

## Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday 19 August 2021 and 1.30pm, Thursday 9 September 2021

(reconvened on Thursday 9 September 2021)

### Present 19 August 2021

Councillors Macinnes (Convener), Doran (Vice-Convener), Bird, Booth (substituting for Councillor Miller (Items 1-13)), Child, Corbett, Gordon (substituting for Councillor Key (items 3 – 13)), Hutchison, Key (items 1 and 2), Lang, Smith, and Whyte.

### Present 9 September 2021

Councillors Macinnes (Convener), Doran (Vice-Convener), Child, Corbett, Hutchison, Key, Lang, McVey (substituting for Councillor Bird (items 16 –19) Miller, Smith, and Whyte.

## 1. Active Travel Measures – Travelling Safely (formerly known as Spaces for People)

---

### a) Deputation – Joint Deputation – Spokes and Better Edinburgh for Sustainable Travel (BEST)

Committee heard a deputation from Spokes and BEST about their concerns over the recommendations in the report to revise and remove measures. The deputation emphasised that whilst they were glad to see many measures implemented, the revision and removal of certain infrastructure was done so inconsistently and with lack of reasoning. The deputation suggested to Committee that they implemented three clear principles in order to determine in future what measures should be revised and replaced. The deputation advised that conforming to the transport hierarchy (putting those who walk, wheel and cycle first), to consider the integrity of the active travel network, and to focus on the equality impacts revising and removing infrastructure could have a positive impact on members of the public.

### b) Deputation – South West Edinburgh 20 Minute Neighbourhoods

Committee considered a deputation from South West Edinburgh 20 Minute Neighbourhoods on their mixed views around the proposals being debated by Committee. The deputation advised that the retention of many schemes was warmly welcomed and hoped that the ETRO process would allow for further consultation, improvements and final designs for these schemes to be delivered in a timely manner, especially Longstone, Inglis Green, Murrayburn and Slateford Roads.

- The schemes needed to be better connected – for example linking Longstone cycle lanes properly with Lanark Road and also from Lanark Road through Juniper Green to reach quieter streets.
- Many walking and cycling improvements would not happen until there were further end-to-end journey investments and the council was urged to be cautious about usage data from schemes which were not yet connected to other safe routes, especially whilst the majority of offices in the city were still closed due to the pandemic.
- The “cut the clutter” partnership with Living Streets was welcomed and should be extended based on survey data collected.
- The CEC was urged to build upon the success of school streets with permanent designs where possible.
- The choice between parking and better active travel was false, reallocation of road space from active travel back to private vehicles did not align with UK, Scottish or local government policies to reduce car use.
- The lack of any serious incidents around floating parking was welcomed, and the principle of well-implemented floating parking was supported. However, the community needed to see the vision for these layouts in a permanent state rather than the temporary materials which may suppress local support.

**c) Deputation – Better Broughton**

Committee considered a deputation from Better Broughton on the proposed changes at the Broughton Road junction. The deputation noted that the proposed scheme seemed to put southbound cyclists, particularly those going straight ahead, at a very high risk of being struck by vehicles turning left. The deputation stated that the proposed change would mean cyclists should be on the inside of the left turn lane, as opposed to the signed straight ahead lane that was currently in place. The deputation also noted there appeared to be issues with traffic signal phasing that may contribute to the reported congestion and bus delays, and ideally would like signals synchronised so traffic could flow through to Broughton Road. The deputation felt the current scheme in place was safer than the scheme proposed, and that cyclists would be best served by infrastructure to support them taking primary position in the straight-ahead and left-turn lanes.

**d) Ward Councillors**

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

Councillor Cameron advised Committee of concerns on representation. Councillor Cameron noted she was doing so as a Small Business Champion and as Chair of Cross Party Working Groups on Equalities. Councillor Cameron supported encouraging the widest variety of people to come into the city, but expressed concerns that small business owners were being impacted with receiving deliveries and logistical issues due to arrangements made by the Committee. Councillor Cameron asked Committee to consider what could be

done to encourage safer wheelchair access and cycling around the city, without impacting on smaller businesses.

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

An update was provided on existing Spaces for People measures installed over 2020 and 2021 in response to the public health emergency (Coronavirus (COVID-19)) together with the actions agreed at Council on 24 June 2021.

**Motion**

- 1) To approve the scheme updates and recommendations included in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To approve the high-level project programme in Appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) To note the update on each scheme grouping describing scheme removal, proposed retention under Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs), engagement and options to be considered at a future Committee.
- 4) To approve the specific actions for scheme modification or removal in paragraphs 4.25 – 4.36 of the report.
- 5) To note that officers had started engagement with Community Councils and local residents regarding specific options for Comiston Road, Braid Road and Lanark Road to bringing a further report to the next meeting of this Committee.
- 6) To note the update on school schemes (Appendix 6 of the report), and the intention to reinstate all existing school measures on or near the appropriate August school return date.
- 7) To note the projected budget plan for the period 2021/2022.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

**Amendment 1**

- 1) To reject the rebranding of Spaces for People given that the programme was no longer required for its intended purpose and believed given widespread public opposition and a scathing audit opinion that Spaces for People did not form a sound basis on which to build this Council's active travel strategy going forward.
- 2) To regret the lack of meaningful consultation on the bulk of the Spaces for People schemes and a failure by the Council to listen to feedback from the residents once schemes were introduced.
- 3) To acknowledge the reputational damage caused to the Council by the profoundly undemocratic manner by which the Spaces for People programme was foisted on the citizens of Edinburgh, as well the negative impact on the lives of our citizens and businesses at a time when they most needed our support.
- 4) To note with concern the red opinion issued by our auditors on the Spaces for People programme and to ask Senior Administration Councillors and officers to reflect on the unlistening and uncollaborative approach taken in rolling out this programme.

- 5) To reject recommendations 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 of the report by the Executive Director of Place and to instruct officers to bring a report to Committee in one cycle detailing the conclusion of the programme and plans for the removal of all remaining Spaces for People infrastructure (except those measures at schools which were supported by the public).
- 6) To consider that given the intended temporary nature of the Spaces for People programme that sufficient funds should have been held back from the grant funding to the Council to facilitate the removal of said schemes in full.
- 7) To instruct officers to bring back a report in one cycle with proposals to expand the Active Travel Forum to ensure cross party representation and membership from a broad cross section of stakeholders to ensure future decisions on active travel were better informed.
- 8) To recognise the detrimental aesthetic impact of much of the Spaces for People infrastructure on our cityscape and to commit to consultation with heritage bodies in designing any permanent infrastructure.
- 9) To agree that the Spaces for People TTROs had provided a more than adequate timeframe to assess the impact of individual schemes and that ETROs should not be used to further expand these temporary schemes.
- 10) To instruct officers to bring back a report to this Committee in three cycles setting out the approach to be taken going forward in developing the city's active travel infrastructure following consultation with the expanded Active Travel Forum. The report should include the outcomes of recommendations 1.1.5 and 1.1.6 of the report, which, if given approval, should then be implemented through the normal TRO process. It should also detail the status of previously planned permanent Active Travel Schemes and actions that could be taken to ensure these were actually delivered.
- 11) To agree that all new Active Travel schemes proposed in future would be developed through full consultation with impacted residents and businesses, ward Councillors, Community Council's and other local stakeholders as appropriate.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Whyte

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To approve the scheme updates and recommendations included in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place as an appropriate response to the policy position agreed by full Council in June 2021.
- 2) To approve the high-level project programme in Appendix 2 to the report.
- 3) To note the update on each scheme grouping describing scheme removal, proposed retention under Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs), engagement and options to be considered at a future Committee.
- 4) To approve the specific actions for scheme modification or removal in paragraphs 4.25 – 4.36 of the report with the exception of Drum Brae North,

where a decision was continued until October 2021 to allow for a full risk assessment, which should include consideration of the risks associated with the continued absence of the previous vehicle separation road markings at the top of the hill.

- 5) To note that officers had started engagement with Community Councils and local residents regarding specific options for Comiston Road, Braid Road and Lanark Road to bringing a further report to the next meeting of this Committee.
- 6) To note the update on school schemes (Appendix 6 of the report), and the intention to reinstate all existing school measures on or near the appropriate August school return date.
- 7) To note the projected budget plan for the period 2021/2022.
- 8) To agree that future reports should include a section on any resource impacts arising from this programme on other transport projects, particularly with respect to the wider active travel programme and road safety programme.
- 9) To note that, on 17 June 2021, Committee agreed that officers should return with a report on “options for modifications to Silverknowes Road South, including possible removal of the scheme” and reaffirms its expectation that the necessary consultation would be undertaken to allow for this report to come to the next meeting of the Committee.
- 10) To agree that the October 2021 report should include a more detailed update on the work being undertaken with Living Streets, local businesses and the access panel on long term replacements for the shopping street schemes, as referred to in the agreed June 2021 motion, and to provide an indicative timetable for future reports to Committee through the 20 minute neighbourhood programme or otherwise.
- 11) To agree that the programme of work should continue to be referred to as ‘Spaces for People’ rather than the proposed title of ‘Travelling Safely’ in order to avoid confusion with other Council transport safety projects.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Child

### **Amendment 3**

- 1) To approve the scheme updates and actions in appendix 1 and in paragraphs 4.25 – 4.36 except as modified below:

To welcome the programme implemented over the last 17 months to increase provision for safer walking, wheeling and cycling and the aim to retain many of those interventions, suitably adjusted in light of public feedback and experience, and integrated with wider council aims such as 20 minute neighbourhoods and Edinburgh City Centre Transformation; nevertheless regret dilution or removal of a minority of schemes; and therefore:

To retain segregated cycle lanes and pedestrian improvements from Forrest Road to the Mound until the Meadows to George Street

permanent scheme was in place and to continue to engage with businesses and bus operators in the corridor on access and loading issues.

To retain Canonmills cycle segregation, pedestrian build-outs and road markings; retain Eyre Place right turn ban; and to continue to engage on other ways of mitigating public transport delays and improving active travel safety.

To retain full cycle segregation on Drum Brae North.

To retain the segregated cycle lane on the uphill stretch of Morningside Road.

To retain town centre modifications in Stockbridge, Gorgie-Dalry, Bruntsfield, Tollcross, Morningside, Portobello and Corstorphine (St John's Road), outlined in Appendix 1 of the report; and to welcome opportunities for future footway widening as 20-minute neighbourhood plans evolved.

To retain and expand school street improvements in Appendix 6 of the report and in line with school travel plan reviews.

To progress Seafield Road temporary crossing until permanent crossing was installed.

- 2) To agree recommendations 1.1.2-1.1.3 and 1.1.5-1.1.7 in the report with any modifications required as above, noting also that proposals for Lanark Road, Comiston Road and Braid Road would come to the October 2021 Committee.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Booth

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

#### **First Vote**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	5 votes
For Amendment 1	-	3 votes
For Amendment 2	-	1 votes
For Amendment 3	-	2 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Child, Doran, Key and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Smith and Whyte.

For Amendment 2: Councillor Lang.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Booth and Corbett.

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendments 1 and 3.

### **Voting**

## **Second Vote**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	5 votes
For Amendment 1	-	3 votes
For Amendment 3	-	2 votes
Abstentions	-	1

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Child, Doran, Key and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Smith and Whyte.

For Amendment 2: Councillor Booth and Corbett.

Abstentions: Councillor Lang.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 3 fell and a third vote was taken between the Motion and Amendment 1.

## **Voting**

### **Third Vote**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	5 votes
For Amendment 1	-	3 votes
Abstentions	-	3

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Child, Doran, Key and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Smith and Whyte.

Abstentions: Councillors Booth, Corbett and Lang.)

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

(References – Act of Council (No 1) 24 June 2021; report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **Declaration of Interests**

Councillors Booth and Corbett declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of Spokes.

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

## **2. George Street and First New Town – Final Concept Design and Operational Plan Update**

---

### **a) Deputation – Essential Edinburgh**

Committee heard a deputation from Essential Edinburgh on their stance on the report. The deputation advised from the start of the process that they had been hugely supportive of changes to the street, with the vast majority of people being happy with the changes, however there were a few areas of concern. The

design could not be looked at in isolation as operational plans also had to be considered, as everyone needed to be satisfied that Rose Street would be utilised by as many businesses and customers than it had been before. The deputation was concerned over businesses being able to operate effectively, as the construction could impact businesses who were required to have goods delivered and mobility issues could be caused for those wanting access to the street. The side streets within Rose Street should be used minimally in order to receive deliveries as these streets were in need of attention. Events spaces within the street were not practical, and did not provide adequate entry for those with mobility issues or emergency services. The street would also be a night time economy space, and therefore taxis needed better access into and out of the street. The deputation also said the time frame was a cause for concern as an adequate time frame was needed in order to minimize impact to businesses, and compensation should be available to businesses who would be impacted by the build.

**b) Deputation – George Street Association**

Committee heard a deputation from the George Street Association who voiced their concerns on the report. The deputation advised that were unresolved issues in the plan, meaning they did not have enough information on how it would affect members. Concerns were raised over the operational plan as there was operational details missing and over the expected delivery by 2025. Rassurance was needed over the impact of stakeholder engagement, and that the stakeholders' needs would be met. The deputation understood the needs of the plan but stated it was very complex and treasurers requested further information on how budgets would also cover small business who were struggling due to the Covid-19 Pandemic to encourage them to stay open until the proposed plans were met in 2025 and to encourage customers to shop in their premises.

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

Details of the proposed final concept design for George Street and the First New Town (GNT) were presented for approval, alongside a set of principles for the future operation of the First New Town streets. The proposals reflected alignment to strategic priorities including the recently approved City Mobility Plan (CMP) and formed an integral relationship with other key city centre active travel projects including Meadows to George Street (MGS) and the City Centre West to East Link (CCWEL).

**Motion**

- 1) To approve a set of final fundamental design elements, outlined in paragraph 4.7 and Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To agree the key principles of an Operational Plan proposed for George Street and First New Town, as outlined in paragraph 4.8 and detailed in Appendix 2 to the report.



- 3) To note that a procurement exercise had commenced to secure multidisciplinary consultancy support to progress the next stages of the project.
- 4) To note that the next design stage was critical where, by end of 2021, it was expected that sufficient detail would emerge from the design process to enable the commencement of the necessary statutory consents; under which the power to construct the scheme would be obtained.
- 5) To note that funding up to £20 million had been secured from Sustrans Places for Everyone programme, with 100% of design costs and 70% of construction costs covered by the grant award.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment**

To continue consideration of the report for 2 cycles to enable further details on the project to be provided.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	8 votes
For the amendment	-	3 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Bird, Booth, Child, Corbett, Doran, Key Lang, and Macinnes.

For the amendment: Councillors Hutchison, Smith and Whyte.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

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

## **3. Leith Connections – Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal route and Low Traffic Neighbourhood**

---

### **a) Deputation – Living Streets Edinburgh**

Committee heard a deputation from Living Streets Edinburgh. The deputation wanted to remind Committee of the sustainable transport hierarchy and did not support the cycle path being taken away at Leith Walk. The deputation claimed that cyclists would use this area even though it was closed due to the tram network being built which could be extremely dangerous. This area was notorious for serious accidents and the deputation requested that Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood report would not be uncoupled. The deputation argued that since the tram works began more road space had become available for motorists, and less space was available for cyclists or those with mobility issues. The deputation supported a bus route in this area and a cycle path to encourage more access to the area. Concerns were raised about there being no definite time line for the completion of the scheme due to ongoing

tram works and perhaps building an accessible cycle path at the same time could be considered as an option.

**b) Deputation – Leith Links Community Council**

Committee received a written deputation from Leith Links Community Council on their concerns over the Low Traffic Neighbourhood proposal which was circulated to Committee members. The deputation commented that they were part of the Leith Conservation Area, a well-used and popular area, that had seen a significant rise in population and members of the public coming in to use the leisure facilities. The deputation supported the City of Edinburgh Council proposals in principle to address problems in the area, however due to ongoing major transport construction projects (tram works) at the heart of the proposal it was causing major disruption on the movement in and out of the area. The deputation recommended that all projects (CPZ, LTN and Segregated Cycle way) should be published as a single report, and that the implementation of the LTN should be postponed, even on an experimental basis, until the tram-works were completed in 2023. The deputation also advised that the Council should engage with the public in order to gauge more evidence of public opinion.

**c) Deputation –Spokes**

Committee received a written deputation from Spokes which was circulated to members of the Committee. Spokes strongly disagreed with the recommendation to delay the implementation of Phase 1 – Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal cycle route. The scheme was essential for providing a safe route for cycling between the Foot of the Walk and Ocean Terminal. The scheme was necessary due to the cycle ban at the south end of Constitution Street and the lack of cycling facilities on the remainder of Constitution Street along the tram route to Ocean Terminal. The Trams to Newhaven programme had denied any responsibility for provision of safe cycling facilities along this section of the route because the Trams to Newhaven programme thought Phase 1 would cover this requirement. The deputation was concerned about the lack of cycling access, and the lack of solutions offered in this area.

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

Details were provided on the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for Phase 1 of the Leith Connections project and on a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN). Approval was sought to commence the statutory process for the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and Redetermination Order (RSO) necessary to implement the key restrictions on traffic movements associated with Phase 1. 2.5 and to commence the statutory process for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) necessary to implement Phase 2 of the project, to introduce an LTN on a trial basis.

## **Motion**

- 1) To note the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for Phase 1 of the Leith Connections project and on a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Leith.
  - 2) To note that measures associated with Phase 1 would remove through traffic from some streets within the area and were a key first stage towards implementing a full LTN at a later date.
  - 3) To approve commencing the statutory process for the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) necessary to implement the key restrictions on traffic movements associated with Phase 1, as specified in the report by the Executive Director of Place.
  - 4) To note that the statutory processes for the TRO necessary to implement the remaining restrictions on traffic movements and the changes to waiting and loading restrictions associated with Phase 1, along with the Redetermination Order (RSO) necessary for changes to kerblines, would be commenced when designs were further advanced and that this would be done under powers delegated to the Executive Director of Place.
  - 5) To approve commencing the statutory process for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) necessary to implement Phase 2 of the LTN on a trial basis, as specified in the report.
  - 6) To note that the implementation of the project would not commence until after the completion of Trams to Newhaven construction work and associated traffic management at the Foot of the Walk. This work was currently expected to be completed by July 2022 but this date might be subject to change.
- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

## **Amendment 1**

To delete Paragraph 6 in the motion by Councillor Macinnes and add as follows:

- 6) To note that the reason for the Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal cycle route was the "lack of cycling infrastructure on [the] main tram route due to constrained streetscape and road widths" (TtN final business case, p.65) and the council commitment that this route would be delivered, "in parallel with the tram project" (ibid, p.65), and therefore to agree to commence construction of the Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal cycle route (phase 1) as soon as practicable once the relevant legal processes were complete.
- 7) To note that many streets in Leith were currently suffering congestion as a result of high traffic levels, that this was exacerbated by construction work, including construction associated with Trams to Newhaven; to note that many responses to the consultation supported the principle of the LTN but asked the council to delay implementation, and therefore agree to delay implementation of the LTN (phase 2) until after the Trams to Newhaven construction work and associated traffic management in the area was complete, expected to be Summer 2022.

- 8) To welcome the list of potential LTN alterations outlined in paragraph 5.16 of the report by the Executive Director of Place; to agree that these should be implemented as soon as possible if the circumstances outlined in that section of the report were met, and therefore to agree to delegate the power to implement these to the Executive Director of Place in consultation with the Convener and Vice Convener.
- 9) To regret that a segregated cycle route from Sandport Bridge to Links Gardens had not been included as part of this project; to agree this was a crucial missing link in the city's cycle path network and, were it to be completed, would allow traffic-free cycling nearly from Joppa to Cramond, and therefore to agree to receive a report on delivering this section, and the other 'missing links' in the traffic-free cycle path network, within three cycles.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Corbett

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To regret the lack of joined up thinking in the development of these proposals with regard to the interaction between the cycle route, LTN, Controlled Parking and tram works, as well as the lack of consultation with local stakeholders and community prior to the development work.
- 2) To consider the proposed cycle route to be sub-optimal and therefore likely to be underutilised, especially given that it was not a direct route between the Foot of the Walk and Ocean Terminal.
- 3) To note the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for Phase 1 of the Leith Connections project and on a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Leith.
- 4) To instruct officers to bring a report to this Committee at least 6 months post the start date of passenger service on the tram line to Newhaven detailing plans for a community consultation to develop new and comprehensive proposals to promote active travel and reduce car usage in the Leith area. This plan should be transparent as to the combined effect of all measures and the impact on residents in the area and surrounding areas. It should also consider the introduction of a closure to traffic on the Shore to provide a new public space as an alternative to Sandport Bridge.
- 5) Thereafter recommendations should be brought before this Committee.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Amendment 3**

To add to the motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 7) To agree that an evaluation report should be submitted to Committee following the formal monitoring of the impact of the phase 2 experiment, and before any decision was taken on a statutory consultation for permanent orders.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Child

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an amendment to the motion, Paragraph 4 of Amendment 2 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion and Amendment 3 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	8 votes
For Amendment 2	-	3 votes

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

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for Phase 1 of the Leith Connections project and on a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Leith.
- 2) To note that measures associated with Phase 1 would remove through traffic from some streets within the area and were a key first stage towards implementing a full LTN at a later date.
- 3) To approve commencing the statutory process for the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) necessary to implement the key restrictions on traffic movements associated with Phase 1, as specified in the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 4) To note that the statutory processes for the TRO necessary to implement the remaining restrictions on traffic movements and the changes to waiting and loading restrictions associated with Phase 1, along with the Redetermination Order (RSO) necessary for changes to kerblines, would be commenced when designs were further advanced and that this would be done under powers delegated to the Executive Director of Place.
- 5) To approve commencing the statutory process for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) necessary to implement Phase 2 of the LTN on a trial basis, as specified in the report.
- 6) To note that the reason for the Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal cycle route was the "lack of cycling infrastructure on [the] main tram route due to constrained streetscape and road widths" (TtN final business case, p.65) and the council commitment that this route would be delivered, "in parallel with the tram project" (ibid, p.65), and therefore to agree to commence construction of the Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal cycle route (phase 1) as soon as practicable once the relevant legal processes were complete.
- 7) To note that many streets in Leith were currently suffering congestion as a result of high traffic levels, that this was exacerbated by construction work, including

construction associated with Trams to Newhaven; to note that many responses to the consultation supported the principle of the LTN but asked the council to delay implementation, and therefore to agree to delay implementation of the LTN (phase 2) until after the Trams to Newhaven construction work and associated traffic management in the area was complete, expected to be Summer 2022 as already reflected in the report.

- 8) To welcome the list of potential LTN alterations outlined in paragraph 5.16 of the report by the Executive Director of Place; to agree that these should be implemented as soon as possible if the circumstances outlined in that section of the report were met, and therefore to agree to delegate the power to implement these to the Executive Director of Place in consultation with the Convener and Vice Convener.
- 9) To regret that a segregated cycle route from Sandport Bridge to Links Gardens had not been included as part of this project; to agree this was a crucial missing link in the city's cycle path network and, were it to be completed, would allow traffic-free cycling nearly from Joppa to Cramond, and therefore to agree to receive a report on delivering this section, and the other 'missing links' in the traffic-free cycle path network, to the January 2022 meeting of the Committee.
- 10) To instruct officers to bring a report to this Committee at least 6 months post the start date of passenger service on the tram line to Newhaven detailing plans for a community consultation to develop new and comprehensive proposals to promote active travel and reduce car usage in the Leith area. It should also consider the introduction of a closure to traffic on the Shore to provide a new public space as an alternative to Sandport Bridge
- 11) To agree that an evaluation report should be submitted to Committee following the formal monitoring of the impact of the phase 2 experiment, and before any decision was taken on a statutory consultation for permanent orders.

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

### **Declaration of Interest**

Councillor Whyte declared a non-financial interest in the above item as he lived in the area under discussion.

## **4. Minutes**

---

### **Decision**

To approve the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 17 June 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 22** – Edinburgh Low Emission Zone – regulations and guidance consultation response and programme update
  - Action 24(2)** – Business Bulletin – Low Emission Zone Scheme
  - Action 26** – Waste and Cleansing Service Policy Assurance Statement
  - Action 32** – Trams to Newhaven: Commencement of Statutory Procedures for Traffic Regulation Order
  - Action 37(3)** – Business Bulletin – Bus Partnership Fund
  - Action 38(2)** – Spaces for People – April 2021 Update
  - Action 42(7)** – Future Provision of Public Conveniences - Signage
  - Action 45(6)** – Potential Retention of Spaces for People Measures Drum Brae North
  - Action 49(1)** – City Centre West to East Cycle Link and Street Improvements Project – Proposed design changes and Statutory Orders Update
- 2) To otherwise note the Rolling Actions Log.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, submitted.)

## 7. Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin

---

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

### Decision

- 1) To note that the section of Business Bulletin relating to the Kirkliston and Queensferry Traffic and Active Travel Study provided, for the second period running, no update on the crossroads junction reconfiguration.
- 2) To acknowledge that the significant and worsening congestion at the Kirkliston crossroads formed the original basis for the traffic study undertaken in 2018.
- 3) To agree that a report setting out options for reconfiguring the junction and any other appropriate action should be presented to Committee for decision in November 2021.
- 4) To otherwise note the Business Bulletin.

(Reference – Business Bulletin, submitted.)

## 8. Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update

---

### a) Deputation – Constituents from Edinburgh Eastern Constituency

Committee received a written deputation from Ash Denham MSP on behalf of the constituents from Edinburgh Eastern Constituency that had been circulated to Committee. Concerns had been raised about parking restrictions that were proposed to be implemented in streets where local residents did not believe they were needed. The deputation stated the current proposals alone would not reduce congestion and car use, and would push congestion and parking problems into neighbouring areas that were not yet proposed. The deputation advised that the proposed restrictions on parking would force households to purchase parking permits, and there was not enough public transport in the area in order for residents to live independently if they could not drive.

### b) Deputation – Murrayfield Community Council

Committee received a written and verbal deputation from Murrayfield Community Council on behalf of the residents of Saughtonhill to oppose the proposed Controlled Parking Zone area. The deputation advised the Committee the scheme as it was proposed would not achieve its primary objective of ensuring residents were able to park near their homes as the proposals would make this more difficult. The deputation also noted there was no evidence of current parking pressures in this area.

### c) Ward Councillors

In accordance with Standing Order 33.1, the Convener agreed to hear a presentation from Ward Councillors Douglas and McLellan.

Councillor Douglas explained to Committee how he had received comments from residents in the area that a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was not needed. Councillor Douglas went on to say that petitions had been launched against the proposed CPZ with residents in the Saughtonhill area wishing to see if parking became an issue before implementing the CPZ. Councillor Douglas also went on to say that most of the area was private land anyway and he did not see the need for the CPZ, and that data within the report was reported by residents to be incorrect. Councillor Douglas suggested that Committee should also review the issues with stadium parking as this was an issue, and that should take priority.

Ward Councillor McLellan advised that he was opposed to the CPZ and that the report was based on pre-pandemic commutes and shopping patterns. The extent of displacement from pre-pandemic to the pandemic was unknown and that the world had changed since Covid-19. This meant that the CPZs were potentially not needed. Councillor McLellan wanted to hold off until the results of Phase 1 of the CPZ were understood in full in order to make a more accurate decision. By implementing the CPZ in these areas many residents would be forced to pay for a service that they had now for free even though parking would be reduced by 50% in the area. Stadium parking was an issue especially on



match days, with residents not being able to access parking at their homes and emergency services not being able to access the area.

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

An update was provided on progress on the Strategic Review which included the results of the Phase 2 consultation process, making a series of recommendations based on the consultation results and, where appropriate, on other strands of work arising from, or linked to, the Strategic Review of Parking.

**Motion**

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the report formed the second part of a city-wide strategic review of parking being conducted in 4 different stages and previously approved in 2018.
- 3) To note the degree of consultation and engagement which had taken place and the consultation results for the Phase 2 schemes.
- 4) To request officers undertook further engagement with resident's groups and other local stakeholders, such as Community Councils, on the final designs for Phase 2.
- 5) To request an additional report in Autumn 2022 at the latest (including feedback on the implementation on phase 1) to allow Committee to review the designs for the TRO process for Phase 2 schemes following the engagement set out in 4) above and prior to a traffic order being issued. These designs should be consistent with the implementation of the pavement parking ban.
- 6) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 7) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report.
- 8) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report, which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.

moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

**Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the Council had traditionally only introduced new parking restrictions in areas where there was significant support amongst residents for such restrictions.
- 3) To consider that the results of the consultation for Phase 2 showed a significant majority of respondents were opposed to these plans and therefore conclude that there was not significant public demand for their implementation.

- 4) To agree not to proceed with the implementation of parking controls in the Phase 2 area.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To approve, having considered the consultation results, the policy justification behind the measures proposed by the Strategic Review of Parking, and the potential for parking migration between areas, commencement of the legal process to introduce parking controls into all areas covered by the Phase 2 proposals.
- 3) To note the operational details for the proposed parking controls for the Phase 2 area, as detailed in Appendix 3 to the report.
- 4) To note the recommended changes arising from the consultation process to the proposed designs as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.
- 5) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 6) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 to the report.
- 7) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.
- 8) To agree that high quality public engagement during the roll-out of these proposals would be crucial to its success, and therefore to call for a comprehensive public engagement programme to be brought forward, in particular focusing on the policy justifications for the extension of the CPZ and the likely knock-on effect of adjacent zones coming into operation.
- 9) To further agree that the roll-out of the extension of the CPZ could be used as an opportunity to encourage vehicle owners to consider more sustainable transport options, and therefore to agree to investigate the potential to collaborate with public transport operators, the City Car Club and active travel organisations to provide information and incentives to residents to choose more sustainable travel options at the point of CPZ extension.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Corbett

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

### **Voting**

#### **First Vote**

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	5 votes
For Amendment 1	-	4 votes
For Amendment 2	-	2 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Child, Doran, Gordon and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Lang, Smith and Whyte.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Booth and Corbett.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion (as adjusted) and Amendment 1.

### **Second Vote**

For the Motion (as adjusted) - 5 votes

For Amendment 1 - 4 votes

Abstentions - 2

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Child, Doran, Gordon and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Lang, Smith and Whyte.

Abstentions: Councillors Booth and Corbett.)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the report formed the second part of a city-wide strategic review of parking being conducted in 4 different stages and previously approved in 2018.
- 3) To note the degree of consultation and engagement which had taken place and the consultation results for the Phase 2 schemes.
- 4) To request officers undertake further engagement with resident's groups and other local stakeholders, such as Community Councils, on the final designs for Phase 2.
- 5) To request an additional report in Autumn 2022 at the latest (including feedback on the implementation on phase 1) to allow Committee to review the designs for the TRO process for Phase 2 schemes following the engagement set out in 4) above and prior to a traffic order being issued. These designs should be consistent with the implementation of the pavement parking ban.
- 6) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 7) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report.
- 8) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report, which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.
- 9) To agree that high quality public engagement during the roll-out of these proposals would be crucial to its success, and therefore to call for a comprehensive public engagement programme to be brought forward, in particular focusing on the policy justifications for the extension of the CPZ and the likely knock-on effect of adjacent zones coming into operation.

- 10) To further agree that the roll-out of the extension of the CPZ could be used as an opportunity to encourage vehicle owners to consider more sustainable transport options, and therefore to agree to investigate the potential to collaborate with public transport operators, the City Car Club and active travel organisations to provide information and incentives to residents to choose more sustainable travel options at the point of CPZ extension.

In terms of Standing Order 31.1 the requisite number of members required that the decision be referred to the Council for approval.

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

## **9. Corstorphine Connections Low Traffic Neighbourhood – Community Engagement on Concept Design and Commencement of Statutory Process for Experimental Traffic Regulation Order**

---

### **a) Deputation – Low Traffic Corstorphine**

Committee received a written deputation from Low Traffic Corstorphine which was circulated to members of the Committee. The deputation wrote to pay respect to the report and asked for the Committee to support for the officer recommendations. The deputation advised that they were broadly supportive of the proposals, however were disappointed that the plans did not go far enough in addressing intrusive traffic across the Low Traffic Network (LTN) and Corstorphine as a whole. The deputation noted that whilst Councillors had adjusted plans accordingly, there were still concerns within the community regarding the LTN. The deputation hoped this was the first step to tackle the climate crisis, enabling more people to walk, wheel and cycle locally to help reduce vehicle domination. It was hoped the trial measures proved to be a success in helping to create a safer community with more pleasant streets.

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

Details were provided on the results of community engagement for a Concept Design for a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Corstorphine together with changes that had since been made to the Concept Design as a result of feedback from the community engagement. Approval was sought to commence the statutory process for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) necessary to implement the revised Concept Design for the LTN on a trial basis.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Corstorphine.
- 2) To note and approve the changes that had since been made to the Concept Design in response to feedback from the community engagement.
- 3) To approve commencing the statutory process for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) necessary to implement the revised Concept Design for the LTN on a trial basis

Moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Corstorphine.
- 2) To note and approve the changes that had since been made to the Concept Design in response to feedback from the community engagement.
- 3) To approve commencing the statutory process for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) necessary to implement the revised Concept Design for the LTN on a trial basis.
- 4) To broadly welcome progress towards implementing a Corstorphine LTN as a first step in reducing the volume and speed of traffic in the area and to look forward to further progress through the trial period and beyond.
- 5) To note that the bus gate timings were likely to be adjusted in light of experience and therefore to recommend a wider range of timings were set, even if narrower bands were used at the outset.
- 6) To note that LTNs both historically in Edinburgh and currently elsewhere in the UK very quickly became popular after being established but to recognise that in advance, they gave rise to mixed opinions and therefore to recognise that continuing high quality engagement and communication were essential.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Booth

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Corstorphine.
- 2) To recognise that the survey results showed significant opposition to the measures contained within the proposed LTN.
- 3) To understand the view of the respondents that these changes would simplify shift traffic on to other local residential streets, and could lead to increased congestion, journey times and local levels of pollution.
- 4) To note the comments from local business owners and their concerns that then plans would restrict local access and cause increased congestion/pollution.
- 5) To believe that the views of the community should be prioritised and that therefore these proposals could not be implemented.
- 6) To therefore agree that the scheme should be halted unless there was a redesign of the proposals that was shown to have gained the support of the local community through further consultation.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Smith

### **Amendment 3**

In 1.1.2, after “engagement”, insert: “with the exception of the proposed one-way system on Featherhall Avenue and instead to agree that the original design for this road should be retained, subject to further monitoring”.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Child

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 was accepted as an addendum to the motion and paragraph 4 of Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

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

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Booth, Child, Corbett, Doran and Gordon

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Smith and Whyte

For Amendment 2: Councillor Lang)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the results of community engagement on a Concept Design for a trial Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in Corstorphine.
- 2) To note and approve the changes that had since been made to the Concept Design in response to feedback from the community engagement.
- 3) To approve commencing the statutory process for the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) necessary to implement the revised Concept Design for the LTN on a trial basis
- 4) To broadly welcome progress towards implementing a Corstorphine LTN as a first step in reducing the volume and speed of traffic in the area and to look forward to further progress through the trial period and beyond.
- 5) To note that the bus gate timings were likely to be adjusted in light of experience and therefore to recommend a wider range of timings were set, even if narrower bands were used at the outset.
- 6) To note that LTNs both historically in Edinburgh and currently elsewhere in the UK very quickly became popular after being established but to recognise that in advance, they gave rise to mixed opinions and therefore to recognise that continuing high quality engagement and communication are essential.
- 7) To note the comments from local business owners and their concerns that the plans would restrict local access and cause increased congestion/pollution.

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

## **10. Granton Waterfront - Investigation of Parking Controls**

---

Committee considered a report that sought approval to investigate parking controls, prepare initial designs for the proposed area of investigation and carry out consultation.

The report recommended a maximum car parking provision across the development area of 25% for residential units, with a number of active travel, public transport and shared mobility interventions to support the level of parking provision and to encourage

new and existing residents to travel sustainably. The outcomes from the consultations would be reported back to Committee at a future date.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note potential benefits to traffic management, urban realm, sustainable travel, health, wellbeing and air quality that restricting car parking provision to a maximum of 25% for the residential development would provide.
- 2) To approve investigations into potential parking controls and preparation of initial designs for the proposed area of investigation.
- 3) To approve commencing consultation on initial design proposals with Ward Councillors, Community Councils, local residents and local businesses, noting that the outcomes from this would be reported back to a future Committee.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To note the potential benefits to traffic management, urban realm, sustainable travel, health, wellbeing and air quality that restricting car parking provision to a maximum of 25% for the residential development would provide.
- 2) To accept the importance of maximising employment opportunities in the Granton Waterfront, recognising this was an area of the City that had not always felt included as prosperity had risen in Edinburgh. To explicitly exclude vehicles that would be a requirement of employment or economic activity from the 25% residential parking restriction.
- 3) To exclude any required disability parking from the 25% residential parking restriction.
- 4) To instruct Officers to investigate how a Community electric dense park, charge and discharge power store could be incorporated in the Granton Waterfront. This would facilitate residents charging electric vehicles using minimal land area. In addition such a dense park and charge facility could become a community battery, able to store and supplement the supply of power to the local electricity grid at times of high demand. Officers should include the possibility of such developments in local consultations. Any such facilities would fall outside the 25% residential parking restriction.
- 5) To instruct that a further consultation was undertaken with residents and stakeholders of existing residential properties in the area, and in the immediately adjacent areas, in order to understand their views of these proposals.

- moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the amendment, as adjusted, were accepted as an addendum to the motion.

## Amendment 2

- 1) To note potential benefits to traffic management, urban realm, sustainable travel, health, wellbeing and air quality that restricting car parking provision to a maximum of 25% for the residential development would provide.
- 2) To approve investigations into potential parking controls and preparation of initial designs for the proposed area of investigation once all four phases of the strategic review of parking were complete.
- 3) To approve commencing consultation on initial design proposals with Ward Councillors, Community Councils, local residents and local businesses, noting that the outcomes from this would be reported back to a future Committee.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Child

### Vote

The voting was as follows:

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

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Booth, Bird, Child, Corbett, Doran, Gordon and Macinnes)

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Smith and Whyte

For Amendment 2: Councillor Lang.)

### Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note potential benefits to traffic management, urban realm, sustainable travel, health, wellbeing and air quality that restricting car parking provision to a maximum of 25% for the residential development would provide.
- 2) To approve investigations into potential parking controls and preparation of initial designs for the proposed area of investigation.
- 3) To approve commencing consultation on initial design proposals with Ward Councillors, Community Councils, local residents and local businesses, noting that the outcomes from this would be reported back to a future Committee.
- 4) To exclude any required disability parking from the 25% residential parking restriction.
- 5) To instruct Officers to investigate how a Community electric dense park, charge and discharge power store could be incorporated in the Granton Waterfront. This would facilitate residents charging electric vehicles using minimal land area. In addition such a dense park and charge facility could become a community battery, able to store and supplement the supply of power to the local electricity grid at times of high demand. Officers should include the possibility of such developments in local consultations.

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



## Declaration of Interests

Councillor Lang declared a non-financial interest in the above item as resident in an affected area.

## 11. Workplace Parking Licensing – Consultation on Regulations and Guidance

---

Details were provided of a draft Council response to a current Transport Scotland consultation on Regulations and Guidance needed to underpin the development of local Workplace Parking Licensing (WPL) schemes in Scotland. The consultation was to seek the views of stakeholders and the general public on key aspects of WPL regulations and guidance that derived from the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019.

### Motion

- 1) To agree the consultation response on Regulations and Guidance for Workplace Parking Licensing as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.
  - 2) To note that the consultation on a Workplace Parking Licensing consultation on Regulations and Guidance closes on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2021.
- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### Amendment

- 1) To welcome the council's draft response to the proposed regulations.
  - 2) To note the Workplace parking levy should be the start of wider reform of charging regimes to shift the balance towards sustainable transport – the future possibly to include large or out of town retail parking.
  - 3) To note, in assessing the impact, equal weight should be given to the benefits (and beneficiaries) of a scheme as well as costs: including reduced congestion, reduced air pollution, better health, better place-making; fewer carbon emissions; and revenue to invest in active travel and public transport alternatives.
  - 4) To note that whilst agreeing that councils should have discretion over the penalty regime, penalties should be levied at such a level as to strongly incentivise compliance.
- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Booth

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

### Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	8 votes
For the Amendment 1	-	3 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted); Councillors Bird, Booth, Child, Corbett, Doran, Gordon, Lang and Macinnes.

For the Amendment : Hutchison, Smith and Whyte.)

### Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To agree the consultation response on Regulations and Guidance for Workplace Parking Licensing as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.
- 2) To note that the consultation on a Workplace Parking Licensing consultation on Regulations and Guidance closes on 6<sup>th</sup> September 2021.
- 3) To welcome the council's draft response to the proposed regulations.
- 4) To note the Workplace parking levy should be the start of wider reform of charging regimes to shift the balance towards sustainable transport – the future possibly to include large or out of town retail parking.
- 5) To note, in assessing the impact, equal weight should be given to the benefits (and beneficiaries) of a scheme as well as costs: including reduced congestion, reduced air pollution, better health, better place-making; fewer carbon emissions; and revenue to invest in active travel and public transport alternatives.
- 6) To note that whilst agreeing that councils should have discretion over the penalty regime, penalties should be levied at such a level as to strongly incentivise compliance.

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

## **12. Reform of Transport Arm's Length Organisations**

---

An update was provided on progress with the proposed reform of the Council's Transport Arm's Length External Organisations (ALEOs) which included details of the conclusions of the short life working group and engagement with key stakeholders.

A preferred way forward with on-going engagement with key stakeholders was set out with no changes in the transport services or branding of existing Council owned public transport companies taking place as a result of these proposals, which were designed to achieve a truly multi-modal approach.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the considerations of the short life working group, including the options for reform.
- 2) To agree to progress with the reforms to the Transport Arm's Length External Organisation (ALEO) structure, as set out in paragraphs 4.20 – 4.25 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To request updates as implementation moved forward.  
- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To consider that the report was not clear on how the proposed new structure would deliver on the stated principles.
- 2) To note that the rolling of transport ALEOs into Lothian Buses appeared to be a backward step and was not consistent with the Council's recent approach to transport ALEOs.

- 3) To therefore delete paragraphs 2 and 3 of the motion by Councillor Macinnes and replace with:

“Instructs officers to recommence the process of examining Reform of Transport Arm’s Length External Organisations with proposals for a more representative working group and terms of reference to be brought to this Committee in a report in one cycle. With a clearer and more substantive report with recommendations to be brought before this Committee in four cycles.”

- moved by Councillor Hutchison seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the considerations of the short life working group, including the options for reform.
- 2) To agree not to progress with the reforms to the Transport Arm’s Length External Organisation (ALEO) structure, as set out in paragraphs 4.20 – 4.25 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Child

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	7 votes
For Amendment 1	-	3 votes
For Amendment 2	-	1 vote

(For the Motion: Councillors Bird, Booth, Child, Corbett, Doran, Gordon and Macinnes.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Hutchison, Smith and Whyte.

For Amendment 2: Councillor Lang.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes:

In terms of Standing Order 31.1 the requisite number of members required that the decision be referred to the Council for approval.

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

### **Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Macinnes declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Chair of Transport for Edinburgh.

Councillor Doran declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of Transport for Edinburgh.

## **13. Trams to Newhaven – Objections to Traffic Regulation Order**

---

Committee considered a report that advised on 14<sup>th</sup> March 2019 the City of Edinburgh Council approved the terms of the Final Business Case for the Trams to Newhaven project. The project completed the tram line to Newhaven from the existing temporary terminus at York Place. The Final Business Case noted that the final designs would be

subject to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). The approval to commence the statutory procedures for the TRO was given by Policy and Sustainability Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> July 2020.

The report detailed the results of the TRO consultation, and was advertised between the 13<sup>th</sup> April 2021 and 14<sup>th</sup> May 2021. A total of 25 objectors lodged objections and comments during the public deposit period. The objections, comments and recommendations of these were detailed in the report.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the developed design which was advertised as part of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) statutory process.
- 2) To note that the implementation of the TROs were fundamental to both the design of the Trams to Newhaven scheme and its operation,
- 3) To note the responses received to the advertised TROs.
- 4) To approve the recommendations contained within the report and detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.
- 5) To set aside the comments that did not relate to TRO matters.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Amendment**

- 1) To consider that the likely impact of the TRO prohibiting a left turn from Leith Walk onto London Road would be to displace vehicular traffic including buses from the Annandale Street depot away from arterial routes and on to quieter side streets.
- 2) To approve the recommendations contained within the report and detailed in Appendix 1 to the report with the exception of the separate TRO prohibiting a left turn from Leith Walk into London Road.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion - 8 votes

For the Amendment - 3 votes

(For the motion; Councillors Bird, Booth, Child, Corbett, Doran, Gordon, Lang and Macinnes.

For the Amendment: Hutchison, Smith and Whyte.

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

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

## **Declarations of Interests**

Councillor Macinnes declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Chair of Transport for Edinburgh.

Councillor Doran declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of Transport for Edinburgh.

## **14. Adjournment**

---

### **Decision**

To adjourn this meeting in terms of Standing Order 25.1 and continue the remaining business of the meeting to an adjourned meeting of the Committee to take place on 9 September 2021.

## **15. Resumption**

---

The Convener reconvened the meeting adjourned from 19 August 2021.

## **16. Revenue Monitoring Update – 2020/21 Provisional Out-turn and 2021/2022 Month Three Position**

---

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

### **Decision**

- 1) To note the overall Place provisional revenue out-turn for 2020/21 was a £0.531m overspend, excluding costs attributable to Covid-19. Services within the remit of the Committee delivered provisional out-turn overspends in 2020/21 of £2.182m excluding Covid-19 impacts.
- 2) To note in addition to the position set out at 1.1.1, the provisional outturn for 2020/21 also reflected £21.984m of Covid-19 related expenditure and loss of income impacts for services within the remit of this Committee.
- 3) To note the overall Place revenue budget month three 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.
- 4) To note General Fund Covid-19 costs of circa £13.5m, in addition to the pressure set out at 1.1.3, had been forecast for the overall Place Directorate at month three with circa £9.58m relating to services within the remit of the Committee.
- 5) 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. Appointments to Working Groups 2021/22**

---

Approval was sought to appoint the membership of the Working Groups of the Transport and Environment Committee for 2021/2022, which were detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.

The Committee was required to annually re-appoint membership of its working groups. The proposed membership structures were detailed in Appendix 1 of the report.

### **Decision**

To appoint the membership of the Working Groups for 2021/22 as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.

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

## **18. All Ability Cycling Grant Award**

---

Approval was sought for an award of £71,000 to the Thistle Foundation for 2021-22 which would support the delivery of a service to allow adaptive cycles to be available for disabled people across the city. This would support improvement of community and wellbeing through being outdoors.

### **Decision**

To approve an award of £71,000 to the Thistle Foundation for 2021-22 to support delivery of a services to allow adaptive cycles to be available for disabled people across the city.

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

## **19. Emergency Motion by the Coalition - Spaces for People Internal Audit**

---

The Convener ruled that the following item, notice of which had been given at the start of the meeting, be considered as a matter of urgency to allow the Committee to give early consideration to the matter, in accordance with Standing Order 22.3(d).

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

“The Transport and Environment Committee:

Welcomes the contents of the Internal Audit report to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee earlier this month which comments on the Spaces for People initiative and notes the ‘red’ rating given indicating that there is significant improvement required.

Notes the comments of Internal Audit that recognises the difficulties faced in implementing these emergency measures during the pandemic.

Notes the identification of some significant and moderate control weaknesses in both the design and documentation of controls established to support identification and prioritisation of SfP proposals; project management and governance; and financial and budget management.

Notes the clear guidance offered by the Internal Audit report on steps required to resolve these issues

Notes that the Internal Audit recognises that management action has already taken place to identify where improvement was required and that implementation of appropriate changes has already been undertaken to address these issues.

Agrees that findings must continue to be addressed effectively by senior management before the end of this administration and that an improved future outcome should be expected by elected members.

Requests a report to the November Transport and Environment Committee which outlines in detail those management responses and what lessons can be learned going forward for future implementation.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

## **20. Emergency Motion by the Coalition - Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme**

---

The Convener ruled that the following item, notice of which had been given at the start of the meeting, be considered as a matter of urgency to allow the Committee to give early consideration to the matter, in accordance with Standing Order 22.3(d).

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

Committee:

Notes with great regret that the Edinburgh Bike Hire Scheme will close from September 17 at the end of the contract with Serco through Transport for Edinburgh.

Notes that this will be an unwelcome development for many regular users of the scheme.

Notes that, despite this being created originally as a scheme with no local authority funding expectations, a budget allocation of £1.8m was made to help sustain the bike hire scheme and that further external funding was also secured to help overcome operational issues.

Recognises that a successful bike hire scheme in this city is a welcome addition to sustainable transport options for residents and visitors, encouraging more people to enjoy the benefits of fast, sustainable journeys by bike.

Requests a report to the November Transport and Environment Committee outlining options for new possible schemes which can deliver those benefits to as many people as possible

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

## Declaration of Interests

Councillor Miller declared a non-financial interest as a Council appointed Director of Transport for Edinburgh.

## 21. Edinburgh Tram Network Supplier Management – referral from the Governance Risk and Best Value Committee

---

The Committee, in terms of Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, excluded the public from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business for the reason that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 12 Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

On 10 August 2021, the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee considered a report on the outcome of the Edinburgh Tram Network Supplier Management Arrangements Internal Audit report that formed part of the 2020/21 internal audit annual opinion. This audit was approved as an urgent addition to the plan by the Committee in December 2020, at the request of the Place Directorate.

The report has been referred to the Transport and Environment Committee for information.

### Motion

To note the report.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### Amendment

- 1) To note the recommendations in the report with great concern given the “Black” Inadequate Audit Rating and the apparent lack of management action or oversight in previous years in an area that should always have been recognised as high risk given the previous contractual disputes with Bilfinger UK.
- 2) To further instruct the following actions, all to be concluded and the outcomes reported to Committee:
- 3) To agree that a full investigation, to be reported within two cycles, as to why it took 28 months to novate a contract between the Council and Edinburgh Trams given the company’s status as a wholly owned subsidiary of the Council including a review to assess the need for improved performance management of the Council teams involved and details of any performance or disciplinary action to be taken as a result.
- 4) To request the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee to consider requesting that the Chief Internal Auditor report to that Committee on the consequences and options to change the Internal Audit annual plan to include a review of all contracts within the Supplier Management Framework to ensure compliance and good practice across all Council Departments.
- 5) To be reported within two cycles, that the Council Procurement Team provided actions and recommendations to resolve any inadequacies of what appeared to be a “let and forget” culture within Council contracting specifically how



Procurement could provide continued periodic involvement in contract management.

- 6) To be reported within two cycles, a full examination of how this specific bespoke contract might be terminated and replaced with standard contract terms either with this contractor or an alternative, how standard terms might be managed, how costs compared across the remaining lifecycle of the contract and how risks compared based on the two scenarios.
  - 7) To agree that relevant Directors sought confirmation, both internally and from Council ALEOs that all their supplier management arrangements were adequate and that all contracts were being appropriately managed by an “intelligent customer” responsible for service delivery (as opposed to at arms-length by another management team) and report this to Committee within two cycles.
- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Hutchison

#### Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion - 7 votes

For Amendment - 4 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Child, Corbett, Doran, Key, Macinnes, McVey and Miller

For the Amendment: Councillors Hutchison, Lang, Smith and Whyte.)

#### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

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