

Transport and Environment Committee

10:00am, Thursday 2 February 2023

Present

Councillors Arthur (Convener), Aston, Bandel, Booth (substituting for Councillor Miller, Item 2), Caldwell (substituting for Councillor Lang, Items 3), Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Graham, Lang (excluding Items 3 and 11), Macinnes (substituting for Councillor Work), McFarlane, Miller (excluding Item 2) and Munro.

Also present: Councillor McVey (item 2), Councillor Faccenda (items 2).

1. **Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme – Options Appraisal**

a) **Deputation – The University of Edinburgh**

The deputation spoke about the new electric cycle hire scheme implemented by the University of Edinburgh. Having firstly operated the Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme since 2015, staff and students continually expressed their need for access to affordable bicycles.

The deputation advised that upon the withdrawal of the original scheme, the University developed their own pilot electric cycle hire scheme using former bikes in an interim project with Council.

The UniCycles scheme offers 60 bikes, hired to students over 2 accommodation sites in the city. Demand was high with all 60 bikes being hired for 3 months of the first semester, and 50 more students on a waiting list. Students expressed the scheme delivers a range of benefits including well-being, health and financial benefits.

The scheme tracks data from the bicycles, and shows data on carbon savings, how bikes are being used, and the routes the bikes take.

The deputation finally outlined how the scheme supports the development of options to continue the scheme which contributes to actions in the Active Travel Plan and that funding is needed for Year 2, to enable scheme to continue.

b) **Deputation – Cargo Bike Movement**

The deputation expressed how the Cargo Bike Movement used cargo bicycles to deliver food and recourses to people in Edinburgh over the pandemic and continue to do so now with a team of forty volunteers support this movement.

The deputation highlighted how the use of cargo bikes would help support the Councils aim in reducing car journeys by 20% over the next five years.

The deputation outlined how funding is limited and this is their greatest barrier. The Cargo Bike Movement have been delighted with in interest and appetite of Cargo Bikes and expressed their need for more staff to support the capacity as well as the need for supportive cycle infrastructure.

c) Deputation – Thistle Foundation

The deputation gave details on the adaptive bike project for people with long term health conditions. The Thistle Foundation engage with over 4000 people, support a wide range of people through their weekly sessions and expressed there is a bike for everyone.

The deputation expressed how important collaboration was and gave detail of the many organisational they have worked with and that have supported the foundation.

d) Report by the Executive Director of Place

On 11 November 2021, the Committee established a project team to take forward a detailed assessment of options and agreed the objectives of a new scheme. The report provided details on the options for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme in the medium to long-term following the assessment.

Motion

- 1) To note the options available for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme set out in the report and in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the financial information at paragraph 6.3 of the report in respect of funding for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme.
- 3) To note that political groups could choose to fund a Cycle Hire Scheme via the budget setting process.
- 4) To note the content of the report and the transformative impact of the Thistle Foundation, Cargo Bike Movement, & Brake the Cycle projects, and also the benefits of the Edinburgh University scheme.
- 5) To agree that Officers should work with the groups involved to identify possible internal and external funding to continue their work.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the options available for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme set out in the report and in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the financial information at paragraph 6.3 of the report in respect of funding for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme.
- 3) To recognise the enormous value of the city having a bike hire scheme with its potential to further sustainability and congestion objectives, improve health and wellbeing, tackle transport inequalities, and other benefits, as set out at 4.2 of the report.

- 4) To refer the decision on a future Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme to Full Council so that it was considered as part of the 2023/24 budget setting process, with a view to Council agreeing a new scheme.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment 2

- 1) The note the options available for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme set out in the report and in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the financial information at paragraph 6.3 of the report in respect of funding for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme.
- 3) The decision around any new cycle hire scheme would be a matter for the Council budget setting process.

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

Amendment 3

- 1) The note the options available for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme set out in this report and in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the financial information at paragraph 6.3 of the report in respect of funding for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme.
- 3) To recognise that cycle hire schemes play an important role in facilitating a modal shift from cars to active travel by normalising and promoting cycling as a transport option.
- 4) To reaffirm the objectives agreed by Transport and Environment Committee in November 2021 that any new cycle hire scheme should be inclusive, secure, financially sustainable, integrated with public transport provision in Edinburgh, and aligned to the aims of the City Mobility Plan.
- 5) To note that a cycle hire scheme meeting these requirements would require significant investment. However, further notes the long-term costs of not reinstating a cycle hire scheme, such as higher levels of congestion, greater damage to roads, adverse climate impacts, and poorer health outcomes.
- 6) To note that the remaining funding approved for the previous cycle hire scheme had been used to fund several interim cycling measures but was now being proposed to be cut in the Revenue Budget Framework 2023-27 report to Finance and Resource Committee on 7 February 2023.
- 7) Recommended to Council to:
 - 7.1) Continue the funding for interim cycling measures
 - 7.2) Consider how a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme could be funded.
- 8) To request officers continue work on developing an Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme and present an update in 6 months on progress made, taking into account the budget decision and any new learnings and external funding streams.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 4

- 1) The note the options available for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme set out in this report and in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the financial information at paragraph 6.3 of the report in respect of funding for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme.
- 3) To note the environmental, health and economic benefits of cycling and cycle hire schemes as set out in section 3.4 of the Turner & Townsend report.
- 4) To note the points set out in section 4.26 of this report highlighting:
 - 4.1) The Council's forecast pressure on capital and revenue budgets.
 - 4.2) The Council's current financial position in respect of revenue funding as set out in the financial impact section of this report (section 6).
 - 4.3) There was no provision in the Council's Sustainable Capital Budget Strategy for a cycle hire scheme.
- 5) To note that a Concession model attracts least cost and risk to the Council.
- 6) To note that Dundee, and Glasgow, along with Brighton and Hove, operate successful Concession schemes with the Glasgow scheme in particular being low cost to users, widespread within the city and long term having been in place for eight years.
- 7) To agree Officers should initiate work on introducing a Concession scheme in Edinburgh at the earliest opportunity and report back to Committee accordingly.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1,2 and 3 were accepted in full and Paragraph 5 of Amendment 4 was adjusted and Paragraph 6 of Amendment 4 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) The note the options available for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme set out in the report and in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 2) To note the financial information at paragraph 6.3 of the report in respect of funding for a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme.
- 3) To note that political groups could choose to fund a Cycle Hire Scheme via the budget setting process.
- 4) To note the content of the report and the transformative impact of the Thistle Foundation, Cargo Bike Movement, & Brake the Cycle projects, and also the benefits of the Edinburgh University scheme.
- 5) To agree that Officers should work with the groups involved to identify possible internal and external funding to continue their work.
- 6) To recognise the enormous value of the city having a bike hire scheme with its potential to further sustainability and congestion objectives, improve health and wellbeing, tackle transport inequalities, and other benefits, as set out at 4.2.

- 7) To therefore refer the decision on a future Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme to Full Council so that it was considered as part of the 2023/24 budget setting process, with a view to Council agreeing a new scheme.
- 8) The decision around any new cycle hire scheme would be a matter for the Council budget setting process.
- 9) To recognise that cycle hire schemes play an important role in facilitating a modal shift from cars to active travel by normalising and promoting cycling as a transport option.
- 10) To reaffirm the objectives agreed by Transport and Environment Committee in November 2021 that any new cycle hire scheme should be inclusive, secure, financially sustainable, integrated with public transport provision in Edinburgh, and aligned to the aims of the City Mobility Plan.
- 11) To note that a cycle hire scheme meeting these requirements would require significant investment. However, further notes the long-term costs of not reinstating a cycle hire scheme, such as higher levels of congestion, greater damage to roads, adverse climate impacts, and poorer health outcomes.
- 12) To note that the remaining funding approved for the previous cycle hire scheme had been used to fund several interim cycling measures but was now being proposed to be cut in the Revenue Budget Framework 2023-27 report to Finance and Resource Committee on 7 February 2023.
- 13) Recommended to Council to:
 - 13.1) Continue the funding for interim cycling measures
 - 13.2) Consider how a new Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme could be funded.
- 14) To request officers continue work on developing an Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme and present an update in 6 months on progress made, taking into account the budget decision and any new learnings and external funding streams.
- 15) To note that a concession model could attract least cost and risk to the Council.
- 16) To note that Dundee, and Glasgow, along with Brighton and Hove, operate successful Concession schemes with the Glasgow scheme in particular being low cost to users, widespread within the city and long term having been in place for eight years.

(Reference – Transport and Environment Committee, 11 November 2021 (Item 11), Report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Bandel made a transparency statement as a student at the University of Edinburgh, who does not live at the halls offering the schemes.

Councillor Miller made a transparency statement as a member of Spokes.

2. Response to Motion by Councillor Booth – Rainbow Bridge / Lindsay Road Bridge - Infilling

a) Deputation – Save the Pride Bridge

The deputation thanked officers for the work they had done on reviewing options to save the Pride Bridge.

The deputation explained that the bridge was a key pedestrian link, critical to upholding a 20 minute neighbourhood and most importantly gained significance for the LGBTQ+ community.

The deputation advised they were speaking on behalf of community and presented data gathered from those in the area. The rainbow feature of the bridge was voted as the best feature of the bridge, voted higher over functionality which expressed the need of the community to keep such an important feature.

The deputation advised infilling or embankment would be most cost effective, and less expensive than building a new steel bridge which would be joyless, ugly and purely functional and lack the LGBTQ+ significance the Pride Bridge currently offers.

The deputation finally explained that demolition should be a last resort and that the redevelopment of the Pride Bridge by the Council would be the best, but not the only option. Collaborating with SEStran, Travel Scotland or local developers in the area could fill the gap in funding.

b) Ward Councillors

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed to hear a presentation from Ward Councillors McVey and Faccenda in relation to the Response to Motion by Councillor Booth – Rainbow Bridge / Lindsay Road Bridge - Infilling - Report by the Executive Director of Place.

c) Report by the Executive Director of Place

On 6 October 2022, Committee requested officers to liaise with organisations or individuals with relevant expertise, and to bring an updated report to committee outlining costed options for retention of all three spans of the existing Rainbow Bridge / Lindsay Road Bridge. The report provided an update on this work.

Ward Councillors McVey and Faccenda spoke to this item.

Decision

- 1) To note the report and thank officers for their work in preparing it.
- 2) To note the value of the Pride Bridge to the community of Leith, both as an important active travel route from Leith to Newhaven, as a community space, and also as an emerging cultural landmark for the LGBT+ community.
- 3) To note the risks identified by officers for an infilling solution at paragraph 4.10 of the report and note that an infilling solution is unlikely to receive external funding

and agrees that an infilling solution around the existing corroding steelwork was not progressed.

- 4) To note the two additional options presented in the report; considered that the proposed modular bridge (option 1) outlined at paragraphs 4.16-4.18 of the report would replace the active travel route but would destroy the emerging LGBT+ cultural landmark and was therefore not an acceptable way forward.
- 5) To note the proposed option 2 of a wider community space at span 3 with a modular bridge over spans 1 and 2, as outlined in paragraphs 4.19-4.21 was a welcome attempt to address community concerns, but still lead to demolition of the majority of the bridge.
- 6) To note the strong desire in the local community to ensure that the Pride Bridge continues to play a key role as a monument for the LGBT+ community, maintains an area of public space similar to the existing arrangement and provides a key active travel link and instructs that any design work for a revision to the structure needs to be co-produced with the local community and the LGBT+ community.
- 7) To therefore agree the solution which best meets the needs of the community, retains the LGBT+ cultural landmark and reinstates the active travel route was to progress on the basis of the overall principles of option 2, but to undertake a feasibility study to explore alternative value-engineered deck configurations to meet community needs and deliver cost and carbon savings, including the option of an embankment under one or more spans and including the option to preserve and refurbish some or all of the existing structure.
- 8) To therefore ask officers to submit a bid to Sustrans for a feasibility study and a detailed design which retained the three crucial elements of the Pride Bridge and to provide a clear programme in a further update report to committee, that sets out the anticipated timescale for this design to be complete, a detailed project cost to be established and the date by which officers expect to be in a position to submit a bid for capital funding to allow delivery of this project.
- 9) To note that if additional funding was not identified by winter 2023/24, the bridge deck would need to be removed to ensure public safety, and therefore agree that if the gap funding was not identified by 1 November 2023, a further report would be brought back to committee on options to agree the way ahead.
- 10) To note that diversion works would be paused in the interim, with the exception of receiving relevant budget estimates, and further notes this matter should be considered as part of the council's capital budget setting.

(Reference – Transport and Environment Committee, 6 October 2022 (Item 1), Report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Arthur made a transparency statement as one of his students from Herriot Watt, where he is an employee, was part of a group making a deputation.

3. Queensferry Town Centre Project – Traffic Regulation Orders and Project Update

a) Deputation – Spokes

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Spokes.

The deputation welcomed the general principle of improving the High Street and Waterfront areas of Queensferry. The deputation noted their serious concerns with regards to many issues, such as using the highly localised non-standard consultation process, problematic cycle routes and parking.

b) Report by the Executive Director of Place

An update was provided on the proposed Town Centre improvement works planned on Queensferry High Street and the Hawes Promenade. As part of the project the existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would need to be changed to reflect the new proposed road layout, parking arrangements, one-way traffic management and weight limit restrictions.

Decision

- 1) To note the content of the report and recommendations made regarding the necessary Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO).
- 2) To abandon the proposed TRO 19/91 previously advertised in 2020 relating to proposed weight restrictions on Queensferry High Street.
- 3) To agree to change the existing pay and display parking arrangements included in the current Order and promote the necessary TRO to reflect the proposed changes in road layout, traffic management and weight limit.
- 4) To agree to commence the statutory process to redetermine areas of the High Street to widen footpaths, narrow the width of the road and create a contraflow cycle lane Redetermination Order (RSO).
- 5) To note the project update and agree the proposed phased programme (paragraph 4.8.3 of the report).

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

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Lang declared a non-financial interest in the above item as he had previously commented on the TRO.

4. Motion by Councillor Lang - Flooding in Kirkliston

a) Deputation – The Orchard Nursery

The deputation outlined the location of their premises next to the river and explained the levels of flooding on 30 December 2022, which caused devastation to the nursery, neighbours' homes, writing off cars etc. Additionally, 3 weeks prior, flood gates, installed by the Council had to close had to be closed

The deputation advised the nursery currently still does not have floors or walls and that their service has been moved to the local community centre, causing further disruption to other council services.

The deputation gave details that the development of properties in the area, expansion of M9, blocked drains and climate change are all factors which have worsened the levels of flooding in the area and won't go away and the River Almond and surrounding burns can no longer cope.

The deputation expressed something needed to be done before more devastation was caused to the local community.

b) Motion by Councillor Lang

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

- 1) "Committee notes;
 - the substantial flooding which took place in Kirkliston in December 2022, which resulted in serious damage to the local nursery, scout hut and several homes.
 - the flooding cut off hundreds of homes in the Gateside estate and also resulted in three of the four roads in and out of Kirkliston becoming impassable.
 - that this is only the latest in a series of increasingly serious flooding events to affect the village, causing major disruption and damage.
- 2) Committee recognises that flooding has become a common issue in many parts of Edinburgh but that the events seen in Kirkliston in December were some of the most serious to be seen within the local authority area.
- 3) Committee notes a petition has now been lodged with over 1,300 signatures calling on Edinburgh Council to prioritise funding for additional measures, including improved flood defences near the River Almond, to minimise flooding in Kirkliston and prevent further serious damage.
- 4) Committee therefore requests a report within two cycles setting out initial short-term and long-term options to address flooding in Kirkliston, including the approaches which may need to be made to the Scottish Government in terms of new infrastructure investment."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

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

Amendment

"Welcomes the motion on this important issue.

Replace final paragraph with:

- "4) Committee therefore request a report to the May Committee setting out short-term mitigations and long-term solutions which could address flooding in Kirkliston and

the wider Almond catchment, including the approaches which may need to be made to the Scottish Government with regards to new infrastructure investment based on the current Scottish Flood Risk Management funding arrangements.”

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Lang:

- 1) Committee notes;
 - the substantial flooding which took place in Kirkliston in December 2022, which resulted in serious damage to the local nursery, scout hut and several homes.
 - the flooding cut off hundreds of homes in the Gateside estate and also resulted in three of the four roads in and out of Kirkliston becoming impassable.
 - that this is only the latest in a series of increasingly serious flooding events to affect the village, causing major disruption and damage.
- 2) Committee recognises that flooding has become a common issue in many parts of Edinburgh but that the events seen in Kirkliston in December were some of the most serious to be seen within the local authority area.
- 3) Committee notes a petition has now been lodged with over 1,300 signatures calling on Edinburgh Council to prioritise funding for additional measures, including improved flood defences near the River Almond, to minimise flooding in Kirkliston and prevent further serious damage.
- 4) Committee therefore request a Report to the May Committee setting out short-term mitigations and long-term solutions which could address flooding in Kirkliston and the wider Almond catchment, including the approaches which may need to be made to the Scottish Government and other agencies with regards to new infrastructure investment based on the current Scottish Flood Risk Management funding arrangements.

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Lang declared a non-financial interest as a member of the Project Steering Group.

5. Update on Council Transport Arms Length Companies

Details were provided on the performance of Transport for Edinburgh (TfE), Edinburgh Trams (ET) and Lothian Buses (LB) over the period 2020, 2021 and 2022. The impact of COVID-19 on the Council's Transport Arms Length External Organisations (ALEOs) was recognised in the update.

Decision

- 1) To note the information provided by the Council's Transport Arms Length External organisations (ALEOs), in accordance with the Council's governance arrangements.
- 2) To note that the report covered the years 2020, 2021 and 2022, which had continued to be dominated by COVID-19 response and recovery and wider operating challenges.
- 3) To refer this report to the Governance Risk and Best Value Committee for noting and scrutiny (as set out in paragraph 3.5.2 of the report).
- 4) To request a presentation to Committee on the timescales of decarbonising the Lothian Bus fleet.
- 5) To request a briefing for members on the progress against Service Level Agreements; and include more of this detail in the next report to Committee.

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

6. Circulation Plan – delivering the City Mobility Plan

Update on progress on the Circulation Plan and associated Streetspace Allocation Framework were provided and set out some themes for opportunities and challenges in the city. Approval was sought for the proposed consultation and engagement strategy for coordinated consultation and engagement on the Circulation Plan and associated Action Plans: Active Travel, Public Transport and Parking Road Safety and Air Quality.

Motion

- 1) To note the update on the development of the Circulation Plan, including developing the themes presented to make the city centre more people friendly, high quality multimodal key corridors and delivering liveable neighbourhoods.
- 2) To approve the consultation and engagement strategy for the Circulation Plan principles and the relevant Action Plans.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the update on the development of the Circulation Plan, including developing the themes presented to make the city centre more people friendly, high quality multimodal key corridors and delivering liveable neighbourhoods.
- 2) To reaffirm the objectives and vision of the City Mobility Plan to create a safe and inclusive net zero carbon transport system which were approved by Transport and Environment Committee in 2021 following extensive public consultation.
- 3) To note that good public engagement required consultations to be clear about the scope of what was being consulted on to avoid confusion and disillusionment among citizens.
- 4) To agree that the forthcoming consultation should be clear that the Council was not re-consulting on the objectives that had already been agreed but rather seeking views on how to resolve the outstanding challenges and conflicts that

come with reallocation of limited street space in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy to successfully deliver the objectives of the City Mobility Plan.

- 5) To approve the consultation and engagement strategy for the Circulation Plan principles and the relevant Action Plans.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the update on the development of the Circulation Plan, including developing the themes presented to make the city centre more people friendly, high quality multimodal key corridors and delivering liveable neighbourhoods.
- 2) To note the Circulation Plan currently consists of themes rather than specific schemes.
- 3) To recognise that consultation on themes was unlikely to provide clear feedback that could easily help inform decision making.
- 4) To instructs Officers to provide more detailed plans before starting Consultations that include:
 - 4.1) A list of proposed schemes that are achievable within the lifetime of this Council in order to determine public support
 - 4.2) How much each scheme would cost
 - 4.3) The funding sources available
 - 4.4) The anticipated timescales for delivery
- 5) In order to provide consultees a clearer picture of what they are being asked. No consultation to take place until this work is complete and reported to Committee.

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	9 votes
For Amendment 2	-	2 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dijkstra-Downie, Graham, Lang, Macinnes, McFarlane and Miller.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Cowdy and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the update on the development of the Circulation Plan, including developing the themes presented to make the city centre more people friendly, high quality multimodal key corridors and delivering liveable neighbourhoods.

- 2) To reaffirm the objectives and vision of the City Mobility Plan to create a safe and inclusive net zero carbon transport system which were approved by Transport and Environment Committee in 2021 following extensive public consultation.
- 3) To note that good public engagement required consultations to be clear about the scope of what was being consulted on to avoid confusion and disillusionment among citizens.
- 4) To agree that the forthcoming consultation should be clear that the Council was not re-consulting on the objectives that have already been agreed but rather seeking views on how to resolve the outstanding challenges and conflicts that come with reallocation of limited street space in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy to successfully deliver the objectives of the City Mobility Plan.
- 5) To approve the consultation and engagement strategy for the Circulation Plan principles and the relevant Action Plans.

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

6. Public Transport Action Plan – Delivering the City Mobility Plan

The draft Public Transport Action Plan for Edinburgh was presented, and approval was sought to carry out consultation on the Plan. The plan covered actions to improve public transport and, linking with walking, wheeling and cycling (or ‘active travel’), over the period to 2030 and beyond to encourage people to travel by more sustainable transport options in the future.

Motion

- 1) To approve the draft Public Transport Action Plan (Appendix 1 of the report) as a basis for public consultation.
- 2) To agree that officers could use the draft Plan’s costings as a basis for engaging with funding bodies.
- 3) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.
- 4) To note the integral relationship between this draft plan, the Circulation Plan and the other City Mobility Plan Action Plans (Active Travel, Air Quality, Parking and Road Safety).
- 5) To note action PG5 “Bus Stop Realignment” and previous public concerns regarding “Bus Stop Rationalisation”, particularly from an equalities perspective.
- 6) To agree that any plans to move/combine bus stops should (1) consider accessibility needs, (2) be mindful of operational needs for bus service reliability and aim to increase patronage/modal shift, (3) should consider initially focusing on the arterial routes defined in the Circulation Plan’s “public transport and active travel priority corridors” and/or the PTAP’s UTC/AVL roll out (PG4), and (4) be informed by a public engagement exercise.

- 7) To agree Transport and Environment Committee members should be briefed on the proposed approach within the context of the Draft PTAP consultation response before the finalised PTAP is tabled for approval.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

- 1) To approve the draft Public Transport Action Plan (Appendix 1 of the report) as a basis for public consultation subject to the following adjustments:
 - In action PG1, delete “particularly in the city centre”
 - Remove PG5
 - In action PR4, add “so as to expand existing and deliver new park and ride capacity.”
 - In PR7, after “express bus services.” add, “This must be done in a way that avoids reducing public transport options for Edinburgh residents.”
- 2) To agree that officers could use the draft Plan’s costings as a basis for engaging with funding bodies.
- 3) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.
- 4) To note the integral relationship between this draft plan, the Circulation Plan and the other City Mobility Plan Action Plans (Active Travel, Air Quality, Parking and Road Safety).

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

Amendment 2

- 1) To approve the draft Public Transport Action Plan (Appendix 1 of the report) as a basis for public consultation.
- 2) To agree that officers could use the draft Plan’s costings as a basis for engaging with funding bodies.
- 3) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.
- 4) To note the integral relationship between this draft plan, the Circulation Plan and the other City Mobility Plan Action Plans (Active Travel, Air Quality, Parking and Road Safety).
- 5) To welcome the action to carry out a trial of Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) but noted concern of the lengthy timescales attached to it.
- 6) To agree that in light of bus withdrawals across the city, work on DRT and supported bus services should be prioritised.
- 7) To note the decision of Full Council on the 30th June 2022 to carry out a review of community requirements for supported bus services across and report back within two cycles. Further noted that while a Business Bulletin update responding to part of the motion was presented to Transport and Environment Committee in

December 2022 and the remaining actions were supposed to be addressed by the Public Transport Action Plan, the review was still outstanding.

- 8) To request officers to carry out the review as per the decision on 30th June 2022 and report back as soon as possible.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 3

- 1) To acknowledge:
 - 1.1) Full delivery of the Action Plan, even over a period of a decade or more, would require a substantial increase in funding and resources. (6.1 Financial impact)
 - 1.2) It is proposed to develop a business case and delivery programme for the PTAP and to seek funding from partners to support delivery. (6.1 Financial impact)
 - 1.3) There is a need for further development work on the PTAP, which will “enable us to present a detailed, integrated case for investment in a transport system.” (Foreword by the Convener)
 - 1.4) The PTAP is largely conceptual and fails to propose a list of specific, deliverable actions that the public can understand in terms of impact and usefulness.
 - 1.5) Consultations using the current draft plan cannot provide clear feedback that can easily help inform decision making.
- 2) To agree not to proceed and that Officers should instead provide more detailed plans of a specific list of prioritised schemes for Consultation that include:
 - a) How much each scheme will cost
 - b) How they will be funded
 - c) How they will be funded
- 3) To provide consultees and the general public a clearer picture of what they are being asked about.

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	7 votes
For Amendment 2	-	2 votes
For Amendment 3	-	2 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Graham, Macinnes, McFarlane and Miller.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Dijkstra-Downie and Lang

For Amendment 3: Councillors Cowdy and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To approve the draft Public Transport Action Plan (Appendix 1 of the report) as a basis for public consultation subject to the following adjustments:
 - In action PG1, delete “particularly in the city centre”
 - In action PR4, add “so as to expand existing and deliver new park and ride capacity.”
 - In PR7, after “express bus services.” add, “This must be done in a way that avoids reducing public transport options for Edinburgh residents.”
- 2) To agree that officers could use the draft Plan’s costings as a basis for engaging with funding bodies.
- 3) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.
- 4) To note the integral relationship between this draft plan, the Circulation Plan and the other City Mobility Plan Action Plans (Active Travel, Air Quality, Parking and Road Safety).
- 5) To note action PG5 “Bus Stop Realignment” and previous public concerns regarding “Bus Stop Rationalisation”, particularly from an equalities perspective.
- 6) To agree that any plans to move/combine bus stops should (1) consider accessibility needs, (2) be mindful of operational needs for bus service reliability and aim to increase patronage/modal shift, (3) should consider initially focusing on the arterial routes defined in the Circulation Plan’s “public transport and active travel priority corridors” and/or the PTAP’s UTC/AVL roll out (PG4), and (4) be informed by a public engagement exercise.
- 7) To agree Transport and Environment Committee members should be briefed on the proposed approach within the context of the Draft PTAP consultation response before the finalised PTAP is tabled for approval.
- 8) To welcome the action to carry out a trial of Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) but noted concern of the lengthy timescales attached to it.
- 9) To agree that in light of bus withdrawals across the city, work on DRT and supported bus services should be prioritised.
- 10) To note the decision of Full Council on the 30th June 2022 to carry out a review of community requirements for supported bus services across and report back in May. To further note that while a Business Bulletin update responding to part of the motion was presented to Transport and Environment Committee in December 2022 and the remaining actions were supposed to be addressed by the Public Transport Action Plan, the review was still outstanding.

- 11) To request officers to carry out the review as per the decision on 30th June 2022 and report back in May.
- 12) To acknowledge that full delivery of the Action Plan, even over a period of a decade or more, would require a substantial increase in funding and resources. (6.1 Financial impact)
- 13) To acknowledge that it was proposed to develop a business case and delivery programme for the PTAP and to seek funding from partners to support delivery. (6.1 Financial impact)
- 14) To acknowledge that there was need for further development work on the PTAP, which will “enable us to present a detailed, integrated case for investment in a transport system.” (Foreword by the Convener)

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

8. Active Travel Action Plan 2023 – Delivering the City Mobility Plan

a) Deputation – Spokes

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Spokes.

The deputation welcomed the new set of City Mobility Plan (CMP) draft delivery policy and action documents. The ambition “to create a city where you don’t need to own a car to get around” was to be applauded for reasons of climate, public health, congestion, and equalities. Such ambition would be essential if the Council were to achieve its ultra-ambitious target to reduce car-km 30% by 2030.

The deputation supported the forthcoming ‘en bloc’ consultation, rather than a drawn-out series of consultations on individual documents.

The deputation raised their concern that the draft CMP delivery plans, such as PTAP, ATAP and the Parking Action Plan are inadequate in not integrating this issue sufficiently.

b) Report by the Executive Director of Place

Details were presented on the draft Active Travel Action Plan for Edinburgh, which sought approval to carry out consultation on the Plan. The plan covered actions to encourage walking, wheeling and cycling over the period to 2030 and beyond.

Motion

- 1) To approve the draft Active Travel Action Plan as a basis for public consultation.
- 2) To agree that initial high-level costings would be used as the basis for engaging with funding bodies.
- 3) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.

- 4) To note the integral relationship between the draft plan and the emerging Circulation Plan and other City Mobility Plan action plans (Air Quality, Parking, Public Transport and Road Safety).
- 5) To delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place to make final graphic design, layout and minor editorial changes to the action plans before final publication on the Council's website.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

- 1) To approve the draft Active Travel Action Plan as a basis for public consultation.
- 2) To agree that initial high-level costings would be used as the basis for engaging with funding bodies.
- 3) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.
- 4) To note the integral relationship between the draft plan and the emerging Circulation Plan and other City Mobility Plan action plans (Air Quality, Parking, Public Transport and Road Safety).
- 5) To delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place to make final graphic design, layout and minor editorial changes to the action plans before final publication on the Council's website.
- 6) Piershill to Powderhall Railway Line:
 - 6.1) Welcomed the ongoing aspiration of bringing the defunct Piershill to Powderhall railway line into use as an off-road walking and cycling and recognised the enormous benefits this new link would bring to active travel between the North and the East of the city, connecting to the North Edinburgh Path Network.
 - 6.2) Regrets that the outcome would not be expected until after 2026 and recognised that Network Rail's approach was the obstacle.
 - 6.3) Directed officers to continue discussions with Network Rail and other relevant parties regarding the acquisition of the railway line by the City of Edinburgh Council and to report back through a Business Bulletin update in three cycles.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment 2

- 1) To acknowledge:
 - 1.1) Delivering every action in the plan to its fullest extent would cost £824m - £1,124bn (at 2022 prices). - (Funding and resourcing the plan)
 - 1.2) Delivery programme would be determined by how much funding could be secured for this work. - (Funding and resourcing the plan)

- 1.3) Full delivery of the Action Plan, even over a long period of time, would require a substantial increase in funding and resources. - (6.2 Financial impact)
- 1.4) The proposal to seek funding to develop a business case and delivery programme for the ATAP. - (6.2 Financial impact)
- 1.5) Consultations which would use the current draft plan would not provide clear feedback that could easily help inform decision making as it would be impossible for the public to determine which aspects of the plan were likely to be prioritised, receive match funding or be approved in the early stages.
- 2) To instruct officers to provide more detailed plans and a specific and prioritised delivery programme before starting Consultations that include:
 - a) How much each scheme will cost
 - b) How they will be funded
 - c) The anticipated timescales for delivery
- 3) To provide consultees and the general public a clearer picture of what they were being asked about. The plan should explain what would be done to achieve delivery of the previously agreed and funded Active Travel Programme and should concentrate on a realistic programme of actions that could be delivered within the lifetime of this Council.
- 4) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.
- 5) To note the integral relationship between the draft plan and the emerging Circulation Plan and other City Mobility Plan action plans (Air Quality, Parking, Public Transport and Road Safety).
- 6) To delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place to make graphic design, layout and minor editorial changes to the action plans before publication on the Council's website

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 was accepted in full, and Amendment 2 adjusted and accepted as addendums to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	9 votes
For Amendment 2	-	2 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dijkstra-Downie Graham, Lang, Macinnes, McFarlane and Miller.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Cowdy and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To approve the draft Active Travel Action Plan as a basis for public consultation.
- 2) To agree that initial high-level costings were used as the basis for engaging with funding bodies.
- 3) To agree to the development of a business case and delivery programme based on the draft Plan.
- 4) To note the integral relationship between the draft plan and the emerging Circulation Plan and other City Mobility Plan action plans (Air Quality, Parking, Public Transport and Road Safety).
- 5) To delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place to make final graphic design, layout and minor editorial changes to the action plans before final publication on the Council's website.
- 6) Piershill to Powderhall Railway Line:
 - 6.1) To welcome the ongoing aspiration of bringing the defunct Piershill to Powderhall railway line into use as an off-road walking and cycling and recognised the enormous benefits this new link would bring to active travel between the North and the East of the city, connecting to the North Edinburgh Path Network.
 - 6.2) To regret that the outcome would not be expected until after 2026 and recognised that Network Rail's approach was the obstacle.
 - 6.3) To direct officers to continue discussions with Network Rail and other relevant parties regarding the acquisition of the railway line by the City of Edinburgh Council and to report back through a Business Bulletin update in three cycles.
- 7) To acknowledge that delivering every action in the plan to its fullest extent would cost £824m -£1,124bn (at 2022 prices). - (Funding and resourcing the plan)
- 8) To acknowledge that a delivery programme would be determined by how much funding could be secured for this work. - (Funding and resourcing the plan)
- 9) To acknowledge that full delivery of the Action Plan, even over a long period of time, would require a substantial increase in funding and resources. - (6.2 Financial impact)
- 10) To acknowledge that it was proposed to seek funding to develop a business case and delivery programme for the ATAP. - (6.2 Financial impact)

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

9. Parking Action Plan – delivering the City Mobility Plan

Details were presented on the draft Parking Action Plan which sought approval to progress to public consultation in early 2023, alongside the other City Mobility Plan (CMP) Delivery Plans.

Motion

- 1) To approve the draft Parking Action Plan, to be presented for public consultation in early 2023.
- 2) To note the concerns of trade unions regarding the Workplace Parking Levy, and that no decision had been made to impose this charge.
- 3) To agree that Action 8 should be redrafted to "...and the Workplace Parking Levy if it is agreed to impose this charge."
- 4) To note that over the lifetime of the PAP many people in Edinburgh would choose to switch from diesel/petrol cars to Electric Vehicles.
- 5) To note that large and inefficient vehicles of all types, including EVs, can have a negative impact on our city.
- 6) To agree Officers should monitor the situation and potentially apply additional surcharges as and when EV efficiency is better understood.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

- 1) To approve the draft Parking Action Plan, to be presented for public consultation in early 2023 subject to the following adjustments.
 - 1.1) In action 2, after 'provide parking controls', insert; 'where there is clear evidence of parking issues and community support for change'
 - 1.2) In action 8, before 'the Workplace Parking Levy', insert; 'subject to the Council's consideration of a full business case,'
 - 1.3) To ensure the phasing map as shown in Section 3 of the plan accurately reflects the committee's decisions of December 2022.

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

Amendment 2

- 1) To approve the draft Parking Action Plan, to be presented for public consultation in early 2023.
- 2) In addition to the actions outlined in the draft Parking Action Plan, requests that the following be included for consultation:
 - 2.1) Introducing a congestion charge
 - 2.2) Varying parking charges by the overall impact of a vehicle, for example weight / size
 - 2.3) Setting a target for annual reduction of parking
 - 2.4) Increasing the price of parking to reflect the total cost
 - 2.5) Exploring charges for other non-residential parking in addition to the WPL
 - 2.6) Changing the uses of some car parking spaces, for example "parklets"
 - 2.7) Making blue badge applications and renewals a more accessible process

- 2.8) Alongside consultation questions on EV charging, include questions about charging EV motability vehicles
- 2.9) Providing easy ways for people to report problems to the council for rapid action, such as pavement parking
- 2.10) Consideration of in-sourcing part/all of parking enforcement services as an alternative to contract renewal.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Bandel

Amendment 3

- 1) To note that:
 - 1.1) The plan set out the Council's strategic approach to parking and kerbside management up to 2030.
 - 1.2) The plan was designed to help the Council target resources.
 - 1.3) The plan would only retain its relevance and effectiveness if we learned from its implementation and regularly update its actions.
 - 1.4) That a public consultation on strategic approaches to targeting resources requiring regular reviews would be unlikely to provide clear feedback that can easily help inform decision making.
- 2) To note that the timescales for implementation of the zones currently approved were unlikely to be met and agrees to provide Committee with an updated implementation plan detailing the Phase 1 roll out order and how information could be provided to the public on the likely timescales for future zones.
- 3) To instruct Officers to provide more detailed delivery programme before starting Consultations that includes:
 - a) How much each scheme will cost
 - b) How they will be funded
 - c) The anticipated timescales for delivery

To provide consultees a clearer picture of what they are being asked about.

- 4) To agree that all future consultations should ask residents/consultees directly whether they support the implementation of a CPZ in their area. If the overwhelming majority or residents do not want a CPZ in their area then it should not proceed.

- moved by Councillor Cowdy, seconded by Councillor Munro

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	7 votes
For Amendment 1	-	2 votes
For Amendment 3	-	2 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Graham, Macinnes, McFarlane and Miller.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Dijkstra-Downie and Lang

For Amendment 3: Councillors Cowdy and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To approve the draft Parking Action Plan, to be presented for public consultation in early 2023 subject to the following adjustments.
 - 1.1) In action 8, before ‘the Workplace Parking Levy’, insert; ‘subject to the Council’s consideration of a full business case,’
 - 1.2) To ensure the phasing map as shown in Section 3 of the plan accurately reflects the committee’s decisions of December 2022.
- 2) To note the concerns of trade unions regarding the Workplace Parking Levy, and that no decision had been made to impose this charge.
- 3) To agree that Action 8 should be redrafted to “...and the Workplace Parking Levy if it is agreed to impose this charge.”
- 4) To note that over the lifetime of the PAP many people in Edinburgh would choose to switch from diesel/petrol cars to Electric Vehicles.
- 5) To note that large and inefficient vehicles of all types, including EVs, can have a negative impact on our city.
- 6) To agree Officers should monitor the situation and potentially apply additional surcharges as and when EV efficiency is better understood.
- 7) In addition to the actions outlined in the draft Parking Action Plan, requests that the following be included for consultation:
 - 7.1) Varying parking charges by the overall impact of a vehicle, for example weight / size
 - 7.2) Setting a target for annual reduction of parking in central Edinburgh
 - 7.3) Increasing the price of parking to reflect the total cost
 - 7.4) Exploring charges for other non-residential parking in addition to the WPL
 - 7.5) Changing the uses of some car parking spaces, for example "parklets"
 - 7.6) Making blue badge applications and renewals a more accessible process
 - 7.7) Alongside consultation questions on EV charging, include questions about charging EV motability vehicles
 - 7.8) Providing easy ways for people to report problems to the council for rapid action, such as pavement parking

7.9) Consideration of in-sourcing part/all of parking enforcement services as an alternative to contract renewal.

- 8) To note that the Plan set out the Council's strategic approach to parking and kerbside management up to 2030.
- 9) To note that the Plan was designed to help the Council target resources
- 10) To note that the Plan would only retain its relevance and effectiveness if we learned from its implementation and regularly update its actions

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

10. Cramond Glebe Road – Traffic Regulation Order 18/83

An update was provided on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) 18/83 to introduce waiting restrictions on Cramond Glebe Road and loading prohibitions at the proposed entry and exit points, on Whitehouse Road, School Brae and Cramond Glebe Road, for a proposed Care Home

Decision

- 1) To note the content of the report and recommendations made by the Independent Reporter following a public hearing.
- 2) To set-aside the objections received and approve the making of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) 18/83 in full.
- 3) To note that should the TRO be made, officers would monitor driver behaviour on Cramond Glebe Road and the interaction between pedestrians and vehicles at the proposed Care Home entry and exit points to consider if further interventions were appropriate.

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

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Lang declared a non-financial interest in the above item as he had previously commented on the TRO.

11. West Edinburgh Link Objections to Traffic Regulation Orders and Redetermination Orders

Details were provided on the representations received following the public advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders and Redetermination Orders for the West Edinburgh Link project and the Council's comments in response. Officers recommended setting aside all relevant objections to the Traffic Regulation Orders and making these Orders, as well as referring the representations to the Redetermination Orders to Scottish Ministers for determination.

Decision

- 1) To note the representations received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders and the re-advertised Redetermination Orders and the Council's comments in response.

- 2) To note that three representations to Traffic Regulation Order TRO/20/25 and 21 representations to TRO/20/29 are no longer pertinent as TRO/20/25 would now be made only in part and TRO/20/29 would not be taken forward at this time, and therefore excludes them from consideration.
- 3) To approve setting aside the 11 remaining objections to Traffic Regulation Orders TRO/20/25, TRO/20/26, TRO/20/27, TRO/20/28A and TRO/20/28B and making the Orders as advertised.
- 4) To approve referring the four representations to the re-advertised Redetermination Orders RSO/22/09, RSO/22/10, RSO/22/11 and RSO/22/12 to Scottish Ministers for determination.

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

12. Results of the West Crosscauseway, Chapel Street, Quarry Close and Buccleuch Street hearing on orders TRO/17/101A and RSO/18/01A

Details were provided on the representations received following the public advertising of Traffic Regulation Orders and Redetermination Orders for the West Edinburgh Link project and the Council's comments in response.

Decision

- 1) To note the information contained within the report, the report from the Independent Reporter and their recommendation.
- 2) To note the recommendation of the Independent Reporter and Scottish Ministers that the advertised orders, TRO/17/101A and RSO/18/01A, should be made without modification.
- 3) To approve the making of the statutory orders, TRO/17/101A and RSO/18/01A, without modification.

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

13. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 8 December 2022 as a correct record.

(References – Minute of 8 December 2022, submitted.)

14. 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)

15. Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log

The Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log was presented.

Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:
 - Action 1** – Public Transport Priority Action Plan
 - Action 21** – Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme – Future Delivery and Interim Community Initiatives
 - Action 24 (1 & 3)** – Progress Report on the ‘Vision for Water Management’ and Operational Management of Roads Drainage Infrastructure
 - Action 25** – Motion by Councillor Staniforth – Updating the Taxicard Scheme
 - Action 32** – Motion by Councillor Booth – Bus Lane Hours
 - Action 36** – Transport Infrastructure Investment – Capital Delivery
 - Action 40** – Motion by Councillor Macinnes – Withdrawal of Contract Extensions for Supported Bus Services 20, 63 and 68
 - Action 42** – Motion by Councillor Thornley – Bus Service Single Fares
 - Action 44** – Our Future Streets Circulation Plan
 - Action 45** – Response to Motion by Councillor Booth – Rainbow Bridge/Lindsay Road Bridge
 - Action 48** – Concessionary Travel on Edinburgh Trams for Young People (Under 22)
 - Action 51** – Motion by Councillor Arthur – Burnside Bridge
 - Action 53** – Motion by Councillor Aston – Electric Scooters
 - Action 62** – Business Bulletin – Bus Lane Operating Hours
 - Action 68** – Motion by Councillor Miller – Driver Behaviour
- 2) To agree Action 30 -Motions By Councillor Whyte and Councillor Mowat – Restoring a Bus Service for Willowbrae/Lady Nairn and Bus for Dumbiedykes and Action 63 – Business Bulletin Motion by Councillor Whyte and Councillor Mowat – Restoring a Bus Service for Willowbrae/Lady Nairn and Bus for Dumbiedykes would remain open.
- 3) To note Actions 15 Rolling Actions Log and 33 Rolling Actions Log appeared to be duplicated and officers would update the Rolling Actions Log to reflect this.
- 4) To otherwise note the remaining outstanding actions.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, submitted.)

16. Business Bulletin

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

Motion

- 1) To acknowledge the value of Burnside Bridge to the local community.

2) To agree to exceptionally fund the re-opening of Burnside Bridge from the Roads and Infrastructure budget and take all reasonable steps to recover the costs.

3) To otherwise note the Business Bulletin.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

1) Welcomed the work by officers both in researching possible ownership of the bridge and in identifying potential legal powers available to the Council to ensure that the bridge is made safe to use for travel and to thereby restore the public right of way.

2) Recognised the unavoidable uncertainty as to when the land adjacent to the bridge might be subject to a planning application and that it could take potentially years, meaning that the bridge and public right of way continue to be unusable and that that has already been the position since summer 2019.

3) Requested a report to Full Council in one cycle outlining a programme of works to restore the bridge for safe use.

4) To otherwise note the Business Bulletin.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment 2

To ask that the “further discussions [...] ongoing on a wider campaign around driver behaviours” were briefed to committee members and a report be provided for approval when recommendations have been developed.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Bandel

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted and Amendment 2 was accepted in full as an addendum to the motion.

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

Decision

1) To acknowledge the value of Burnside Bridge to the local community.

2) To agree to exceptionally fund the re-opening of Burnside Bridge from the Roads and Infrastructure budget and take all reasonable steps to recover the costs.

3) To welcome the work by officers both in researching possible ownership of the bridge and in identifying potential legal powers available to the Council to ensure that the bridge is made safe to use for travel and to thereby restore the public right of way.

4) To recognise the unavoidable uncertainty as to when the land adjacent to the bridge might be subject to a planning application and that it could take potentially years, meaning that the bridge and public right of way continue to be unusable and that that has already been the position since summer 2019.

- 5) To ask that the “further discussions [...] ongoing on a wider campaign around driver behaviours” were briefed to committee members and a report be provided for approval when recommendations have been developed.
- 6) To otherwise note the Business Bulletin.

(Reference – Business Bulletin, submitted.)

17. Motion by Councillor Macinnes - Edinburgh Freight Conference

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

“Committee recognises:

- 1) Each city has freight issues of some kind, including Edinburgh. These include large and increased numbers of delivery vehicles contributing to congestion and difficulties on bus routes, pavement parking and associated expensive damage to physical infrastructure, road safety risks, particularly for vulnerable road users, and noise and air pollution.
- 2) The prime importance of reliable freight deliveries and loading to businesses of all sizes in Edinburgh and that there is evidence that the logistics industry is responding to changing expectations in cities. Many logistics operations have set their own climate impact reduction policies, and this is starting to be seen through the increased incidence of smaller electric vehicles or cargo bike deliveries in Edinburgh.
- 3) The previously published City Mobility Plan contains a clear reference to the strong support through public consultation for a reduction in freight vehicle trips and commits (through Policy Measure Movement 26 Managing Delivery and Servicing) to ‘Reduce the impact of delivery and servicing vehicles such as through access and timing restrictions, edge of town consolidation centres and local click and collect facilities while supporting deliveries by foot and bicycle.’

Committee therefore:

- 4) Calls on officers to commit to specific engagement with, and learning from, the logistics industry through the creation of a special conference covering key city delivery issues. This should include key representatives from main delivery companies, logistic experts both industry and academic, Council officers and other Edinburgh-related organisations. Its purpose should be to understand how best to reduce delivery vehicle kms and heavy vehicle usage inside the City, explore the proposition of consolidation centres with the logistics industry themselves and find appropriate ways forward that both support business operations and deliver key benefits for the city identifying specific Council actions to facilitate this progress.
- 5) The findings from this conference should be brought back to the Transport Committee with specific actions arising from those renewed and effective relationships with those who can help us shape this aspect of transport policy development.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment

- 1) To delete paragraphs 4 and 5 of the motion by Councillor Macinnes and insert
 - a. notes the update included in the December 2022 business bulletin on the development of the operational management plan (OMP) as set out in the City Mobility Strategy, and the specific references to freight, consolidation hubs, servicing and deliveries
 - b. believes there should be ongoing engagement with the delivery and logistics industry on reducing delivery vehicle kms in the development and delivery of the OMP.
 - c. notes SEStran held a Logistics and Freight Forum in November 2022 and Transport Scotland held a Decarbonising Last Mile Delivery in Scotland event in September, and that Edinburgh Council officers have been involved with both conferences and continue the dialogue at a regional and national level.
 - d. agrees the Freight Forum should be reconstituted and that group transport spokespeople should be invited along with Edinburgh business representatives.
 - e. agrees officers should continue to focus on agreeing the final OMP and provide an update to committee in May.”

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

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

(For the Motion: Councillors Aston, Macinnes and McFarlane.

For the Amendment: Arthur, Bandel, Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Graham, Lang, Miller and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor Lang.