

## Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday 14 October 2021

Present 14 October 2021

Councillors Macinnes (Convener), Doran (Vice-Convener), Bird, Cameron (substituting for Councillor Child), Corbett, Key, Lang, McLellan (substituting for Councillor Hutchison), Miller, Smith, and Whyte.

### 1. Active Travel Measures – Travelling Safely Update

---

#### a) Deputation – SW20

Committee considered a deputation from SW20. The deputation advised that COVID-19 and the global climate crisis continued to impact local neighbourhoods, and that a sustainable and integrated transport system which supported Active Travel had been highlighted by public health leaders and politicians as a priority investment area. The deputation advised that national and local policies in relation to climate change, transport, air quality, placemaking and health increased promotion of Active Travel and the need to shift to more sustainable transport options. The deputation asked Committee to note this and hoped they would seek to promote innovative, place-based solutions and to invest in neighbourhoods.

#### b) Deputation – Living Streets Edinburgh

Committee considered a deputation from Living Streets Edinburgh. The deputation argued that pedestrians had to wait too long to cross the road, and that junctions and signal timings were designed around convenience of motor vehicles and not pedestrians. The deputation argued that this resulted in longer waiting times, danger for pedestrians, noise, and unpleasant conditions that discouraged walking. Committee was asked to agree a further report taking into consideration the points made within the deputation and to agree that a budget was a key part of the Active Travel programme.

#### c) Deputation – New Town and Broughton Community Council

Committee considered a deputation from New Town and Broughton Community Council. The deputation advised that there was a lack of engagement with Community Councils with regards to Active Travel measures, and that they could have provided useful input. Committee was asked to take their views into account and to provide a process for them to do so.

#### d) Deputation – South West Edinburgh in Motion

Committee considered a deputation from South West Edinburgh in Motion. The deputation argued they had collected significant data on local opinions about the Spaces for People schemes, that Lanark Road had been poorly invested in as it had not attracted any more cyclists, and CCTV cameras had been removed in the area.

The deputation also argued that the scheme did not benefit cyclists and that the transport hierarchy was not being followed. Committee was asked to listen to community opinion and to consider alternatives to the Lanark Road scheme.

**e) Deputation – Edinburgh City Private Hire and Capital Cars**

Committee considered a deputation from Edinburgh City Private Hire and Capital Cars. The deputation explained they felt that Private Hire Taxis were not given the same treatment as Black Cab Taxis, and that they thought Private Hire Taxis should be allowed to use the bus gates at the East End of Princes Street and at South David Street. The deputation asked Committee to change signage to allow all licenced vehicles in Edinburgh to use these bus gates.

**e) Councillors with a Special Interest**

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed to hear a presentation from Ward Councillor Neil Gardiner. Councillor Gardiner spoke of the coalition addendum, and explained the proposal could lead to wider proposals. Councillor Gardiner wanted to give his opinion on the addendum as a Councillor with a special interest in this item..

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

Committee considered a report providing an update on the Travelling Safely programme, which included details of the engagement undertaken on the Lanark Road scheme, following a request from Council in June 2021. The report also included an update on Silverknowes Road (south section), on the school travel plan review and on bus priority measures.

**Motion**

- 1) To note the updates in the report, including details on existing measures.
- 2) To consider feedback received on the Lanark Road scheme and agreed the recommendations in paragraph 4.6 and in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note the options considered for Silverknowes Road (south section) and agreed to retain the scheme that was currently installed.
- 4) To note local community councils including Juniper Green/Baberton Mains, Currie and Balemo were seeking to bring forward active travel proposals in the Water of Leith Villages.
- 5) To request that Council Officers ensured any issues of safe access or connectivity to the Lanark Road infrastructure were progressed across existing work streams.
- 6) To recognise that the renewed proposals included significant additions such as a new signalised crossing at Kingsknowe Park.
- 7) To note the importance of ensuring that schemes reflected the strategic approach to active travel as defined in the City Mobility Plan, as well as reflecting the agreed transport hierarchy.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

**Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the lack of progress to ETROs.
- 2) To note it was no longer legitimate to use TTROs promoted as an emergency response to lockdown as a means to maintain or extend temporary emergency measures when the measures bringing their necessity had passed. Any necessary full TROs for schemes that had general public support from the Council consultation to be prioritised to allow a permanent introduction as additions to the permanent Active Travel Programme with public consultation.
- 3) To agree to remove the TTRO scheme on Lanark Road in line with public consultation and residents' wishes and progress a full TRO for the introduction of permanent pedestrian crossings as necessary.
- 4) To agree to remove the TTRO scheme on Silverknowes Road and to consult residents to determine whether there was a solution that gained local support and could then be progressed through a full TRO process if necessary.
- 5) To agree to receive a further urgent report on resourcing levels within the Department for implementation of Active Travel Schemes and how these could be applied to get the permanent and agreed Active Travel Programme back on track in terms of timeline and budget.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Smith

## **Amendment 2**

To delete recommendation 1.1.2 and insert;

- 1) To note that, under standing order 30.1, the committee remained bound by the 24 June 2021 decision of the Council and therefore to note the updates provided in appendix 1 of the report.

To delete recommendation 1.1.3 and insert;

- 2) To note the content of the report relating to the Lanark Road scheme; to express significant concern over the issues which arose during the recent consultation and risk exposing any decision to proceed with an ETRO to challenge; to therefore agree not to proceed with an ETRO at this stage; instead to agree that officers should engage with relevant community groups with respect to the alternative proposals which were presented to the Longstone Community Council in August 2021; and to agree that the outcomes of these discussions be reported back to the November 2021 committee meeting.
- 3) To delete "retain the scheme as currently installed" in recommendation 1.1.4 and insert, "remove the current scheme and to instruct officers to return to committee with options to upgrade the path running between Silverknowes Road and Cramond Road South into a full cycleway, recognising this as a more pressing priority for improving cycle safety in Silverknowes.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Bird

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Paragraph 2 of Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

## Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	7 votes
For amendment 1	-	3 votes
For amendment 2	-	1 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Bird, Cameron, Corbett, Doran, Key, Macinnes and Miller

For amendment 1: Councillors McLellan, Smith and Whyte

For amendment 2: Councillor Lang.)

## Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the updates in the report, including details on existing measures
- 2) To consider feedback received on the Lanark Road scheme and agreed the recommendations in paragraph 4.6 and in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 3) To note the options considered for Silverknowes Road (south section) and agreed to retain the scheme that was currently installed.
- 4) To note local community councils including Juniper Green/Baberton Mains, Currie and Balemo were seeking to bring forward active travel proposals in the Water of Leith Villages.
- 5) To request that Council Officers ensured any issues of safe access or connectivity to the Lanark Road infrastructure were progressed across existing work streams.
- 6) To recognise that the renewed proposals included significant additions such as a new signalised crossing at Kingsknowe Park.
- 7) To note the importance of ensuring that schemes reflected the strategic approach to active travel as defined in the City Mobility Plan, as well as reflecting the agreed transport hierarchy.
- 8) To note that, under Standing Order 30.1, the Committee remained bound by the 24 June 2021 decision of the Council and therefore to note the updates provided in Appendix 1 of the report.

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

## Declaration of Interests

Councillor Key declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of the RAC.

## 2. Petition for Consideration: Resurfacing particularly noisy cobbled streets – Learmonth Terrace, Dean Park Crescent and Comely Bank Avenue

---

A petition had been submitted calling on the Council to consider the resurfacing of particularly noisy cobbled streets in Learmonth Terrace, Dean Park Crescent and Comely Bank Avenue.

The Committee heard the petitioner who had been invited to speak in support of his petition. The Committee also heard from Ward Councillors Osler and Mitchell who spoke in support of the petition and offered suggestions on how to resolve the issue.

A report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services outlined the background to the issues highlighted by the petition and asked members to consider the course of action.

### **Motion**

- 1) To agree to request a report on the issues raised by the petitioner and the Committee.
- 2) To agree to take any other appropriate action, including noise monitoring being carried out in the area.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment 1**

To request a report on the issues raised by the petitioners and to instruct a traffic survey to determine average traffic speed on Comely Bank Avenue and to include the results in the report.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Smith

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To agree that Officers should undertake new inspections of all three streets listed in the petition to determine what repairs were required.
- 2) To agree that separate traffic speed surveys should be undertaken on each street, with the petitioners consulted on the positioning of the speed monitoring equipment in each case.
- 3) To agree that the results of the inspection and monitoring be reported back to the 11 November 2021 meeting of the Committee.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Bird

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion - 7 votes

For amendment 1 - 3 votes

For amendment 2 - 1 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Bird, Cameron, Corbett, Doran, Key, Macinnes and Miller

For amendment 1: Councillors McLellan, Smith and Whyte

For amendment 2: Councillor Lang.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

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

### 3. Short Term Improvement at Portobello High Street/Inchview Terrace/Sir Harry Lauder Road Junction

---

#### a) Deputation – Spokes Party

Committee considered a deputation from Spokes Party. The deputation was concerned over the danger of HGVs and explained how dangerous the Sir Harry Lauder Road Junction was. The deputation went on to say that Option 1 was not acceptable, and that people were still losing their lives at the junction. The deputation argued that more had to be done for cyclists, and that medium-term improvements rather than short-term improvements should be considered.

#### b) Deputation – Portobello Community Council

Committee considered a deputation from Portobello Community Council. The deputation was concerned for the public's safety following two fatalities at the junction.. The deputation argued Option 1 was not suitable for a short-term remedy, and that Option 2 should be implemented instead. The deputation argued however that better options should have been provided, and that the medium-term solution should be implemented.

#### c) Deputation – Brightons and Rosefield Residents' Association

Committee considered a written deputation from Brightons and Rosefield Residents' Association. The deputation explained that option 2a would be the preferred option, and that they supported improvements at this junction. The deputation asked Committee to insert measures to discourage or prevent HGVs using the route and for signage to be installed so that the route did not become busier and more dangerous.

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

Committee received an update on work undertaken to develop short term improvements to safety for vulnerable road users at the junction of Portobello High Street and Sir Harry Lauder Road and sought approval to proceed with the preferred option. The report also provided a brief update on proposals for the medium and longer – term improvement of the junction.

### Motion

- 1) To note the work undertaken over the past year to develop and evaluate options for short term improvements to safety for vulnerable road users at the junction of Portobello High Street, Inchview Terrace and Sir Harry Lauder Road.
- 2) To approve the implementation of Option 2a, as described within the report.
- 3) To note that work had commenced on developing more substantive, medium term improvements for implementation within 18 months of the short-term changes, subject to the successful conclusion of the statutory process for any Traffic Orders required.

- 4) To note that longer term improvements would be considered as part of the citywide review of vulnerable road user safety at major junctions that was instructed by Committee on 12 November 2020.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment 2**

To replace recommendation 1.1.2 with;

To approve the implementation of Option 1, as described in the report.

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Amendment 3**

To insert an additional recommendation at 1.1;

- 1) To note with sadness that almost one year had passed since Heather Stronach was killed at this location on 3 November 2020, and over two years since Stuart Elliott was killed at this location on 13 March 2019.

To insert the additional text at recommendation 1.2;

- 2) and called for urgent implementation of this short term solution.

To insert additional recommendations 1.6 and 1.7;

- 3) To require that short, medium and long term improvements should be designed in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy.
- 4) To agree to receive regular business bulletin updates on works associated with improving cycle safety (in the context of the sustainable transport hierarchy) with reference to the short, medium and, long term plans at the junction.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 3 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	8 votes
For the Amendment	-	3 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): Councillors Bird, Corbett, Doran, Key, Lang, Macinnes and Miller

For Amendment 2: Councillors McLellan, Smith and Whyte.)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes;

- 1) To note with sadness that almost one year has passed since Heather Stronach was killed at this location on 3 November 2020, and over two years since Stuart Elliott was killed at this location on 13 March 2019.

- 2) To note the work undertaken over the past year to develop and evaluate options for short term improvements to safely for vulnerable road users at the junction of Portobello High Street, Inchview Terrace and Sir Harry Lauder Road
- 3) To approve the implementation of Option 2a, as described within the report and calls for urgent implementation of this short-term solution.
- 4) To note that work had commenced on developing more substantive, medium term improvements for implementation within 18 months of the short-term changes, subject to the successful conclusion of the statutory process for any Traffic Orders required.
- 5) To note that longer term improvements would be considered as part of the citywide review of vulnerable road user safety at major junctions that was instructed by Committee on 12 November 2020.
- 6) To require that short, medium and long-term improvements should be designed in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy.
- 7) To agree to receive regular business bulletin updates on works associated with improving cycle safety (in the context of the sustainable transport hierarchy) with reference to the short, medium and, long term plans at the junction.

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

#### 4. Minutes

---

##### Decision

To approve the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 19 August 2021 as a correct record.

#### 5. Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme was presented.

##### Decision

To note the Work Programme.

(Reference – Work Programme, submitted.)

#### 6. Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log for April 2021 was presented.

##### Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:

**Action 8** – Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Area 1 Review and Corstorphine Consultation Results

**Action 10** – Use of Street Lighting for Electric Vehicle Charging

**Action 29(2)** – Strategic Review of Parking – Results Phase 1 Consultation and General Update

**Action 31** – Waste and Cleansing Services Performance Update

**Action 34** – Motion by Councillor Rose – Pedestrian crossing in Bernard Terrace – Agenda – Transport and Environment Committee 28.01.21

**Action 35** – Motion by Councillor Webber – EV Infrastructure – Agenda – Transport and Environment Committee 28.01.21

**Action 37(3&8)** – Future Provision of Public Conveniences - Signage

**Action 41(10&11)** – Future Provision of Public Conveniences

**Action 42** – Motion by Councillor Webber – Proposed Changes to Roads in Juniper Green – Agenda – Transport and Environment Committee – 24.04.21

**Action 43** – Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin

**Action 44(1,2,3,4,7 and 9)** – Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures

- 2) To include the actions from the Green Amendment in the RAL that was referred from Council to Transport and Environment Committee on maintenance of cycle and foot paths
- 3) To engage with Edinburgh Buses on items 3 and 13.3 prior to the release of the bus timetables for next summer.
- 4) To otherwise note the outstanding actions.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, submitted.)

## **7. Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin**

---

The Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin for October 2021 was presented.

### **Decision**

- 1) To agree to add an addendum or change the online text of the Mobility Plan to reflect the clarifications that had been set out and to circulate these to Committee.
- 2) To acknowledge receipt of the photographs sent by Councillor Lang regarding the Newbridge Parking Restrictions and that officers would continue to work with local residents to resolve the issues raised.
- 3) To agree that officers would look at tightening links between the City Mobility Plan and the City Plan and would include an update in relevant reports.
- 4) To otherwise note the Business Bulletin.

(Reference – Business Bulletin, submitted.)

## **8. Active Travel Investment Programme Update**

---

Committee considered a report which provided an update on the Travelling Safely programme.

The report included details of the engagement undertaken on the Lanark Road scheme, following a request from Council in June 2021. The report also provided an

update on Silverknowes Road (south section), on the school travel plan review and on bus priority measures.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the updates in the report, including details on the existing measures (as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report).
- 2) To approve the recommendations in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 3) To consider the feedback received on the Lanark Road scheme and to agree the recommendations in paragraph 4.6 and in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 4) To note the options considered for Silverknowes Road (south section) (as set out in Appendix 3 of the report) and to agree to retain the scheme as installed.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note with concern the considerable delays to the Active Travel programme and the consequent rising costs.
- 2) To note that the vast majority of the proposed programme was cycling based schemes and that very little was proposed to specifically assist pedestrians – the top of the Active Travel Hierarchy.
- 3) To note with concern that, despite officer and Administration promises of early action following the removal of Spaces for People measures on George IV Bridge, the Meadows to George St proposals were not now set to even begin construction until sometime in 2023/24 with no completion date indicated.
- 4) To agree to;
  - a. Investigate whether further pedestrian friendly measures could be added to the programme to assist safety and mobility – especially at areas of high footfall and recorded pedestrian injury accidents such as the Foot of the Walk.
  - b. Reprioritise work and funding to deliver a full solution at Arboreturn Place within early course and certainly by the end of 2022/23 financial year.
  - c. Reconsider a proper network of connections to existing cycle routes in the area rather than a duplicative route that failed to meet desire lines.
  - d. Bring forward plans for Meadows to George Street to begin consideration as soon as possible.
- 5) To further agree that a revised Active Travel Investment programme taking account of these issues was presented to Committee before the end of the 2021 calendar year.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Smith

### **Amendment 2**

To insert an additional recommendation:

- 1) To thank council officers for the detailed assessment and programming work, and to welcome delivery of wide-ranging active travel projects across Edinburgh, utilising significant external funding alongside capital investment from this council.

To add additional text to the end of recommendation 1.1.1 and to insert sub points below 1.1.1 as follows:

- 2) Subject to the following adjustments:
  - a) To note the map in Appendix 3 of the report showed some remaining active travel network gaps, and asked that the refreshed Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP) report described how the network could be joined up and any remaining gaps eliminated.
  - b) To note that the Active Travel Forum last met in 2019 and to request the restart of these meetings in order to facilitate engagement on the delivery of this investment programme and the refresh of the ATAP.
  - c) To note with regret the re-programmed later construction dates for some of the key projects, seeks clarification on whether these projects could be delivered earlier, and called for short term changes where possible in these locations (potentially exploring the use of experimental traffic orders) for example the junction at the King's Theatre in advance of the final Meadows to Union Canal project.
  - d) To welcome the "QuietRoute 5 – Holyrood Park" project, notes that provision of through routes to motorised vehicles via the private roads within Holyrood Park did not align with Edinburgh's transport strategies, and sought to continue working collaboratively with the park authorities to end motorised vehicle journeys through the park.
  - e) To add the "the Rutland spur" as a project and assess its priority within the programme.

- Moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12) Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Voting**

For the Motion (as adjusted)	- 7 votes
For Amendment 1	- 4 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted) - Councillors Bird, Corbett, Doran, Key, Macinnes and Miller

For Amendment 1: Councillors Lang, McLellan, Smith and Whyte)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the updates in the report, including details on the existing measures (as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report).
- 2) To approve the recommendations in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 3) To consider the feedback received on the Lanark Road scheme and to agree the recommendations in paragraph 4.6 and in Appendix 2 of the report.
- 4) To note the options considered for Silverknowes Road (south section) (as set out in Appendix 3 of the report) and to agree to retain the scheme as installed.

- 5) To thank council officers for the detailed assessment and programming work, and to welcome delivery of wide-ranging active travel projects across Edinburgh, utilising significant external funding alongside capital investment from this council.
- 6) To note the updates in the report, including details on the existing measures (as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report) subject to the following adjustments;
  - a. To note the map in Appendix 3 of the report showed some remaining active travel network gaps, and to asked that a refreshed Active Travel Plan (ATAP) report described how the network could be joined up and any remaining gaps eliminated.
  - b. To note that the Active Travel Forum last met in 2019 and to request the restart of these meetings in order to facilitate engagement on the delivery of this investment programme and the refresh of ATAP.
  - c. To note with regret the re-programmed later construction dates for some of the key projects, seeks clarification on whether these projects could be delivered earlier, and called for short term changes where possible in these locations (potentially exploring the use of experimental traffic orders) for example the junction at the King’s Theatre in advance of the final Meadows to Union Canal project
  - d. To welcome the “QuietRoute 5 – Holyrood Park” project, noting with provision of through routes to motorised vehicles via the private roads within Holyrood Park did not align with Edinburgh’s transport strategies, and sought to continue working collaboratively with the park authorities to end motorised vehicle journeys through the park
  - e. To add “the Ruthland spur” as a project and assess its priority within the programme.

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

## 9. Woodhall Terrace – Proposed Changes to Roads in Juniper Green

---

Committee considered a report which sought approval to introduce ‘No Entry’ restrictions through the TRO process at the junction of Woodhall Terrace and Baberton Avenue.

The report also sought approval for construction of a continual footway crossing at Woodhall Terrace to help reduce intrusive motorised traffic and improved pedestrian crossing provision.

### Decision

- 1) To note the work carried out by Juniper Green and Baberton Mains Community Council who supported these proposals.
- 2) To note that all Ward Councillors were supportive of these proposals.
- 3) To note the current cost estimate for the project was £9,000.00.
- 4) To approve the commencement of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process to introduce ‘No Entry’ restrictions to Eastbound motorised vehicles.

- 5) To approve the additional works to improve crossing for pedestrians at Woodhall Terrace as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 6) To discharge the Motion agreed at the Transport and Environment Committee on 22 April 2021 regarding Proposed Changes in Juniper Green.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee, 22 April 2021 (item 2); report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **10. Proposed Parking Controls – Allanfield, Allanfield Place and Dicksonfield**

---

Committee considered a report that sought approval to start a legal Traffic Road Order (TRO) process to include the areas of Allanfield, Allanfield Place and Dicksonfield into Zone N1 to ensure consistency with parking controls across streets within the broader area.

The report made observations that Allanfield, Allanfield Place and Dicksonfield were residential streets located within the general boundary of Zone N1 of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Although these areas were located within Zone N1 of the CPZ, only limited sections of carriageway within Allanfield and Allanfield Place currently had parking restrictions in place, while Dicksonfield had no parking restrictions. The report advised that uncontrolled streets caused a situation that allowed unmanaged parking opportunities within the CPZ boundary.

### **Motion**

To approve the commencement of the legal process required to add all publicly maintained areas of road within Allanfield, Allanfield Place and Dicksonfield to the N1 area of the Controlled Parking Zone and to approve the setting of charges as detailed in the report.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment**

- 1) To agree to consult the residents of Allanfield, Allanfield Place and Dicksonfield on the proposal and not to commence the legal process to add the publicly maintained areas of the road within these streets to the N1 area of the Controlled Parking Zone.
- 2) To approve the setting of charges unless the residents were in favour of the proposal

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Smith

### **Vote**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	8 votes
For the Amendment	-	3 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Cameron, Corbett, Doran, Key, Lang, Macinnes and Miller)

For the Amendment: Councillors McLellan, Smith and Whyte)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

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

## **11. Future Provision of Public Conveniences Update**

---

Committee considered a report providing an update on the actions agreed on 22 April 2021 by the Transport and Environment Committee on the immediate need for toilet facilities and future permanent provision in Edinburgh.

### **Decision**

#### **Motion**

- 1) To note the update provided on the actions agreed by Committee in April 2021
- 2) To note the investment required to support the creation of new (or refurbished) facilities
- 3) To note the update on the removal of temporary toilets.
  - moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

#### **Amendment**

- 1) To note the update provided on the actions agreed by Committee in April 2021
- 2) To note the investment required to support the creation of new (or refurbished) facilities
- 3) To note the update on the removal of temporary toilets and agree to receive a report in the first quarter of 2022 covering;
  - a. The costs of re-providing these facilities next summer
  - b. The options to secure the necessary funding to cover these costs, recognising the fact that the temporary provision had been funded by Scottish Government Covid-related funding.
  - moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Bird

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the update provided on the actions agreed by Committee in April 2021
- 2) To note the investment required to support the creation of new (or refurbished) facilities
- 3) To note the update on the removal of temporary toilets and agree to receive a report in the first quarter of 2022 covering;
  - a. The costs of re-providing these facilities next summer
  - b. The options to secure the necessary funding to cover these costs, recognising the fact that the temporary provision had been funded by Scottish Government Covid-related funding

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

## 12. Union Canal Bicentenary

---

Committee considered a report outlining proposing funding for the Union Canal Bicentenary post.

2022 was the bicentenary of the Union Canal, and there was the opportunity to utilise this to celebrate the history of the Union Canal, to refresh the vision for its future, and accelerate landmark projects. The report asked Committee to consider the Council meeting 50% of the costs of the fixed-term post with the remit of progressing the programme, with Scottish Canals meeting the remaining costs.

### **Motion**

- 1) To agree that the Council would work with Scottish Canals and other partners to take forward a programme of items around the bicentenary of the Union Canal.
- 2) To agree that the Council co-funded a fixed term-post with the remit of delivering the aforementioned programme.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment**

To add to the recommendations:

To agree that the views of canal-side residents should be reflected in any refreshing of the vision for the canal's future.

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	8 votes
For Amendment	-	3 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Cameron, Child, Corbett, Doran, Key, Lang, Macinnes and Miller.

For the Amendment: Councillors McLellan, Smith and Whyte.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

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

### **Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Corbett declared a non-financial interest in the above item as City Canal Champion.

Councillor McLellan declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a Canal Side resident.

### **13. Edinburgh's Sustainable Rainwater Management Guidance**

---

Committee considered a report proposing Edinburgh's Sustainable Rainwater Guidance, which would form part of the Edinburgh Design Guidance and Street Design Guidance. The report aimed to help achieve an objective of the Water Vision, and provided guidance to developers, designers and Council officers. The report also would help to explain proposed new City Plan 2030 policies on surface water management. Committee were asked to consider the report in line with Edinburgh's commitment to be net zero with emissions by 2030.

#### **Motion**

To approve the 'Edinburgh's Sustainable Rainwater Management Guidance and Factsheets' that would form part of Edinburgh design guidance.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

#### **Amendment**

To agree to refer the report to the Planning Committee for scrutiny and consideration with a final decision to be taken thereafter at the earliest Council meeting to allow the cross-cutting policy issues to be considered by all Councillors.

#### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion - 8 votes

For the Amendment - 3 votes

(For the motion; Councillors Bird, Cameron, Child, Corbett, Doran, Lang, Key, Macinnes and Miller

For the Amendment: McLellan, Smith and Whyte.)

#### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

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

### **14. Internal Audit: Overdue Findings and Key Performance Indicators as at 11 August 2021 – referral report from the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee**

---

Committee considered a referral report from the Governance Risk and Best Value Committee. The report provided the Committee with information regarding a further three-month extension date was applied to all open IA findings, for Committee to note management commitment to implementation of the governance assurance model, ensuring appropriate ongoing focus on closure of all high rated findings, and all findings that were more than one year overdue.

#### **Decision**

To note the report.

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

## **15. Place Services Internal Audit – Actions Update**

---

Committee considered an update on progress management actions arising from the Internal Audits relating to services which fell into the remit of this Committee. The report sat alongside a referral report from the Governance Risk and Best Value Committee from 21 September 2021 on Internal Audit: Overdue Findings and Key Performance Indicators.

### **Decision**

- 1) To note the progress made on recommendations made on Internal Audit actions relating to the services within the remit of this Committee
- 2) To recognise the complexities and issues which have delayed progress and led to revised implementation dates for some management actions
- 3) To note the audit actions which were agreed corporately, with services who sat within the remit of this Committee were working on
- 4) To provide an update on the next report at November Committee

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

## **16. Revenue Monitoring Update – 2021/22 Month Five Position**

---

Committee considered an update on financial performance regarding revenue budgets; provisional 2020/21 out-turn and 2021/22 forecast for month five for the services within the remit of the Transport and Environment Committee.

### **Decision**

- 1) To note that the overall Place revenue budget month five position for 2021/22 was a projected £1.592m overspend (excluding Covid-19 impact). Services within the remit of the Committee were forecasting an overspend of £0.404m
- 2) To note that General Fund Covid-19 costs of circa £12.57m, in addition to the pressure set out at 1.1.1, were forecast for the overall Place Directorate at month five with circa £8.630m relating to services within the remit of the Committee
- 3) To note that the Executive Director of Place was taking measures to address budget pressures and risks. Progress would be reported to Committee

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

## **17. Motion by the Green Group – Zero Waste Hierarchy for Edinburgh World Heritage Sites**

---

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

“Committee:

- 1) Notes the UNESCO world heritage site status of the [Old and New Towns of Edinburgh](https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/728) [https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/728] and recognises the value of this designation;

- 2) Notes correspondence from residents in the New Town to the council raising concerns regarding the communal bin review project which will change arrangements for domestic waste in this area and in particular the effect on heritage;
- 3) Notes that a reduction in the volume of waste presented would require fewer and/or smaller bins as well as being environmentally beneficial;
- 4) Agrees that, in tandem with the communal bin review, residents should be supported and empowered to embrace the zero waste hierarchy in answer to their call for lower impact of waste on the world heritage site.”

-moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

### **Amendment**

- 1) To note the UNESCO world heritage site status of the [Old and New Towns of Edinburgh](https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/728) [https://whc.unesco.org/en/list/728] and recognises the value of this designation;
- 2) To note correspondence from residents in the New Town to the council raising concerns regarding the communal bin review project which will change arrangements for domestic waste in this area and in particular the effect on heritage;
- 3) To note concerns that the Communal Bin Enhancement plan appears to produce a significant increase in capacity for waste and recycling disposal but that it was impossible to assess the impact of proposed changes and therefore their impact on the World Heritage Site at the time the decision was made because no plans showing the number and location of bins were available, and that whether residents use gull proof sacks or communal bins there is overwhelming concern about adding more bins into the World Heritage Site
- 4) To note paragraph 3.10 of the Report on the purchasing of the corrals for the Communal Bins hubs to the Finance and Resources Committee it was stated that 2The approach to be taken in the World Heritage Site (part of phase four) will be subject to a further options appraisal, which will include consultation with Edinburgh World Heritage and engagement with residents
- 5) To note that the Scottish Government is due to make an announcement date for the introduction of the Deposit Return Scheme, ut given no TROs have been advertised for the World Heritage Site it is unlikely that bins could be placed much ahead of the introduction of the scheme which would significantly reduce the requirement for bins on the streets especially if the introduction of the DRS was accompanied by clear messaging about changed in waste collection and therefore to take into account the great significance of the World Heritage Site agrees:
  - i) To recognise that without having details of what is going to be put on the street the Council and Councillors cannot fully consider the impacts of the World Heritage Site
  - ii) To pause work on the introduction of bin hubs in the World Heritage Site until such time as there is an announcement on the start date for a DRS

iii) Once the start date for the DRS is announced review the bin capacity to determine whether there is still a requirement for additional bins in the World Heritage Site and bring a costed report back to Committee for determination – such costs to include the relative costs of collecting gull proof sacks and communal bins which the response to the FOI33356 is clear cannot currently be compared as the implementation plan for the communal bins has yet to be agreed

iv) A plan to demonstrate how the changes will improve the environment in the World Heritage Site

v) The outcome of further options appraisal and the engagement with other residents

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Smith

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion - 7 votes

For the Amendment - 4 votes

(For the motion; Councillors Bird, Cameron, Child, Corbett, Doran, Key, Macinnes and Miller)

For the Amendment: Lang, McLellan, Smith and Whyte.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Miller.