amenity (if at all possible)"
  - 12) To agree that even mitigated noise levels caused by glass bins would be wholly unacceptable and severely diminish residential amenity, and to review the number and distribution of glass bins in order to reduce noise impacts.
  - 13) To therefore, request a report to the next Transport and Environment Committee (12th December 2024) detailing measures by which glass bins might be removed from bin hubs and sited instead in locations further from residential homes, in addition to all work done to date on noise mitigation, as per the Motion by Councillor Mitchell which was agreed unanimously at Full Council in February 2024, including an estimated implementation timeline and costs.
  - 14) Further notes that although the report indicated that 133 existing bin hubs would be subject to revision, no information was provided as to which bin hubs these might be, nor the complaints received regarding them, nor the reasons for their revision.

- 15) To note that in some cases, where a TRO was required, it might not be possible to remove or alter even those bin hubs scheduled for adjustment for several months.
- 16) To therefore request that within three cycles a report be brought before Committee detailing:
  - a) Identifies measures to alleviate identified adverse impacts whilst waiting for the bin hub to be adjusted.
  - b) A list of those bin hubs scheduled for adjustment, the complaints made against them and the reasons for which the proposed adjustments were accepted.
  - c) A list of all bin hubs which have received complaint (either directly or through ward councillors), the nature of those complaints, (where data is available) the number of residents supporting the complaint, and the reasons for which those complaints were not acted upon.

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

## **8. Secure On-Street Cycle Parking and Public Bike Parking Update**

---

An update was provided on the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking (SSCP) project including Phase Two installations and current use of the units. Details were also provided on considerations in respect of bringing the operation in-house and awarding a contract for continued operation together with an update on the installation of public and school cycle/scooter parking.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note that a review had concluded that bringing the functions for the administration, operation and maintenance of the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking project (SSCP) in-house would not offer best value to the Council and residents and would bring additional risk to the Council.
- 2) To agree therefore to continue to procure an external provider, to ensure the continuity and quality of the scheme whilst offering best value to the Council.
- 3) To note that delivery of further rollouts of the SSCP was likely to be dependent on external funding.

- moved by Councillor Jenkinson, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note that a review had concluded that bringing the functions for the administration, operation and maintenance of the Secure On-Street Cycle

- Parking project (SSCP) in-house would not offer best value to the Council and residents and would bring additional risk to the Council.
- 2) To agree therefore to continue to procure an external provider, to ensure the continuity and quality of the scheme whilst offering best value to the Council.
  - 3) Notes the large unmet demand for safe cycle storage as demonstrated by the long waiting list for secure on-street cycle hangers.
  - 4) Understands that the Dutch cities of Utrecht and Delft have a successful model of larger-capacity neighbourhood cycle stores, which are Council-owned but managed by U-Stal, the external provider that also manages on-street cycle hangers similar to those in Edinburgh.
  - 5) Requests that officers investigate whether such a model could be implemented in Edinburgh, for example by using underused Council-owned garages or similar properties located in areas where there is a high concentration of demand, and by exploring the possibility of contracting the same external provider to manage these facilities.
  - 6) Requests an update to be presented to the March meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee.
  - 7) To note that delivery of further rollouts of the SSCP was likely to be dependent on external funding.

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

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) Notes the report and the review of bringing the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking Project (SSCP) in-house; further notes that this review does not appear to have considered whether advantages might be gained from VAT exemption if the council were to be the operator of the scheme.
- 2) Therefore agrees to procure an external provider for the immediate future but not to reach a decision on in-housing of the scheme at the present time, but rather to undertake a workshop with committee members exploring the issue, and returning with a further report within four cycles on whether in-housing could deliver benefits to the council and cycle hanger users.
- 3) Noting the financial pressure on the council and that, without changes to the council budget, further rollouts of the SSCP are dependent on external funding, committee agrees to refer the process on to the current council budget setting process with a request to officers to identify sufficient capital budget to undertake further rollouts of cycle parking, including but not limited to the SSCP, and if necessary, to consider raising fees and charges in other areas of the transport budget in order to achieve this.



- 4) Agrees to add a webform or other mechanism to the council website for members of the public to request locations for public cycle parking.
- 5) Noting the actions in the City Mobility Plan 2021-2030 implementation plan, agrees to include an update on cycle parking installations as part of the annual review of the City Mobility Plan.

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

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

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

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	6 votes
For Amendment 2(as adjusted)	-	5 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Dijkstra-Downie, Jenkinson, Lang, Munro, Watt and Whyte.

For Amendment 2 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Booth, Glasgow, Hyslop and O'Neill.)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jenkinson:

- 1) To note that a review had concluded that bringing the functions for the administration, operation and maintenance of the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking project (SSCP) in-house would not offer best value to the Council and residents and would bring additional risk to the Council.
- 2) To agree therefore to continue to procure an external provider, to ensure the continuity and quality of the scheme whilst offering best value to the Council.
- 3) To note that delivery of further rollouts of the SSCP was likely to be dependent on external funding.
- 4) To note the large unmet demand for safe cycle storage as demonstrated by the long waiting list for secure on-street cycle hangers.
- 5) To understand that the Dutch cities of Utrecht and Delft have a successful model of larger-capacity neighbourhood cycle stores, which were Council-

- owned but managed by U-Stal, the external provider that also managed on-street cycle hangers similar to those in Edinburgh.
- 6) To request that officers investigate whether such a model could be implemented in Edinburgh, for example by using underused Council-owned garages or similar properties located in areas where there was a high concentration of demand, and by exploring the possibility of contracting the same external provider to manage these facilities.
  - 7) To request an update to be presented to the March meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee.
  - 8) To note that delivery of further rollouts of the SSCP was likely to be dependent on external funding.
  - 9) To agree to add a webform or other mechanism to the council website for members of the public to request locations for public cycle parking.
  - 10) Noting the actions in the City Mobility Plan 2021-2030 implementation plan, to agree to include an update on cycle parking installations as part of the annual review of the City Mobility Plan.

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

## **9. City Centre Ward Councillors - Cowgate**

---

The Convener ruled in terms of Standing Order 4.5, that the following item, notice of which had been given at the start of the meeting and which report had been issued in a late reports pack, be considered as a matter of urgency to allow the Committee to give early consideration to this matter.

In response to a motion by Councillor Mowat, an update was provided of the tragic and devastating incident that occurred on the Cowgate on Saturday 2 November 2024 together with an update on the workstream to reduce traffic on the Cowgate and proposals for short, medium and longer term options for this.

### **Decision**

- 1) To express sincere condolences following the tragic road traffic incident in the Cowgate on Saturday 2 November.
- 2) To note that officers from the Council and Police Scotland had undertaken a site meeting in respect of the circumstances which led to the tragedy.
- 3) To note the update on the proposals to reduce traffic in the Cowgate.
- 4) To agree the Next Steps, as outlined in section 5 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place.

(References – Act of Council No 25 of 7 November 2024; report by the Interim Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **10. Road Safety – School Travel Plan Review**

---

An update was provided on the status of historical School Travel Plans, which included information relating to engagement and progress and also set out a new approach to streamline the School Travel Plan process (to be known as School Travel Audits).

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the progress update on the School Travel Plan Review and delays to the historical programme.
- 2) To agree to take forward a new streamlined approach of School Travel Audits aimed at promptly identifying and programming road safety measures for the school communities, as set out in paragraphs 4.6 to 4.7 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To note challenges in programme planning and project delivery due to uncertainty in longer-term funding arrangements, as set out in section 6 of the report.

- moved by Councillor Jenkinson, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the progress update on the School Travel Plan Review and delays to the historical programme.
- 2) To agree to take forward a new streamlined approach of School Travel Audits aimed at promptly identifying and programming road safety measures for the school communities, as set out in paragraphs 4.6 to 4.7 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place.
- 3) Agrees that a summary of the interventions taken in relation to each school travel action plan (as per paragraph 4.8) will be provided to the members of the joint review meeting for that particular school (school management teams, Parent Council representatives, ward councillors, and any other relevant stakeholders) each year to enable stakeholders to track progress of travel plan implementation.
- 4) To note challenges in programme planning and project delivery due to uncertainty in longer-term funding arrangements, as set out in section 6 of the report.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Hyslop

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the progress update on the School Travel Plan Review and delays to the historical programme.
- 2) To agree to take forward a new streamlined approach of School Travel Audits aimed at promptly identifying and programming road safety measures for the school communities, as set out in paragraphs 4.6 to 4.7 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To note challenges in programme planning and project delivery due to uncertainty in longer-term funding arrangements, as set out in section 6 of the report.
- 4) Nevertheless requests an update with projected timescales for completion of the remaining school travel audits following the 2025/26 Council Budget, no later than the April meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee

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

## **Amendment 3**

- 1) To note the progress update on the School Travel Plan Review and delays to the historical programme.
- 2) To agree to take forward a new streamlined approach of School Travel Audits aimed at promptly identifying and programming road safety measures for the school communities, as set out in paragraphs 4.6 to 4.7 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place.
- 3) Noting the financial challenges mentioned in section 6 of the report, committee agrees to refer the process on to the current council budget setting process with a request to officers to:
  - a) identify sufficient revenue budget to expand the school travel team to allow additional support for all schools in carrying out future School Travel Audits, and in particular those schools in low SIMD areas or where there is no active parent body;
  - b) identify sufficient capital revenue to undertake the road safety improvements identified in school travel plans / school travel audits;
  - c) if necessary, to consider raising fees and charges in other areas of the transport budget in order to undertake a) and b) above.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the Motion, and Amendment 3 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the Motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to Amendment 3.

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted) - 4 votes  
For Amendment 3 (as adjusted ) - 7 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Jenkinson, Munto, Watt and Whyte.

For Amendment 3 (as adjusted ): Councillors Aston, Booth, Dijkstra-Downie, Glasgow, Hyslop, Lang, and O'Neill.)

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 3 by Councillor Booth:

- 1) To note the progress update on the School Travel Plan Review and delays to the historical programme.
- 2) To agree to take forward a new streamlined approach of School Travel Audits aimed at promptly identifying and programming road safety measures for the school communities, as set out in paragraphs 4.6 to 4.7 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place.
- 3) Noting the financial challenges mentioned in section 6 of the report, to agree to refer the process on to the current council budget setting process with a request to officers to:
  - a) identify sufficient revenue budget to expand the school travel team to allow additional support for all schools in carrying out future School Travel Audits, and in particular those schools in low SIMD areas or where there is no active parent body;
  - b) identify sufficient capital revenue to undertake the road safety improvements identified in school travel plans / school travel audits;
  - c) if necessary, to consider raising fees and charges in other areas of the transport budget in order to undertake a) and b) above.
- 4) To agree that a summary of the interventions taken in relation to each school travel action plan (as per paragraph 4.8 of the report) would be provided to the members of the joint review meeting for that particular school (school

management teams, Parent Council representatives, ward councillors, and any other relevant stakeholders) each year to enable stakeholders to track progress of travel plan implementation.

- 5) Nevertheless to request an update with projected timescales for completion of the remaining school travel audits following the 2025/26 Council Budget, no later than the April meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee

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

## **11. Citywide Road Coordination – Revised Charging Structure**

---

Details were provided on an updated charging structure for road occupation permits and associated traffic orders following a review which had been undertaken to ensure that the public road space could be more effectively managed for the benefit of all road users.

### **Motion**

- 1) To agree the recommended charging structure, as noted in Appendix 1 to the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place (with examples shown in Appendix 2 to the report).
- 2) To agree that the implementation date would be for Road Occupation and Roads Events applications received from 1 January 2025.
- 3) To refer the report to the Council for approval of the fees and charges for Road Occupations and Roads Events from 1 January 2025.

-moved by Councillor Jenkinson, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment**

- 1) To agree the recommended charging structure, as noted in Appendix 1 to the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place (with examples shown in Appendix 2 to the report) with the exception that the 'failure to notify' surcharges detailed in Appendix 1 shall be set at 100%.'
- 2) Committee further agrees that officers will look into the feasibility of increasing the rate of the 'failure to notify' surcharge by increments over the period of non-consented road occupation – e.g. 100% surcharge for week 1, 200% for week 2
- 3) To agree that the implementation date would be for Road Occupation and Roads Events applications received from 1 January 2025.
- 4) To refer the report to the Council for approval of the fees and charges for Road Occupations and Roads Events from 1 January 2025.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Hyslop

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, the amendment was adjusted and accepted as an amendment to the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jenkinson:

- 1) To agree the recommended charging structure, as noted in Appendix 1 to the report by the Interim Executive Director of Place (with examples shown in Appendix 2 to the report) with the exception that the 'failure to notify' surcharges detailed in Appendix 1, officers investigate the feasibility of setting at 100%.'
- 2) To further agree that officers would look into the feasibility of increasing the rate of the 'failure to notify' surcharge by increments over the period of non-consented road occupation – e.g. 100% surcharge for week 1, 200% for week 2
- 3) To agree that the implementation date would be for Road Occupation and Roads Events applications received from 1 January 2025.
- 4) To refer the report to the Council for approval of the fees and charges for Road Occupations and Roads Events from 1 January 2025.

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

## **12. Dell Road to Colinton Dell Access Path**

---

An update was provided on plans to reopen a path that provided access from the south of Dell Road into the countryside area of Colinton Dell and the Water of Leith walkway and cycle path.

### **Decision**

To note the update on the cost, timescale and timeline for all necessary remedial work to ensure the stabilisation and reopening of the path between Dell Road and Colinton Dell.

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

## **13. Internal Audit: Audit Outcomes June to October 2024**

---

The Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee had referred the Internal Audit: Audit outcomes June to October 2024 to the Transport and Environment Committee to consider future monitoring of the implementation of management actions.

## **Motion**

To agree to receive a quarterly Business Bulletin update on the implementation of the management actions detailed in 9.1 to 9.8 of the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services until such time that all management actions had been successfully implemented.

- moved by Councillor Jenkinson, seconded by Councillor Watt

## **Amendment**

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



- h) and any other relevant management actions that should be brought to the attention of the Committee.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Glasgow

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jenkinson:

- 1) To agree to receive a quarterly Business Bulletin update on the implementation of the management actions detailed in 9.1 to 9.8 of the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services until such time that all management actions had been successfully implemented.
- 2) To note that there were a number of concerning findings of the audit on 'Safety of Council HGVs' which were graded as 'limited assurance' and that some of these lay within the remit of the Policy and Sustainability Committee (to which the audit findings had also been referred), and some within the remit of this Committee.
- 3) To note that the Driving for the Council policy had not been reviewed in full since 2019 and therefore request that officers commence this process, including discussion with trade union representatives and that this be reported back to this Committee as soon as possible.

(Reference – Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee of 31 October 2024 (item 5): referral from the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.)

## **14. Internal Audit Open and Overdue Internal Audit Actions – Performance Dashboard as at 13 September 2024**

---

### **Decision**

To note that the report had been withdrawn.

## **15. Motion by Councillor Aston – Improving Signalised Crossings**

---

The following motion by Councillor Aston was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17, and verbally adjusted in terms of Standing Order 22(6):

“Committee:

- 1) Notes that both the Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP) and the first review of the City Mobility Plan (CMP) committed to Action for Better Crossings (ABC) –

- measures to improve how well connected our streets and neighbourhoods are for walking.
- 2) Notes that the ATAP states that: a. For most journeys on foot, the biggest delay and inconvenience is caused by crossing streets. To address this, the ABC initiative would:
    - i) Commit to a default maximum pedestrian delay at ‘standalone’ crossings and report on the percentage of crossings that have this setting.
    - ii) Continue the programme of installing pedestrian crossings, with revised criteria giving more weight to likely pedestrian delay.
    - iii) Review pedestrian waiting times at signalled junctions, with a view to reducing delays by giving more ‘green man’ opportunities per signal cycle.
  - 3) Requests a report on progress towards these improvements in three cycles, noting that this will be one year on from the first review of the CMP.
  - 4) Further notes that some groups, such as older people, disabled people, young children, and parents/carers pushing buggies, may traverse crossings more slowly, and therefore requests that the report also presents options for increasing the ‘Green Man’ time allowed for pedestrians at Pelican, Puffin and Toucan crossings.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Aston

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Hyslop

### **Amendment**

- 1) Inserts after 2) iii in the motion by Councillor Aston:
  - “3) Committee also notes:
    - i) According to Sustrans Scotland, 40% of Edinburgh’s pavements don’t even meet minimum width and there are nearly 17,000 missed or substandard dropped kerbs in the city.
    - ii) Research to the Scottish Road Research Board states that for the provision of walkers, wheelers, and cyclists, traffic reduction and speed reduction should be the first considerations as this not only improves provision of space but also has wider network benefits.”

Renumber accordingly.

- 2) After new 5) in the motion insert:

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

- moved by Councillor O’Neill, seconded by Councillor Booth

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

### **Decision**

- 1) To note that both the Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP) and the first review of the City Mobility Plan (CMP) committed to Action for Better Crossings (ABC) – measures to improve how well connected our streets and neighbourhoods were for walking.
- 2) To note that the ATAP stated that: a. For most journeys on foot, the biggest delay and inconvenience is caused by crossing streets. To address this, the ABC initiative would:
  - i) Commit to a default maximum pedestrian delay at ‘standalone’ crossings and report on the percentage of crossings that have this setting.
  - ii) Continue the programme of installing pedestrian crossings, with revised criteria giving more weight to likely pedestrian delay.
  - iii) Review pedestrian waiting times at signalled junctions, with a view to reducing delays by giving more ‘green man’ opportunities per signal cycle.
- 3) To also note:
  - i) According to Sustrans Scotland, 40% of Edinburgh’s pavements did not even meet minimum width and there were nearly 17,000 missed or substandard dropped kerbs in the city.
  - ii) Research to the Scottish Road Research Board stated that for the provision of walkers, wheelers, and cyclists, traffic reduction and speed reduction should be the first considerations as this not only improved provision of space but also had wider network benefits
- 4) To request a report on progress towards these improvements in three cycles, noting that this would be one year on from the first review of the CMP.
- 5) To further note that some groups, such as older people, disabled people, young children, and parents/carers pushing buggies, might traverse crossings more slowly, and therefore request that the report also present options for increasing

the 'Green Man' time allowed for pedestrians at Pelican, Puffin and Toucan crossings.

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

## **16. Motion by Councillor McKenzie – Save the Burnside**

---

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

“Committee:

Notes:

The Burnside is a public right of way path which connects Longstone Road with Stenhouse Mill Lane. The path has been in place for at least 150 years on land which is currently understood to be owned by the Earl of Morton.

The Burnside Bridge was repaired by the Council in February 2024 following a period of over 3 years during which damage to the bridge prevented access to the path from the Longstone Road end.

On 31 May 2024, a large sink hole was found on the path. The Council erected barriers to prevent access to the affected area and a diversion route was established by users of the path. Subsequently, ward councillors and stakeholders have been unable to engage the Council in discussions about improving safety and accessibility.

Agrees:

- 1) A safety assessment of the affected area will take place as soon as possible, with consideration given to the stability of the retaining wall under the sink hole, and to the effectiveness of the current safety barriers.
- 2) To request a Business Bulletin update within 2 cycles which includes low cost options for establishing and formalising the diversion route, prioritising improvements to accessibility at the Longstone Road end.
- 3) To request a report within 4 cycles which provides options for investment to safeguard the path for future use, including resurfacing, widening and ongoing maintenance of the path. This report should consider options to bring the path up to an adoptable standard, and the potential to recoup costs from the landowner.”

In accordance with Standing Order 32.1, the Convener agreed to hear a presentation from Councillor McKenzie.

## **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor McKenzie.

- moved by Councillor McKenzie, seconded by Councillor Aston

## **Amendment**

- “1) To note the Council is only entitled to repair the right of way to the condition it has historically maintained (ie. it may repair the path to remove the sinkhole), it is specifically not allowed to conduct improvements, still less charge the cost of those improvements to the owner. It is a public right of way, not public property. To act as Cllr. McKenzie suggests would be unlawful; the council would be liable for any costs and for damages in addition.
- 2) Therefore, deletes point 3 in the motion by Councillor Mackenzie.”

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Whyte

At this point in the proceedings, the amendment was withdrawn.

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor McKenzie.

## **Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Booth made a transparency statement in regard to the above item as a member of Spokes.

## **17. Motion by Councillor Booth – Speeding Parking Controls Roll-out – Improving Signalised Crossings**

---

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

“Committee:

- 1) Notes existing council commitments, both in the City Mobility Plan (CMP), and in the Parking Action Plan, to:
  - a) extend parking controls and increase the percentage of population covered by parking controls (CMP, p.42)
  - b) decrease the number of parking permits issued to higher polluting vehicles (CMP 1st review, appendix 1)
  - c) reduce the number of residents' parking permits issued within existing CPZs (CMP 1st review, appendix 1);

- 2) Notes the existing mandate to deliver these policies, as part of the council's support for the creation of liveable places, protection against vehicle dominance and wider action to address the climate crisis;
- 3) Notes that at present, any extension of CPZ requires a comprehensive and time-consuming parking survey as well as consultation with a number of stakeholder groups and residents;
- 4) Further notes the fragmented nature of existing parking controls, with 19 CPZ areas and 10 PPA areas, can make enforcement challenging;
- 5) Notes, following the recent decision of committee confirmed at full council to pause development of the WPL, and the questions around whether the council has full powers to introduce congestion charging or commuter charging, that parking restrictions and road space reallocation are the only demand management tools currently available to the council;
- 6) Therefore agrees that as part of future planned report(s) to committee on the Strategic Review of Parking updates, that these report(s) should set out options to speed up expansion of the CPZ and rationalise parking controls to allow for more effective enforcement, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - a) Retaining the need for consultation which complies with the Council's consultation policy, including parking occupation surveys prior to commencing the TRO process and consider removing the need for any additional consultation or survey work prior to each expansion;
  - b) Consideration of rationalisation of hours of restriction and converting existing PPA into CPZ."

## **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth.

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

## **Amendment 1**

- 1) Amend title of the motion by Councillor Booth to read: 'Speeding Up Parking Controls Roll-out'.
- 2) Insert new paragraph 3 to the motion and renumber existing paragraphs accordingly:
  - "3) Notes that the Council declared a nature emergency in February 2023, and that the Council's updated Biodiversity Action Plan and the Climate Ready Edinburgh Plan contain commitments to increase the use of street trees, raingardens, benches, and cycle parking, and notes that

City Plan 2030 contains commitments to expand the city's blue/green networks;

- 3) Delete existing paragraph 4 in the motion and replace with:
  - “5) Further notes the fragmented nature of existing parking controls, with 26 CPZ areas and 9 PPA areas, can make enforcement challenging;
- 4) Insert new paragraph at the end of the motion:
  - “8) Further agrees that as part of the "City Mobility Plan annual update", due to be presented to committee in April 2025, that officers will set out options for biodiversity and climate adaptation enhancements as part of the 'Delivering Actions for Parking' appendix including, but not limited to, accelerated rollout of street trees, rain gardens, benches and cycle parking, to replace some motor vehicle parking spaces throughout the city, and in particular along corridors identified as part of the future blue-green network in City Plan 2030.”

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Glasgow

## **Amendment 2**

Committee deletes all of the motion by Councillor Booth and inserts:

“Committee:

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

- 6) therefore, requests a committee update within three cycles on the current resourcing of the traffic orders team, how the developments of certain TROs are prioritised, and what opportunities exist to speed up the processes surrounding TROs.”

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

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1 was accepted as an amendment to the Motion, and Amendment 2 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the Motion.

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

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

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

(For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Aston, Booth, Glasgow, Hyslop, Jenkinson, O’Neill and Watt.

For Amendment 2 (as adjusted) – Councillors Dijkstra-Downie, Lang, Munro and Whyte.)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Booth:

- 1) To amend the title of the motion by Councillor Booth to read: ‘Speeding Up Parking Controls Roll-out’.
- 2) To note existing council commitments, both in the City Mobility Plan (CMP), and in the Parking Action Plan, to:
  - a) extend parking controls and increase the percentage of population covered by parking controls (CMP, p.42)
  - b) decrease the number of parking permits issued to higher polluting vehicles (CMP 1st review, appendix 1)
  - c) reduce the number of residents' parking permits issued within existing CPZs (CMP 1st review, appendix 1).
- 3) To note the existing mandate to deliver these policies, as part of the council's support for the creation of liveable places, protection against vehicle dominance and wider action to address the climate crisis.



- 4) To note that the Council declared a nature emergency in February 2023, and that the Council's updated Biodiversity Action Plan and the Climate Ready Edinburgh Plan contained commitments to increase the use of street trees, raingardens, benches, and cycle parking, and notes that City Plan 2030 contained commitments to expand the city's blue/green networks
- 5) To note that at present, any extension of CPZ required a comprehensive and time-consuming parking survey as well as consultation with a number of stakeholder groups and residents.
- 6) To further note the fragmented nature of existing parking controls, with 26 CPZ areas and 9 PPA areas, could make enforcement challenging.
- 7) To note, following the recent decision of committee confirmed at full council to pause development of the WPL, and the questions around whether the council had full powers to introduce congestion charging or commuter charging, that parking restrictions and road space reallocation were the only demand management tools currently available to the council.
- 8) To therefore agree that as part of future planned report(s) to committee on the Strategic Review of Parking updates, that these report(s) should set out options to speed up expansion of the CPZ and rationalise parking controls to allow for more effective enforcement, including, but not limited to, the following:
  - a) Retaining the need for consultation which complies with the Council's consultation policy, including parking occupation surveys prior to commencing the TRO process and consider removing the need for any additional consultation or survey work prior to each expansion;
  - b) Consideration of rationalisation of hours of restriction and converting existing PPA into CPZ.
- 9) To further agree that as part of the "City Mobility Plan annual update", due to be presented to committee in April 2025, that officers would set out options for biodiversity and climate adaptation enhancements as part of the 'Delivering Actions for Parking' appendix including, but not limited to, accelerated rollout of street trees, rain gardens, benches and cycle parking, to replace some motor vehicle parking spaces throughout the city, and in particular along corridors identified as part of the future blue-green network in City Plan 2030.
- 10) To note Policy Measure 34 in the City Mobility Plan on Parking Controls which aimed to "extend the coverage and operational period of parking controls in the city to manage parking availability for the benefit of local residents and people with mobility difficulties".
- 11) To recognise the importance of parking surveys and local consultation to understand the impact of commuter and other parking in local communities.

- 12) To note that, in some cases and as a result of parking surveys and consultations, decisions had been taken not to proceed with CPZ in certain areas.
- 13) To note that, even when the principle of extending CPZ to an area had been agreed to, a significant bottleneck had been the development and advertisement of the necessary legal traffic orders, and the consideration of any objections received.
- 14) To recognise that delays in developing traffic orders had also had an impact on the delivery of other projects, including important road safety measures.
- 15) To therefore request a committee update within three cycles on the current resourcing of the traffic orders team, how the developments of certain TROs were prioritised, and what opportunities existed to speed up the processes surrounding TROs.