

Minutes

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday 18 May 2023

Present

Councillors Arthur (Convener), Aston, Bandel, Cowdy (items 1(a) to 1(c) and 2 to 14), Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Jones (substituting for Councillor Cowdy) (items 1(d) to 15), Lang (items 1 to 9 and 11 to 15), McFarlane, Miller, Mitchell (substituting for Councillor Munro (item 7), Munro (items 1 to 6 and 8 to 15), Osler (substituting for Councillor Lang) (item 10) and Work.

1. Deputations

**a) Residents Association for Eildon Street
(in relation to item 8 - Communal Bin Review Update)**

The deputation highlighted the lack of consultation with residents regarding the positioning of proposed bin hubs on Eildon Street.

The deputation noted that residential properties were only on one side of the street and the proposed bin hub location meant that they were placed very close to residents' windows, increasing the likelihood of disturbance from noise and potential smells.

The deputation supported the establishment of a mechanism to resolve outstanding local conflicts on bin hub positioning and asked the Council to undertake a review of the bin hub locations on Eildon Street.

**b) New Town and Broughton Community Council
(in relation to item 8 - Communal Bin Review Update)**

The deputation welcomed the recommendation to extend the period of the trial to increase recycling capacity in a limited number of streets within the World Heritage Site and the recommended changes in the next phase of the trial.

The deputation acknowledged the contributions of the Council's Waste team and residents' associations in making the trial a success and believed that it could have a significant impact on overall recycling goals if extended to other city centre streets.

The community council wished to collaborate with the Council to increase food waste collection rates and reduce the amount of waste going to incineration.

**c) Cramond and Barnton Community Council
(in relation to item 14 - Motion by Councillor Lang - Lothian Buses and Changes to Routes)**

The deputation highlighted the changes to the number 41 and 47 bus routes specifically North West Edinburgh to the City Centre.

The deputation asked for clearer lines of communications between the City of Edinburgh Council and Lothian Buses in relation to bus route and timetable changes.

The deputation asked that the motion go further by lobbying central government for changes to legislation which would support more participative decision making

**d) Davidson's Mains and Silverknowes Association
(in relation to item 14 - Motion by Councillor Lang - Lothian Buses and Changes to Routes)**

The deputation highlighted the lack of consultation regarding changes to the 41 and 47 bus routes. The following points were raised:

- The time and cost implications for passengers if they needed to change buses to reach their destination.
- Other bus services had been withdrawn with Davidson's Mains in recent years.
- That Ward Councillors should lobby to be involved in future services changes, on a confidential basis prior to publication.

**e) Ratho & District Community Council
(in relation to item 15 - Motion by Councillor Cowdy - Better Buses for Ratho)**

The deputation noted their concern about the lack of report or strategy regarding Buses for Ratho which was expected in May 2023. There was also concern regarding the length of time taken to reach a solution.

The deputation felt that the proposed plans from Lothian Buses did not meet the needs of the community, potentially leading to a poorer service.

The deputation highlighted the need for a sustainable strategy for bus provision in the area as the area would potentially be left without a suitable bus service if the existing contract was allowed to lapse.

**f) Joppa Residents' Association
(in relation to item 16 - Motion by Councillor Meagher - Accidents in the 'Joppa Triangle')**

The deputation noted that traffic in the area was currently heavy and getting worse. There had been 3 recent accidents with damage to cars and walls which concerned the community. The deputation encouraged the Committee to approve Councillor Meagher's motion and consider further traffic calming measures.

2. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 20 April 2023 as a correct record.

3. Work Programme

The Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme was presented.

Decision

To note the work programme.

(Reference – Work Programme 18 May 2023, submitted.)

4. Rolling Actions Log

The Transport and Environment Committee Rolling Actions Log was presented.

Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:
 - Action 1 – Proposed Increase in Scale of Rollout and Amendment to Contract form On-Street Secure Cycling Parking
 - Action 20 – Progress Report on the ‘Vision for Water Management’ and Operational Management of Roads Drainage Infrastructure
 - Action 26(2) – Updated Pedestrian Crossing Prioritisation 2022/23
 - Action 30 - Motion by Councillor Macinnes – Severe Climate Change Impact
 - Action 31 – Response to Motion by Councillor Whyte – Cleaning Up Edinburgh (Communal Bin Review Update)
 - Action 39 – Business Bulletin – Motion by Councillor Whyte and Councillor Mowat – Restoring a Bus Service for Willowbrae/Lady Nairn and Bus for Dumbiedykes
 - Action 44 - Motion by Councillor McFarlane - Low Emission Zones
 - Action 46 – Motion by Councillor Caldwell – Planter – based protection on Leith Walk
 - Action 48 - Motion by Councillor Lang - Flooding in Kirkliston
 - Action 49 (1)&(2) - Motion by Councillor Macinnes - Edinburgh Freight Conference
 - Action 52 – Active Travel Action Plan 2023 – Delivering the City Mobility Plan
 - Action 55 - Motion by Councillor Lang - Surface Treatment of Carriageways
- 2) To otherwise note the remaining outstanding actions.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log 18 May 2023, submitted.)

5. Business Bulletin

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

Motion

To note the business bulletin.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) Committee agrees to remit the following to the Tram All Party Oversight Group for consideration:
 - 1.1) Notes the update on Response to the motion by Councillor Caldwell – Planter Based Protection on Leith Walk, which was unanimously supported by Council and that the proposal was widely acknowledged as being positive both in terms of improving appearance and in terms of greening, biodiversity, and supporting bees and other pollinators.
 - 1.2) Acknowledges however that the size and shape of planters which were installed in a number of locations on Leith Walk were too big or otherwise unsuitable, particularly in sites where these are encroaching on the cycleway and/or footway.
 - 1.3) Requests that the potential retention of planters is examined in suitable sites on Leith Walk, replacing them, where appropriate and possible, with smaller and narrower but heavily weighted units which fit better into the spaces available but which cannot be easily moved.

- moved by Councillor McFarlane, seconded by Councillor Work

Amendment 2

Committee:

- 1) Notes the update on the Powderhall Railway line and its potential use as an active travel link, connecting Piershill in the east of Edinburgh with the North Edinburgh Path Network, which would enormously enhance off-road connectivity for walking, wheeling and cycling.
- 2) Regrets the response from Network Rail, which appears to be unwilling to take the necessary steps to facilitate this now redundant rail line becoming a valuable and well-used link.
- 3) Asks the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee to write to the Chief Executive of Network Rail to ask him to take decisive action to ensure that the Powderhall line can be transformed from a derelict railway to a transformative active travel link as soon as possible.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Bandel

Amendment 3

Committee notes the update on 'Planter Based Protection on Leith Walk' and requests that officers provide the results of the formal monitoring, as listed in section 1, in the committee's August business bulletin.

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

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1, 2 and 3 were accepted as addenda to the motion by Councillor Arthur.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the business bulletin.
- 2) Committee agrees to remit the following to the Tram All Party Oversight Group for consideration:
 - 2.1) Notes the update on Response to the motion by Councillor Caldwell – Planter Based Protection on Leith Walk, which was unanimously supported by Council and that the proposal was widely acknowledged as being positive both in terms of improving appearance and in terms of greening, biodiversity, and supporting bees and other pollinators.
 - 2.2) Acknowledges however that the size and shape of planters which were installed in a number of locations on Leith Walk were too big or otherwise unsuitable, particularly in sites where these are encroaching on the cycleway and/or footway.
 - 2.3) Requests that the potential retention of planters is examined in suitable sites on Leith Walk, replacing them, where appropriate and possible, with smaller and narrower but heavily weighted units which fit better into the spaces available but which cannot be easily moved.
- 3) To note the update on the Powderhall Railway line and its potential use as an active travel link, connecting Piershill in the east of Edinburgh with the North Edinburgh Path Network, which would enormously enhance off-road connectivity for walking, wheeling and cycling.
- 4) To regrets the response from Network Rail, which appeared to be unwilling to take the necessary steps to facilitate this now redundant rail line becoming a valuable and well-used link.
- 5) To ask the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee to write to the Chief Executive of Network Rail to ask him to take decisive action to ensure that the Powderhall line could be transformed from a derelict railway to a transformative active travel link as soon as possible.
- 6) To note the update on ‘Planter Based Protection on Leith Walk’ and requests that officers provide the results of the formal monitoring, as listed in section 1, in the committee’s August Business Bulletin.

(Reference – Business Bulletin of 18 May 2023, submitted.)

6. Secure On-Street Cycle Parking Project – Progress Report

A report provided an update on the delivery of the Secure On-Street Parking project, following a request from Committee to examine potential changes to the scheme, including the potential to price the scheme at less than the cost of a residents’ parking permit.

The Council sought to complete the installation of Phase 1 and install a further 200 units as part of Phase 2 during 2023/24 and 2024/25 to meet the growing demand. The project

had received total grant awards of £806,600 from the Scottish Government via the Sustrans Places for Everyone Fund and Cycling Scotland's Cycle Storage Fund.

Motion

- 1) To note progress on installing the secure on-street cycle parking units.
- 2) To note the project had been awarded total funding of £806,600 by the Scottish Government via the Sustrans Places for Everyone Fund and Cycling Scotland's Cycle Storage Fund.
- 3) To note the installation of an additional 200 units as Phase 2, prioritising units based on population density, existing coverage, number of requests and Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) decile.
- 4) To note that the £6 monthly charge (£72pa) for secure bicycle parking was set in 2021 by the last Administration and has not risen since despite inflation over the period being 15.5%.
- 5) To note that £72pa for secure bicycle parking in Edinburgh compares to £34.70pa - £664.70pa for a residential car parking permit, with a second car costing up to £864.10pa.
- 6) To note that car parking for permits do not come with secure parking, nor do they guarantee a space will be available.
- 7) To note that £36pa for secure bicycle parking in Glasgow compares to £98pa - £328pa for a residential car parking permit there.
- 8) To note that £36pa for secure bicycle parking in Dundee compares to £21pa - £124pa for a residential car parking permit.
- 9) To agree, therefore, that parking bands should be reviewed as part of the October Parking Action Plan report, and consideration is given to setting the lower end at £2 per week.
- 10) To welcome the increased focus on placing secure bicycle parking in lower decile areas of SIMD.
- 11) To welcome that once Phase 2 of the scheme is complete it will be significant in scale and income, and agrees that in the run-up to contract renewal a report should be brought to this Committee which includes the option of bringing the service in-house.
- 12) This report to also provide an update on how residents on low incomes (or registered disabled) could access the scheme at a significant reduction, funded by the income to the scheme whilst protecting the £1 levy for maintenance.
 - moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note progress on installing the secure on-street cycle parking units.

- 2) To note the project had been awarded total funding of £806,600 by the Scottish Government via the Sustrans Places for Everyone Fund and Cycling Scotland's Cycle Storage Fund.
- 3) To note the installation of an additional 200 units as Phase 2, prioritising units based on population density, existing coverage, number of requests and Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) decile.
- 4) To request a report to the August committee detailing the methodology for the weighted ranking system that is being used to determine prospective sites for secure on-street cycle parking. Requests that there is a strong weighting applied to SIMD decile to ensure that transport inequalities are addressed through this process, Furthermore, noting that there is little or no current or proposed provision in high SIMD decile areas in the North West, South West, and East of the city, requests that work is done to establish whether provision can be improved in these areas in the current phase and to ensure that it will be in future phases.
- 5) To request that this report looks at the possibility of in-housing delivery of secure on-street cycle parking upon expiry of the current contract.
- 6) To further request that the report brings forward proactive proposals to increase awareness of the future roll-out of additional secure on-street cycle parking locations and the importance of expressions of interest in these being recorded to indicate the presence of demand, especially in areas which are currently distant from existing units. These will include but not be limited to including information being carried on existing units, inclusion in the Tenants' Courier newsletter (and encouragement to RSL partners to include in their equivalent updates to tenants), and via the Council's social media channels.
 - moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment 2

- 1) To note progress on installing the secure on-street cycle parking units.
- 2) To note the project had been awarded total funding of £806,600 by the Scottish Government via the Sustrans Places for Everyone Fund and Cycling Scotland's Cycle Storage Fund.
- 3) To note the installation of an additional 200 units as Phase 2, prioritising units based on population density, existing coverage, number of requests and Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) decile.
- 4) Recognises that current parking charges do not account for the true cost of car parking to society and the environment such as congestion, air pollution, and loss of public space, and that bike parking does not cause similar negative externalities.
- 5) Agrees that bike hangar charges should not exceed the cost of any resident parking permit.

- 6) Agrees that to encourage a modal shift from private car use to active travel, strategies to reduce bike hangar charges by raising extra revenue should focus on increasing parking charges for the most polluting vehicles.
- 7) Requests a report by October 2023 to provide budget information detailing the costs of the subsidy that would be required to bring cycle hangar charges below car parking charges and how it could potentially be funded; and explore the possibility of lowering charges by insourcing the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking project.
 - moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 3

- 1) To note progress on installing the secure on-street cycle parking units.
- 2) To note the project had been awarded total funding of £806,600 by the Scottish Government via the Sustrans Places for Everyone Fund and Cycling Scotland's Cycle Storage Fund.
- 3) To note the installation of an additional 200 units as Phase 2, prioritising units based on population density, existing coverage, number of requests and Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) decile.
- 4) To agree that officers notify Ward Councillors and residents living adjacent to site locations no less than two weeks prior to installation.
 - 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 addenda to the motion.

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

Voting

For the motion (as adjusted) – 9 votes

For Amendment 3 (as adjusted) – 2 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Lang, McFarlane, Miller and Work.

For Amendment 3 (as adjusted) – Councillors Cowdy and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note progress on installing the secure on-street cycle parking units.
- 2) To note the project had been awarded total funding of £806,600 by the Scottish Government via the Sustrans Places for Everyone Fund and Cycling Scotland's Cycle Storage Fund.
- 3) To note the installation of an additional 200 units as Phase 2, prioritising units based on population density, existing coverage, number of requests and Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) decile.

- 4) To note that the £6 monthly charge (£72pa) for secure bicycle parking was set in 2021 by the last Administration and has not risen since despite inflation over the period being 15.5%.
- 5) To note that £72pa for secure bicycle parking in Edinburgh compares to £34.70pa - £664.70pa for a residential car parking permit, with a second car costing up to £864.10pa.
- 6) To note that car parking for permits do not come with secure parking, nor do they guarantee a space will be available.
- 7) To note that £36pa for secure bicycle parking in Glasgow compares to £98pa - £328pa for a residential car parking permit there.
- 8) To note that £36pa for secure bicycle parking in Dundee compares to £21pa - £124pa for a residential car parking permit.
- 9) To agree, therefore, that parking bands should be reviewed as part of the October Parking Action Plan report, and consideration is given to setting the lower end at £2 per week.
- 10) To welcome the increased focus on placing secure bicycle parking in lower decile areas of SIMD.
- 11) To welcome that once Phase 2 of the scheme is complete it will be significant in scale and income, and to agree that in the run-up to contract renewal a report should be brought to this Committee which includes the option of bringing the service in-house.
- 12) The report to also provide an update on how residents on low incomes (or registered disabled) could access the scheme at a significant reduction, funded by the income to the scheme whilst protecting the £1 levy for maintenance.
- 13) To request a report to the August committee detailing the methodology for the weighted ranking system that is being used to determine prospective sites for secure on-street cycle parking. To request that there was a strong weighting applied to SIMD decile to ensure that transport inequalities are addressed through this process, Furthermore, to note that there was little or no current or proposed provision in high SIMD decile areas in the North West, South West, and East of the city, to request that work was done to establish whether provision could be improved in these areas in the current phase and to ensure that it would be in future phases.
- 14) To further request that the report brought forward proactive proposals to increase awareness of the future roll-out of additional secure on-street cycle parking locations and the importance of expressions of interest in these being recorded to indicate the presence of demand, especially in areas which are currently distant from existing units. These would include but not be limited to including information being carried on existing units, inclusion in the Tenants' Courier newsletter (and encouragement to RSL partners to include in their equivalent updates to tenants), and via the Council's social media channels.

- 15) To recognise that current parking charges did not account for the true cost of car parking to society and the environment such as congestion, air pollution, and loss of public space, and that bike parking did not cause similar negative externalities.
- 16) To agree that bike hangar charges should not exceed the cost of any resident parking permit.
- 17) To request a report by October 2023 to provide budget information detailing the costs of the subsidy that would be required to bring cycle hangar charges below car parking charges and how it could potentially be funded, and explore the possibility of lowering charges by insourcing the Secure On-Street Cycle Parking project.
- 18) To agree that officers notify Ward Councillors and residents living adjacent to site locations no less than two weeks prior to installation.

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

7. Bus Partnership Fund - Strategic Business Case

An update was provided on the production of the Strategic Business Case for Bus Priority Improvements on eight key transport corridors. The project was expected to progress to the next stage of the programme immediately after a successful progression from the associated gateway review.

Decision

- 1) To note a Strategic Business Case for Bus Priority Measures along eight key corridors between the region and Edinburgh had been concluded. This identified a very strong case for bus priority interventions across all eight corridors with positive Benefit to Cost Ratios.
- 2) To note that Transport Scotland was currently reviewing the Strategic Business Case, as part of the gateway process.
- 3) To note a grant award from Transport Scotland would provide £1.05m for the next stages of the project.
- 4) To note that in order to deliver the next stages in the project, procurement of technical consultancy services was required and that this would be competitively tendered.
- 5) To note the next stages in the programme included significant public consultation exercises.

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

8. Communal Bin Review Update

A report provided an update on the delivery of the Communal Bin Review project and the implementation of increased collection schedules including the performance related to Phase 1 of the project. It also provided an update on the timelines for implementation

and sought approval to revise the timescale of the project to allow the roll-out to continue in the areas of Phase 3 and Phase 4.

Motion

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring for Phase 1 (attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place).
- 2) To note the progress of the Communal Bin Review project and delivery of Phases 2 and A.
- 3) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out (attached at Appendix 2 to the report) and the revised framework for reviewing bin hub locations (attached at Appendix 3 to the report).
- 4) To note the outcome of the application to Zero Waste Scotland for additional funding to meet the increased project costs.
- 5) To approve the next stage of the World Heritage area trial to align non-recyclable waste capacity with the existing kerbside service and agree to receive a report within six months with final proposals for future waste collections in the area.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring for Phase 1 (attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place).
- 2) To note the progress of the Communal Bin Review project and delivery of Phases 2 and A.
- 3) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out (attached at Appendix 2 to the report) and the revised framework for reviewing bin hub locations (attached at Appendix 3 to the report).
- 4) To note the outcome of the application to Zero Waste Scotland for additional funding to meet the increased project costs.
- 5) To approve the next stage of the World Heritage area trial to align non-recyclable waste capacity with the existing kerbside service and agree to receive a report within six months with final proposals for future waste collections in the area.
- 6) Notes that residents in the Phase 5 area and adjacent areas of the Communal Bin Review who live on a street of mixed provision (both communal on-street bins and gull proof bags) have observed the on-street provision reserved for properties without Gull Proof Bags being used by residents who have allocated Gull Proof Bag collections.
 - 6.1) Understands that this can result in a lack of capacity for those without Gull Proof Bags, overflowing communal on-street bins and street litter.
 - 6.2) Acknowledges that while there has been a great focus in the trial on those residents with Gull Proof Bag provision, residents have expressed a degree of uncertainty about what the continuation of this scheme might mean for

those who presently use on-street communal provision, and how they might also benefit from the Communal Bin Review improvements.

- 6.3) Therefore agrees that any final recommendation in respect to Phase 5 must include details relating to mixed provision streets in Phase 5 outlining:
- a. How City of Edinburgh Council plans to ensure residents who do not have Gull Proof Bags will benefit from the Communal Bin Review, both in the facilitation of more local recycling options and frequency of uplift, if recommendations following the trial are no longer a full communal bin rollout as originally proposed.
 - b. The mitigating factors applied to new communal on-street provision in Phase 5 to minimise the impact on the World Heritage Site
 - c. How it can be effectively communicated to residents on mixed provision streets that on-street provision is provided for their neighbours who do not have Gull Proof Bags only and that using on-street provision can cause significant issues regarding capacity.
- moved by Councillor McFarlane, seconded by Councillor Aston

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring for Phase 1 (attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place).
- 2) To note the progress of the Communal Bin Review project and delivery of Phases 2 and A.
- 3) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out (attached at Appendix 2 to the report).
- 4) Recognises the concerns raised by a significant number of residents affected by new bin hub locations.
- 5) Further recognises the concerns raised by residents about the consultation and engagement with residents on locations of bin hubs, especially in areas where bin hubs are placed outside Controlled Parking Zones.
- 6) Notes the improvements to the revised framework and proposals for enhanced communication with residents, but believes that the revised framework in Appendix 3 does not yet provide the necessary flexibility to ensure the new bin hubs are located in the most appropriate locations possible.
- 7) Therefore agrees the framework should be continued for two cycles to allow for discussions with elected members and further improvements to the methodology for resolving disputed locations.
- 8) Further agrees that the planned review of bin hub locations in phase 1, 2, and A will be reported to the Transport and Environment committee when available.
- 9) To note the outcome of the application to Zero Waste Scotland for additional funding to meet the increased project costs.

- 10) To approve the next stage of the World Heritage area trial to align non-recyclable waste capacity with the existing kerbside service and agree to receive a report within six months with final proposals for future waste collections in the area.
 - moved by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie, seconded by Councillor Lang

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring for Phase 1 (attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place).
- 2) To note the progress of the Communal Bin Review project and delivery of Phases 2 and A.
- 3) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out (attached at Appendix 2 to the report) and the revised framework for reviewing bin hub locations (attached at Appendix 3 to the report).
- 4) Notes, however, the outstanding concerns of the Edinburgh Access Panel about the mechanism for resolving bin hub location conflicts, specifically that it may require residents with mobility disabilities to cross the road to access waste and recycling services without making this accessible.
- 5) Agrees to add a requirement to the revised framework for reviewing bin hub locations for accessible facilities such as dropped kerbs in a location that provides safe and convenient access to residents with mobility disabilities if they are required to cross a road.
- 6) Agrees that bin hub relocations should allow disabled people to remain as independent and self-sufficient as possible, and that measures to make a bin hub accessible should be considered before requiring them to use the Assisted Bin Collection service.
- 7) To note the outcome of the application to Zero Waste Scotland for additional funding to meet the increased project costs.
- 8) To approve the next stage of the World Heritage area trial to align non-recyclable waste capacity with the existing kerbside service and agree to receive a report within six months with final proposals for future waste collections in the area.
 - moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 4

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring for Phase 1 (attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place).
- 2) To note the progress of the Communal Bin Review project and delivery of Phases 2 and A.
- 3) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out (Appendix 2) with the exception of Phase 3 which will be paused until an engagement and consultation exercise can be undertaken.

- 4) To approve changes to the Framework for reviewing bin hub locations (Appendix 3) to improve flexibility and align with Waste and Cleansing Service Policy Assurance Statement, as follows:
 - 4.1) "Walking Distance:
 - Remove the wording "The relaxation of the walking distance parameter cannot be used in conjunction with the relaxation on the crossing the road parameter."
 - 4.2) "Road Safety Requirements & Streetscape (1st paragraph of 3rd bullet point):
 - Insert the words in bold - Bin users should **preferably** not be required to cross a road to dispose of their waste and recycling. Every effort should be made to provide bins on the same side of the road as the users' properties, **unless a safe crossing place is nearby**.
 - Remove the wording "The relaxation of the crossing the road parameter cannot be used in conjunction with the relaxation of the walking distance parameter."
- 5) To note the outcome of the application to Zero Waste Scotland for additional funding to meet the increased project costs.
- 6) To approve the next stage of the World Heritage area trial to align non-recyclable waste capacity with the existing kerbside service and agree to receive a report within six months with final proposals for future waste collections in the area.
 - moved by Councillor Cowdy, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

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

Voting

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

(For the Motion – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Faccenda, McFarlane, Miller and Work.

For Amendment 2 – Councillors Dijkstra-Downie and Lang.

For Amendment 4 – Councillors Cowdy and Mitchell.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the outcome of the performance monitoring for Phase 1 (attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place).
- 2) To note the progress of the Communal Bin Review project and delivery of Phases 2 and A.

- 3) To approve the revised timeline for the delivery of the communal bin hubs roll-out (attached at Appendix 2 to the report) and the revised framework for reviewing bin hub locations (attached at Appendix 3 to the report).
- 4) To note the outcome of the application to Zero Waste Scotland for additional funding to meet the increased project costs.
- 5) To approve the next stage of the World Heritage area trial to align non-recyclable waste capacity with the existing kerbside service and agree to receive a report within six months with final proposals for future waste collections in the area.
- 6) To note that residents in the Phase 5 area and adjacent areas of the Communal Bin Review who lived on a street of mixed provision (both communal on-street bins and gull proof bags) had observed the on-street provision reserved for properties without Gull Proof Bags being used by residents who had allocated Gull Proof Bag collections.
 - 6.1) To understand that this can result in a lack of capacity for those without Gull Proof Bags, overflowing communal on-street bins and street litter.
 - 6.2) To acknowledge that while there had been a great focus in the trial on those residents with Gull Proof Bag provision, residents had expressed a degree of uncertainty about what the continuation of this scheme might mean for those who presently used on-street communal provision, and how they might also benefit from the Communal Bin Review improvements.
 - 6.3) Therefore to agree that any final recommendation in respect to Phase 5 must include details relating to mixed provision streets in Phase 5 outlining:
 - a. How City of Edinburgh Council planned to ensure residents who did not have Gull Proof Bags would benefit from the Communal Bin Review, both in the facilitation of more local recycling options and frequency of uplift, if recommendations following the trial are no longer a full communal bin rollout as originally proposed.
 - b. The mitigating factors applied to new communal on-street provision in Phase 5 to minimise the impact on the World Heritage Site.
 - c. How it could be effectively communicated to residents on mixed provision streets that on-street provision was provided for their neighbours who did not have Gull Proof Bags only and that using on-street provision could cause significant issues regarding capacity.
- 7) To agree that the planned review of bin hub locations in phases 1, 2, and A would be reported to the Transport and Environment Committee when available.
- 8) To note, however, the outstanding concerns of the Edinburgh Access Panel about the mechanism for resolving bin hub location conflicts, specifically that it may require residents with mobility disabilities to cross the road to access waste and recycling services without making this accessible.

- 9) To agree to add a requirement to the revised framework for reviewing bin hub locations for accessible facilities such as dropped kerbs in a location that provided safe and convenient access to residents with mobility disabilities if they were required to cross a road.
- 10) To agree that bin hub relocations should allow disabled people to remain as independent and self-sufficient as possible, and that measures to make a bin hub accessible should be considered before requiring them to use the Assisted Bin Collection service.

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

Declarations of interest

Councillor Miller made a transparency statement in respect of the above item as a resident of an area affected by the issues raised in the report.

9. Under 22 Concessionary Travel on Trams

The board of Edinburgh Trams had resolved to carry under 22s for free on trams for the remainder of their financial year (to 31 December 2023) to allow the Scottish Government's Fair Fares review to complete.

Decision

- 1) To note the decision of the Edinburgh Trams board to continue to offer free concessionary travel for people under the age of 22 on trams until 31 December 2023.
- 2) To refer the report to the Finance and Resources Committee for information.
- 3) To reaffirm the Committee's decision of 6 October 2022 that the Scottish Government should expand U22 free travel to light rail.
- 4) To agree to receive an update once the Fair Fares Review had been concluded.

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

10. Response to Motion by Councillor Lang – Flooding in Kirkliston and the Wider Almond Catchment

A report provided a response to the motion by Councillor Lang of 2 February 2023 outlining 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.

Motion

- 1) To note the actions in the published Local Flood Risk Management Plan and the prioritisation of flood studies across the Edinburgh area.
- 2) To note the ongoing development of the Edinburgh Surface Water Management Plan and the importance of including opportunities into wider Council projects.

- 3) To note a River Almond Flood Study would take time to develop and was unlikely to identify a suitable flood scheme.
- 4) To note it was not currently feasible to attract Scottish Government funding for the development of a Kirkliston flood scheme through current Scottish Flood Risk Management funding arrangements.
- 5) To note the Breastmill location was in a historically high-risk flooding area and that mitigation and recovery was more appropriate than flood prevention.
- 6) To note the short-term and long-term actions identified in the report by the Executive Director of Place.
 - moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment

- 1) To note the actions in the published Local Flood Risk Management Plan and the prioritisation of flood studies across the Edinburgh area.
- 2) To note the estimated £200,000 cost for a River Almond Flood Study and agrees officers should return within two cycles with options on how that start of such a study could be funded in this financial year, including whether money could be utilised from the additional £2 million allocated for flooding as set out in report 7.5.
- 3) To note a River Almond Flood Study would take time to develop and was unlikely to identify a suitable flood scheme.
- 4) To note it was not currently feasible to attract Scottish Government funding for the development of a Kirkliston flood scheme through current Scottish Flood Risk Management funding arrangements, and agrees the Convener should write to the Scottish Government to ask for a review of current national guidelines so the prevention of severe flooding of critical transport infrastructure, such as that seen in Kirkliston, can be better prioritised for government funding.
- 5) To note the Breastmill location was in a historically high-risk flooding area and that mitigation and recovery was more appropriate than flood prevention.
- 6) To note the short-term and long-term actions identified in the report by the Executive Director of Place.
 - moved by councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

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 Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the actions in the published Local Flood Risk Management Plan and the prioritisation of flood studies across the Edinburgh area.
- 2) To note the estimated £200,000 cost for a River Almond Flood Study and agrees officers should return within three cycles with options on how that start of such a

study could be funded in this financial year, including whether money could be utilised from the additional £2 million allocated for flooding as set out in report 7.5.

- 3) To note a River Almond Flood Study would take time to develop and was unlikely to identify a suitable flood scheme.
- 4) To note it was not currently feasible to attract Scottish Government funding for the development of a Kirkliston flood scheme through current Scottish Flood Risk Management funding arrangements, and agrees the Convener should write to the Scottish Government to ask for a review of current national guidelines so the prevention of severe flooding of critical transport infrastructure, such as that seen in Kirkliston, can be better prioritised for government funding.
- 5) To note the Breastmill location was in a historically high-risk flooding area and that mitigation and recovery was more appropriate than flood prevention.
- 6) To note the short-term and long-term actions identified in the report by the Executive Director of Place.

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

11. Response to Motion by Councillor Osler - Flooding

A report identified five programmes of work to be progressed utilising the additional £2m of capital funding allocated for flood prevention measures and with a plan for communications and engagement to be progressed as part of these programmes.

Motion

- 1) To note the five identified programmes of work and the projects initially prioritised for investment in 2023/24.
- 2) To note an update would be provided by way of Business Bulletin in May 2024.
 - moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment

- 1) To note the five identified programmes of work and the projects initially prioritised for investment in 2023/2024.
- 2) To note an update would be provided by way of Business Bulletin in May 2024.
- 3) To note the decision of committee in relation to agenda item 7.4 on flooding in Kirkliston, and that a further report would come to committee on the option of using £200,000 of the additional £2m for a River Almond Flood Study.
 - moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the five identified programmes of work and the projects initially prioritised for investment in 2023/2024.

- 2) To note an update would be provided by way of Business Bulletin in May 2024.
- 3) To note the decision of committee in relation to agenda item 7.4 on flooding in Kirkliston, and that a further report would come to committee on the option of using £200,000 of the additional £2m for a River Almond Flood Study.

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

12. Response to Motion by Councillor Lang – Surface Treatments of Carriageways

Information was provided on the suitability of Surface Treatments in Edinburgh and the methodology used to select areas of investment suitable for surface treatments. The report demonstrated that surface treatments represented best value and achieved the best road condition within the available budget.

Decision

- 1) To note the rationale for introducing surface treatments in Edinburgh.
- 2) To note the issues with the surface treatment programme in 2022/2023.
- 3) To note the use of alternative materials in future capital programmes.
- 4) To refer the report to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee, in line with the motion agreed by the Council on 9 February 2023.
 - moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

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

13. Waste and Cleansing Service Policy Assurance Statement

Approval was sought of a suite of waste and cleansing policies which had been reviewed and updated to ensure they were current, relevant and fit for purpose.

Motion

- 1) To approve the updated Waste and Cleansing policies as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note the policies had been reviewed and updated (where necessary) and were considered as being current, relevant and fit for purpose.
- 3) The Communal Bin Enhancement Project section of the Communal Bin Collections policy to be amended to reflect the decision of Committee (item 7.3) in relation to locations of bin hubs.
 - moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment

- 1) To approve the updated Waste and Cleansing policies as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report by the Executive Director of Place, with the exception of the Litter Bin Siting Policy.
- 2) To approve a temporary 3-month extension to the current Litter Bin Siting Policy pending an officer/elected member workshop which should consider:

- a) whether the existing policy is too restrictive in terms of delivering the Council's policy of reducing littering and,
 - b) options and associated costs for expanding the criteria for the positioning of litter bins.
- 3) To agree the outcome of this workshop should be reported to a future meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee along with the existing or amended litter bin siting policy for approval beyond the temporary extension.
 - 4) The Communal Bin Enhancement Project section of the Communal Bin Collections policy to be amended to reflect the decision of Committee (item 7.3) in relation to locations of bin hubs.
 - moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To approve the updated Waste and Cleansing policies as outlined in Appendix 2 to the report by the Executive Director of Place, with the exception of the Litter Bin Siting Policy.
- 2) To approve a temporary 3-month extension to the current Litter Bin Siting Policy pending an officer/elected member workshop which should consider:
 - a) whether the existing policy is too restrictive in terms of delivering the Council's policy of reducing littering and,
 - b) options and associated costs for expanding the criteria for the positioning of litter bins.
- 3) To agree the outcome of this workshop should be reported to a future meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee along with the existing or amended litter bin siting policy for approval beyond the temporary extension.
- 4) The Communal Bin Enhancement Project section of the Communal Bin Collections policy to be amended to reflect the decision of Committee (item 7.3) in relation to locations of bin hubs.

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

14. Motion by Councillor Lang – Lothian Buses and Changes to Routes

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

“Committee notes:

- 1) the hard work of Lothian Buses to maintain a sustainable network of bus services following the reduction in passenger demand and changes to travel patterns which followed the COVID pandemic.

- 2) how the financial pressures on Lothian and other bus companies intensified following the ending of the Scottish Government's COVID support grants but, despite this, the company has continued to invest heavily in its fleet and workforce.
- 3) Lothian Buses announcement in May 2023 involving significant changes to a number of long-standing and established bus services, some of which have raised substantial concern within affected communities.
- 4) that Lothian Buses operates on a commercial basis and does not, as a matter of course, either consult or brief ward councillors on substantive route changes before they are made public, as shown by the May 2023 announcement.

Committee recognises that current governance arrangements and legal requirements mean it is neither possible nor appropriate for ward councillors to have a direct role in deciding the routes and timetables provided by Lothian Buses.

Nevertheless, Committee agrees:

- a. that Lothian Buses, as a company majority owned by the City of Edinburgh Council, it should be possible for local ward members to be consulted, engaged and briefed before significant changes to bus services are announced.
- b. that such engagement must always respect commercial sensitivity and confidentiality
- c. that the Transport & Environment Convener should write to Lothian Buses to request a mechanism by which two-way communication with local councillors can be improved when route changes are being considered and in advance of final announcements being made.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

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

Amendment

To insert after point 'b':

“That there needs to be a balance between the level of influence councillors hold in the decision-making processes about service changes and the extent to which they are expected to take on the role of communicating and explaining these changes to communities.”

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Miller

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

- 1) To note the hard work of Lothian Buses to maintain a sustainable network of bus services following the reduction in passenger demand and changes to travel patterns which followed the COVID pandemic.
- 2) To note how the financial pressures on Lothian and other bus companies intensified following the ending of the Scottish Government's COVID support grants but, despite this, the company had continued to invest heavily in its fleet and workforce.
- 3) To note Lothian Buses' announcement in May 2023 involving significant changes to a number of long-standing and established bus services, some of which raised substantial concern within affected communities.
- 4) To note that Lothian Buses operates on a commercial basis and did not, as a matter of course, either consult or brief ward councillors on substantive route changes before they were made public, as shown by the May 2023 announcement.
- 5) Committee recognises that current governance arrangements and legal requirements mean it was neither possible nor appropriate for ward councillors to have a direct role in deciding the routes and timetables provided by Lothian Buses.
- 6) To agree:
 - a. that Lothian Buses, as a company majority owned by the City of Edinburgh Council, it should be possible for local ward members to be consulted, engaged and briefed before significant changes to bus services were announced.
 - b. that such engagement must always respect commercial sensitivity and confidentiality.
 - c. that there needed to be a balance between the level of influence councillors hold in the decision-making processes about service changes and the extent to which they were expected to take on the role of communicating and explaining these changes to communities.
 - d. that the Transport and Environment Committee Convener should write to Lothian Buses to request a mechanism by which two-way communication with local councillors could be improved when route changes were being considered and in advance of final announcements being made.

15. Motion by Councillor Cowdy – Better Buses for Ratho

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

“Committee notes:

- 1.1) The current Service 20 is a subsidised bus service running between Ratho and Chesser.
- 1.2) The current provider is McGills after First Bus agreed to sell its First Scotland East business and all its routes in the region to McGill's Group in September 2022.

- 1.3) That there have been significant challenges delivering the existing service and the route and frequency of the service falls short of what is required by the residents of Ratho.

Committee understands:

- 2.1) The residents of Ratho are exasperated by the existing service with buses failing to turn up, the limited frequency, and that the route itself fails to meet their needs.
- 2.2) Unreliability is impacting decisions residents are making and they are now reliant on private cars and taxis to attend work, medical appointments, leisure, school, and further education.

Committee further notes:

- 3.1) The poor evening service means residents cannot use public transport due to safety concerns walking from Ratho station and there is no guarantee any bus to the village will appear.
- 3.2) Young people under 22 are unable to take advantage of the benefit their Young Scot National Entitlement Card should provide.
- 3.3) Committee therefore requests a report to Transport and Environment Committee, in July, that identifies and provides a suitable public transport solution for the residents of Ratho to include (but not limited to):
 - Reviewing the existing contract to ensure the service tendered is being provided.
 - Assessing alternative options that have been presented previously to officers and elected members from Ratho and District Community Council, including a shuttle to local transport hubs such as train stations and park & rides.
 - Reviewing alternative routes.
 - Retendering as soon as is practicable.
 - Meeting with stakeholders at RBS Gogar to consider innovative ideas including extending their shuttle bus service.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Cowdy.

- moved by Councillor Cowdy, seconded by Councillor Munro

Amendment 1

To insert at the end of the motion by Councillor Cowdy:

- 3.4) Committee acknowledges the enormous efforts made by the Ratho Bus Work Group towards finding a sustainable public transport service for the village and requests the issuing of a PIN notice to explore alternative provision prior to any formal procurement process and explore opportunities linking to local businesses and organisations, including RBS, Lost Shore and the Council-owned Edinburgh International Climbing Arena.

3.5) Committee further requests the seeking of a meeting with McGills composed of the Ratho Bus Work Group, council officers, Pentland Hills ward councillors, and the Transport and Environment Convener, to discuss the operational difficulties outlined and potential solutions within the framework of the current contract, with a date for the meeting to be sought before the summer recess in July.

- Moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Work

Amendment 2

To amend the motion by Councillor Aston as follows:

- 1) After paragraph 1.3, to insert: "1.4. that similar issues of poor performance have arisen with respect to McGill's services in Kirkliston, including the Council supported 63 service, which formed the basis of a major public meeting on 2 May."
- 2) To replace bullet point 1 in paragraph 3.3 with: "Reviewing existing contracts awarded to McGills, including the 20 service, to ensure all services tendered to them by the Council are being delivered properly."
- 3) To amend bullet point 4 in paragraph 3.3 to read: "Retendering as soon as is practicable ensuring there is no break in supported bus services between existing contracts concluding and any new contracts commencing."

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Cowdy:

- 1) To note the current Service 20 was a subsidised bus service running between Ratho and Chesser.
- 2) To note the current provider was McGills after First Bus agreed to sell its First Scotland East business and all its routes in the region to McGill's Group in September 2022.
- 3) To note that there had been significant challenges delivering the existing service and the route and frequency of the service fell short of what was required by the residents of Ratho.
- 4) To note that similar issues of poor performance had arisen with respect to McGill's services in Kirkliston, including the Council supported 63 service, which formed the basis of a major public meeting on 2 May 2023.
- 5) To understand the residents of Ratho were exasperated by the existing service with buses failing to turn up, the limited frequency, and that the route itself failed to meet their needs.
- 6) To understand unreliability was impacting decisions residents were making and they were now reliant on private cars and taxis to attend work, medical appointments, leisure, school, and further education.

- 7) To note the poor evening service meant residents could not use public transport due to safety concerns walking from Ratho station and there was no guarantee any bus to the village would appear.
- 8) To note young people under 22 were unable to take advantage of the benefit their Young Scot National Entitlement Card should provide.
- 9) To therefore request a report to Transport and Environment Committee, in July, that identified and provided a suitable public transport solution for the residents of Ratho to include (but not limited to):
 - Reviewing existing contracts awarded to McGills, including the 20 service, to ensure all services tendered to them by the Council were being delivered properly
 - Assessing alternative options that had been presented previously to officers and elected members from Ratho and District Community Council, including a shuttle to local transport hubs such as train stations and park & rides.
 - Reviewing alternative routes.
 - Retendering as soon as was practicable ensuring there was no break in supported bus services between existing contracts concluding and any new contracts commencing.
 - Meeting with stakeholders at RBS Gogar to consider innovative ideas including extending their shuttle bus service.
- 10) To acknowledge the enormous efforts made by the Ratho Bus Work Group towards finding a sustainable public transport service for the village and requests the issuing of a PIN notice to explore alternative provision prior to any formal procurement process and explore opportunities linking to local businesses and organisations, including RBS, Lost Shore and the Council-owned Edinburgh International Climbing Arena.
- 11) To further request the seeking of a meeting with McGill's composed of the Ratho Bus Work Group, council officers, Pentland Hills ward councillors, and the Transport and Environment Committee Convener, to discuss the operational difficulties outlined and potential solutions within the framework of the current contract, with a date for the meeting to be sought before the summer recess in July.

Declarations of interest

Councillor Faccenda made a transparency statement in respect of the above item as her partner was employed by a bus company which was part of the same group of companies as those mentioned in the deputation and motion.

16. Emergency Motion by Councillor Meagher - Accidents in the 'Joppa Triangle'

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

- “1) Committee notes with concern the number of accidents in the ‘Joppa Triangle’, apparently resulting from vehicles speeding along Musselburgh Road and Coillesdene Avenue. Most recently, on the night of 9 May 2023, two cars were written off and a garden wall partially demolished by a driver losing control of speeding car.
- 2) Committee agrees to initiate an urgent road safety assessment of the area with resulting recommendations on how to reduce speeding, and improve road safety, in the area. Committee also asks that officers provide a clear timescale to committee members and local ward members on when this work could be completed by and reported back to committee as soon as possible.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Meagher.

- Moved by Councillor Meagher, seconded by Councillor Jones

Amendment 1

To delete paragraph 2 of the motion by Councillor Meagher and replace with:

“Committee agrees that the June Business Bulletin should provide a concise update on any proposed speed reduction measures in the area, and likely implementation schedule.”

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 2

To insert after paragraph 2 of the motion by Councillor Meagher:

“Particular consideration will be given to permanent speed reducing measures including speed bumps/cushions. Notes that limited temporary mitigations have been implemented already in acknowledgment of the effect of Brunstane Road’s closure to vehicles and agrees that permanent mitigations to reduce speed must be part of the overall approach to traffic management in Joppa and Coillesdene.”

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment 3

To insert at paragraph 2 of the motion by Councillor Meagher after “in the area”: “based on the Council’s current road safety policies and established criteria for traffic calming”.

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

Amendment 4

To insert after paragraph 2 of the motion by Councillor Meagher:

- “3) Notes the decision by the committee at its meeting on 8th December to introduce sinusoidal speed humps and/or chicanes on Coillesdene Avenue.
- 4) Notes that it remains unclear whether these road safety measures were implemented at the time and asks for this action to be carried out immediately if it has not been completed yet.”

- Moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Miller

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Meagher:

- 1) To note with concern the number of accidents in the 'Joppa Triangle', apparently resulting from vehicles speeding along Musselburgh Road and Coillesdene Avenue. Most recently, on the night of 9 May 2023, two cars were written off and a garden wall partially demolished by a driver losing control of speeding car.
- 2) To agree that the June Business Bulletin should provide a concise update on any proposed speed reduction measures in the area based on the Council's current road safety policies and established criteria for traffic calming, and likely implementation schedule.
- 3) To agree particular consideration would be given to permanent speed reducing measures including speed bumps/cushions.
- 4) To agree that permanent mitigations to reduce speed must be part of the overall approach to traffic management in Joppa and Coillesdene.
- 5) To note the decision of the Committee at its meeting on 8 December 2022 to introduce sinusoidal speed humps and/or chicanes on Coillesdene Avenue.
- 6) To note that it remained unclear whether these road safety measures were implemented at the time and asks for this action to be carried out as soon as possible if it had not been completed yet.