

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday 14 September 2023

Present

Councillors Arthur (Convener), Aston, Bandel, Burgess (substituting for Councillor O'Neill, items 13 and 14), Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Dobbin, Graham (substituting for Councillor Faccenda, items 1 to 7), Faccenda (item 8 onwards), Lang, McFarlane, Munro and O'Neill (items 1 to 13).

1. Deputation

Pesticide Free Balerno

(in relation to item 9 - Phased Reduction in Use of Glyphosate)

The deputation provided a summary of Glyphosate use, and the changes of use which had occurred since 2016. They highlighted health concerns and requested at the minimum, the introduction of some level of safe alternatives in the meantime until the phase out was completed.

2. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 17 August 2023 as a correct record.

3. Work Programme

The Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme was presented.

Decision

- 1) To request a business bulletin update for the next meeting on Burnside Bridge.
- 2) To request a business bulletin update on the George Street and First New Town Consultation.
- 3) To otherwise note the work programme.

(Reference – Work Programme 14 September 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 34 - Business Bulletin – Motion by Councillor Miller – Driver Behaviour

- Action 35 - Public Transport Action Plan 2023 – Delivering the City Mobility Plan
 - Action 37 (1) - Strategic Business Case for an Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy
 - Action 38 (2) and (3) - Response to motion by Councillor Arthur and Project Update - Electric Vehicle Charging
 - Action 40 (1-3) and (5) - Roads and Infrastructure Investment – Capital Delivery Priorities for 2023/24
 - Action 43 – Business Bulletin (Leith Walk Planters)
 - Action 44 - Business Bulletin (Powderhall)
 - Action 45 – Business Bulletin (Supported bus services)
 - Action 48 - Response to motion by Councillor Lang - Flooding in Kirkliston and the wider Almond Catchment
 - Action 49 (2) and (3) - Response to Motion by Councillor Osler – Flooding
 - Action 52 - Motion by Councillor Cowdy - Better Buses for Ratho
 - Action 54 (2) – RAL
 - Action 55 (1) and (2) - Business Bulletin
 - Action 56 - A71 Dalmahoy Junction Improvements – Funding Options
 - Item 60 (3) - Maintenance of Footways and Cycleways
- 2) To agree action 40 (4) – ‘Roads and Infrastructure Investment – Capital Delivery Priorities for 2023/24’ would remain open.
- 3) To note the remaining outstanding actions.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log 14 September 2023, submitted.)

5. Business Bulletin

The Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin was submitted.

Decision

- 1) To note the Business Bulletin.
- 2) To request an update on how many service hours were lost to incorrectly parked vehicles on the tram route.
- 3) To confirm the timescale for completion of signalling works on the tram route.

(Reference – Business Bulletin 14 September 2023, submitted.)

6. Roseburn to Union Canal Active Travel Route and Green Corridor – Compulsory Purchase Order

Approval was sought to serve a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) in respect of a plot on privately owned land to enable constructions of a link, which would be of value to residents for accessing the main active travel route and greenspace.

Decision

- 1) To agree to pursue a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) for the area of land shown in Appendix 3 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that it was intended to submit a draft CPO to the next appropriate meeting of the Council for authority to exercise compulsory purchase powers.
- 3) To note that the Council would continue to seek a negotiated purchase or servitude access to the land noted in Appendix 3 to the report in parallel with the CPO process.

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

7. Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy

A report responded to a request from the Transport and Environment Committee at its meeting of 2 March 2023 on an integrated impact assessment for an Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy and agreed plans for future engagement and a public consultation. The Committee was asked to note the progression of these milestones.

Motion

- 1) To note the interim integrated impact assessment report and progression with the agreed milestones for the Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy.
- 2) To thank officers for a balanced report which highlights both the potential benefits of a Workplace Parking Levy and its predictable negative consequences on key groups.
- 3) To note that the Labour administration previously raised concerns that the predictable and non-trivial negative impacts of a Workplace Parking Levy were not being adequately addressed by the Committee. Regrets, therefore, that other parties decided to proceed without addressing these. Welcomes that this report provides an opportunity to pause and robustly address these concerns before giving the Edinburgh public a say on the matter.
- 4) To recommit Edinburgh to a just transition – it must move to a net-zero economy in a way that is fair and equitable for all, including workers, communities, and the environment.
- 5) To note, however, that in contrast with this the current report makes the following observations:
 - 5.1) *“...15% of those that travel to work by car” are in “the lowest two groups of Socio-economic classification”.*
 - 5.2) *“The school sector has a relatively higher dependency on car use to work, and part time workers have a relatively higher income impact if the full cost of WPL was passed on.”* Further notes that *“56% of the Teaching and*

Educational Professionals in Edinburgh are women”, and “31% of women employed in Edinburgh work part-time”.

- 5.3) *The Workplace Parking Levy could create “displaced parking to residential areas or places located near existing parking terminals as drivers commuting to work attempt to avoid paying for the levy”.*
 - 5.4) *There may be an “impact on cost of living if the levy is passed on to workers” and that women are “overrepresented in sector specific employment with car reliance”.*
 - 5.5) *“...a Workplace Parking Levy could reduce private car use, and that may lead to disproportionate impacts on lower income groups experiencing forced car ownership.”*
 - 6) To note that the report is clear that more work is required to evaluate the carbon impact, environmental impact and any risks from cumulative impacts.
 - 7) To note that in terms of the impact a Workplace Parking Levy may have on modal shift, a significant independent study in Nottingham (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cstp.2019.09.001>) found that in terms of sustainable transport *“around 8.5% of all commuters on these modes have switched away from the car, at least in part because of the WPL Package. About half of these commuters cited the increase in the cost of parking at work or the removal of workplace parking as an important reason... .however, the survey also demonstrates that a quarter of all current car users surveyed have switched to this mode in the study period, with convenience and a quicker journey time being important reasons for this switch.... It is concluded that this limits the ability of the WPL to actually reduce congestion as when road space is consequently released by the WPL itself, or the measures it part funds, further car trips are generated.”*
 - 8) To conclude that whilst a Workplace Parking Levy would help address Edinburgh’s position as Scotland’s worst funded Council, such a scheme must not worsen inequality between residents in our capital. Further concludes a Workplace Parking Levy would only succeed if it was part of a wider progressive plan to encourage modal shift.
 - 9) To agree that progressing to a consultation without addressing these points fully and offering robust and workable mitigation options as part of an open and transparent public consultation, would conflict with the commitment to deliver a just transition.
 - 10) To agree all work on the consultation should stop until robust mitigation options are presented to the Committee for consideration which have been developed in partnership with local Trade Unions and other key stakeholders.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the interim integrated impact assessment report and progression with the agreed milestones for the Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy.

- 2) To agree to proceed to engagement and consultation as set out in 5.1.
- 3) To acknowledge the strategic importance of the City Mobility Plan's commitment to a 30% reduction in car kilometres by 2030. This must extend to regular and frequent reporting of progress towards that target in order to assist the Council in identifying what policy solutions, such as a Workplace Parking Levy are needed to address Edinburgh's severe congestion problems and to meet the challenges of the climate crisis.
- 4) To agree therefore that the annual progress towards the target of a 30% reduction in car kilometres by 2030 will be reported on an annual basis in the Annual Performance Report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee, with the figure for the last reporting year to have concluded to be included in the next Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin.
 - moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the interim integrated impact assessment report and progression with the agreed milestones for the Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy.
- 2) To reiterate approval of going forward to an initial consultation on the general principles of a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL).
- 3) To recognise the necessity for measures to promote a cultural and modal shift from solo car use towards more sustainable travel options which will have a positive impact on our environment and also on people with marginalised identities – notably workers who come from a low-income background, women, disabled people, elderly people and ethnic minority groups – all of whom are more likely to travel by public transport anyway.
- 4) To acknowledge outstanding concerns and the possibility for misunderstandings raised in the Integrated Impact Assessment but recognises the wide range of possible mitigations available.
- 5) To recognise the need for the consultation to clearly communicate the aims, scope, and potential benefits of a WPL and asks that the consultation should explore views on these mitigations as well as what workers would like the money to be spent on.
 - moved by Councillor O'Neill, seconded by Councillor Bandel

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the interim integrated impact assessment report and progression with the agreed milestones for the Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy.
- 2) Considers that the imposition of a Workplace Parking Levy would be an additional and unwelcome tax on jobs burdening businesses and workers with extra costs, especially during the difficult economic times of a cost-of-living crisis.
- 3) To note that Council Officers time could be better spent elsewhere.
- 4) To agree to take no further action on this proposal.

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 22.12, Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	2 votes
For amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	7 votes
For amendment 3	-	2 votes

(For the motion – Councillors Arthur and Graham.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) – Councillors Aston, Bandel, Dijkstra-Downie, Dobbin, Lang, McFarlane and O’Neill.

For Amendment 3 – Councillors Cowdy and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor Aston:

- 1) To note the interim integrated impact assessment report and progression with the agreed milestones for the Edinburgh Workplace Parking Levy.
- 2) To agree to proceed to engagement and consultation as set out in paragraph 5.1 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To acknowledge the strategic importance of the City Mobility Plan’s commitment to a 30% reduction in car kilometres by 2030. This must extend to regular and frequent reporting of progress towards that target in order to assist the Council in identifying what policy solutions, such as a Workplace Parking Levy were needed to address Edinburgh’s severe congestion problems and to meet the challenges of the climate crisis.
- 4) To agree therefore that the annual progress towards the target of a 30% reduction in car kilometres by 2030 would be reported on an annual basis in the Annual Performance Report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee, with the figure for the last reporting year to have concluded to be included in the next Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin.
- 5) To reiterate approval of going forward to an initial consultation on the general principles of a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL).
- 6) To recognise the necessity for measures to promote a cultural and modal shift from solo car use towards more sustainable travel options which would have a positive impact on our environment and also on people with marginalised identities – notably workers who come from a low-income background, women, disabled people, elderly people and ethnic minority groups – all of whom were more likely to travel by public transport anyway.
- 7) To acknowledge outstanding concerns and the possibility for misunderstandings raised in the Integrated Impact Assessment but to recognise the wide range of possible mitigations available.

- 8) To recognise the need for the consultation to clearly communicate the aims, scope, and potential benefits of a WPL and to ask that the consultation should explore views on these mitigations as well as what workers would like the money to be spent on.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee of 2 March 2023 (item 7); report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

8. Roads and Transport Infrastructure Investment

A report responded to a request from the Transport and Environment Committee on 20 April 2023, setting out the current strategies for roads and infrastructure investment, including condition status, future estimates and funding options, and details of the setted streets strategy.

Motion

- 1) To note the options for investment, as detailed in section 4 of the report by the Executive Director of Place and in Appendix 5 to the report.
- 2) To note the strategy for setted streets, as detailed in section 4 of the report and Appendix 6.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the options for investment, as detailed in section 4 of the report by the Executive Director of Place and in Appendix 5 to the report.
- 2) Welcomes the marked improvements to safe and accessible active travel infrastructure and the public realm the application of Street Design Guidance to capital renewal projects has delivered in the past.
- 3) Expresses concern at the possible impact going forward with like-for-like carriageways renewals instead of applying Street Design Guidance in the future would have on active travel.
- 4) Recognises that some of the investment options presented require trade-offs between the condition of the carriageway and improvements to active travel infrastructure and the public realm.
- 5) Notes that while carriageway condition is assessed and measured through the RCI score, no comparable projections exist for progress on delivering active travel infrastructure and public realm improvements that would improve the safety and experience of its users.
- 6) Requests a report in advance of the 24/25 Council Budget to quantify the impact of the two options proposing like-for-like carriageway renewals on the council's year by year progress on the delivery of active travel infrastructure and public realm improvements.
- 7) To note the strategy for setted streets, as detailed in section 4 of the report and Appendix 6.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor O'Neil

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the options for investment, as detailed in section 4 of the report by the Executive Director of Place and in Appendix 5 to the report.
 - 2) To note the strategy for setted streets, as detailed in section 4 of the report and Appendix 6.
 - 3) To note point 3.8 of the report that the current capital budget strategy “forecasts deterioration of the carriageway network.”
 - 4) To acknowledge:
 - 4.1) The current poor condition of the City’s roads is of great concern and needs to be addressed.
 - 4.2) That Scenario 4, requiring an extra £3Mil - £5Mil funding per financial and using like for like renewals, represents the most efficient, effective and pragmatic option for future improvement.
- moved by Councillor Cowdy, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22.12, Amendment 1 and Amendment 2 were adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

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

(For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Dijkstra-Downie, Dobbin, Faccenda, Lang, McFarlane and O’Neill.
For Amendment 2 – Councillors Cowdy and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the options for investment, as detailed in section 4 of the report by the Executive Director of Place and in Appendix 5.
- 2) To note the strategy for setted streets, as detailed in section 4 of the report and Appendix 6.
- 3) To request a report in advance of the 24/25 Council Budget to quantify the impact of the two options proposing like-for-like carriageway renewals on the council's year by year progress on the delivery of active travel infrastructure and public realm improvements.
- 4) To acknowledge the current poor condition of the City’s roads and footpaths was of great concern and needed to be addressed.

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

9. Phased Reduction in Use of Glyphosate

Approval was sought for the phased reduction of the use of glyphosate-based chemicals for the treatment of weeds, with the exception of use to control invasive weeds.

Motion

- 1) To introduce a ban from April 2024 on all use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of weeds and unwanted vegetation in greenspaces across the Council's estate, with the exception of invasive weeds.
- 2) To approve the continued use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of invasive weeds i.e. Giant Hogweed, Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed.
- 3) To introduce a phased reduction of the use of glyphosate-based herbicide, with the aim of not using these by 2026 for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas.
- 4) To note that a weeds policy would be included as part of the next Neighbourhood Environmental Services Policy Assurance review in Spring 2024.
- 5) To agree the Convener would write to SEPA to request any information they hold on water quality and levels of Glyphosate in watercourses.
- 6) To agree the Convener would write to the Scottish Government to note the Council's progress in the phasing out of glyphosate use and request that they consider further regulations.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note point 3.3 in the report and believes that the burden of evidence indicates that glyphosate, being a 'forever' chemical, is carcinogenic, and as an endocrine disruptor, is a threat to the health and wellbeing of those who come in contact with it, particularly children.
- 2) To note and agree that glyphosate-based herbicides are a significant threat to biodiversity and the environment.
- 3) Committee believes use of glyphosate-based herbicides should be phased out across all our Greenspaces.
- 4) To require an accelerated timescale for the phasing out of glyphosate use for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas prior to 2026 with a plan to be included in the Environmental Services Policy Assurance review in Spring 2024, this review to explore non-glyphosate approaches to controlling and eradicating invasive weeds (as listed in 4.9).
- 5) To note the 2018 case of Dewayne Johnson, the US greenkeeper who won a landmark legal case against the manufacturer with the jury ruling that the manufacturer's glyphosate product had caused his terminal cancer, and requests a report back, within one cycle, on the protective equipment that Council workers and any contractors are required to use while spraying.

- 6) To agree that officers should prepare and circulate a short briefing to Edinburgh's Community Councils with details on the procedure and process for involvement in the glyphosate-free trial areas.
 - 7) To agree the Convener would write to SEPA to request any information they hold on water quality and levels of Glyphosate in watercourses.
 - 8) To agree the Convener would write to the Scottish Government to note the Council's progress in the phasing out of glyphosate use and request that they consider further regulations
- moved by Councillor Dobbin, seconded by Councillor Aston

Amendment 2

- 1) To introduce a ban from April 2024 on all use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of weeds and unwanted vegetation in greenspaces across the Council's estate, with the exception of invasive weeds.
 - 2) To approve the continued use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of invasive weeds i.e. Giant Hogweed, Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed.
 - 3) To introduce a phased reduction of the use of glyphosate-based herbicide, with the aim of not using these by 2026 for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas, but agrees there should be no reduction overall in the scope and quality of weed control on roads and pavements during, or after, this period of transition.
 - 4) To note that a weeds policy would be included as part of the next Neighbourhood Environmental Services Policy Assurance review in Spring 2024.
 - 5) To agree the Convener would write to SEPA to request any information they hold on water quality and levels of Glyphosate in watercourses.
 - 6) To agree the Convener would write to the Scottish Government to note the Council's progress in the phasing out of glyphosate use and request that they consider further regulations.
- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment 3

- 1) To introduce a ban from April 2024 on all use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of weeds and unwanted vegetation in greenspaces across the Council's estate, with the exception of invasive weeds.
- 2) To approve the continued use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of invasive weeds i.e. Giant Hogweed, Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed.
- 3) To introduce a phased reduction of the use of glyphosate-based herbicide, with the aim of not using these by 2026 for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas.
- 4) To note that a weeds policy would be included as part of the next Neighbourhood Environmental Services Policy Assurance review in Spring 2024.

- 5) To welcome the ban in greenspaces and proposed phase out on roads and pavements as the toxicity of glyphosate is known to be fatal to birds, bees, worms and fish, and can also have a detrimental impact to people's health and wellbeing.
- 6) To reiterate our commitment to tackling the Climate and Nature emergencies in all forms, especially by ways of Council's use of chemical sprays on our streets and in our green spaces.
- 7) To recognise the need for ongoing scrutiny around the phase out.
- 8) Therefore, requests a progress update to come back to Committee in one year's time.
- 9) To agree the Convener would write to SEPA to request any information they hold on water quality and levels of Glyphosate in watercourses.
- 10) To agree the Convener would write to the Scottish Government to note the Council's progress in the phasing out of glyphosate use and request that they consider further regulations.

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

Amendment 4

- 1) To introduce a ban from April 2024 on all use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of weeds and unwanted vegetation in greenspaces across the Council's estate, with the exception of invasive weeds (see recommendation 2)
- 2) To approve the continued use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of invasive weeds i.e. Giant Hogweed, Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed.
- 3) To continue to consider effective alternatives with the aim of reducing use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas, where feasible.
- 4) To note that a weeds policy would be included as part of the next Neighbourhood Environmental Services Policy Assurance review in Spring 2024.
- 5) To agree the Convener would write to SEPA to request any information they hold on water quality and levels of Glyphosate in watercourses.
- 6) To agree the Convener would write to the Scottish Government to note the Council's progress in the phasing out of glyphosate use and request that they consider further regulations.

- moved by Councillor Cowdy, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22.12, Amendments 1 and 4 were adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion. Amendments 2 and 3 were accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To introduce a ban from April 2024 on all use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of weeds and unwanted vegetation in greenspaces across the Council's estate, with the exception of invasive weeds.
- 2) To approve the continued use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of invasive weeds i.e. Giant Hogweed, Himalayan Balsam and Japanese Knotweed.
- 3) To introduce a phased reduction of the use of glyphosate-based herbicide, with the aim of not using these by 2026 for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas, but to agree there should be no reduction overall in the scope and quality of weed control on roads and pavements during, or after, this period of transition.
- 4) To note that a weeds policy would be included as part of the next Neighbourhood Environmental Services Policy Assurance review in Spring 2024.
- 5) To welcome the ban in greenspaces and proposed phase out on roads and pavements as the toxicity of glyphosate was known to be fatal to birds, bees, worms and fish, and could also have a detrimental impact to people's health and wellbeing.
- 6) To reiterate our commitment to tackling the Climate and Nature emergencies in all forms, especially by ways of Council's use of chemical sprays on our streets and in our green spaces.
- 7) To recognise the need for ongoing scrutiny around the phase out.
- 8) Therefore, to request a progress update to come back to Committee in one year's time.
- 9) To agree that glyphosate-based herbicides were a significant threat to biodiversity and the environment.
- 10) To believe the use of glyphosate-based herbicides should be phased out across all our greenspaces.
- 11) To explore an accelerated timescale for the phasing out of glyphosate use for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas prior to 2026 with a plan to be included in the Environmental Services Policy Assurance review in Spring 2024; this review to explore non-glyphosate approaches to controlling and eradicating invasive weeds (as listed in paragraph 4.9 of the report by the Executive Director of Place).
- 12) To note the 2018 case of Dewayne Johnson, the US greenkeeper who won a landmark legal case against the manufacturer with the jury ruling that the manufacturer's glyphosate product had caused his terminal cancer, and to request a report back, within one cycle, on the protective equipment that Council workers and any contractors were required to use while spraying.
- 13) To agree that officers should prepare and circulate a short briefing to Edinburgh's Community Councils with details on the procedure and process for involvement in the glyphosate-free trial areas.

- 14) To continue to consider effective alternatives with the aim of reducing use of glyphosate-based herbicide for the control of weeds on our roads, carriageways, pavements and hardstanding areas, where feasible.
- 15) To agree the Convener would write to SEPA to request any information they hold on water quality and levels of Glyphosate in watercourses.
- 16) To agree the Convener would write to the Scottish Government to note the Council's progress in the phasing out of glyphosate use and request that they consider further regulations.

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

10. Flooding in Kirkliston and the wider Almond Catchment

A report provided an update on the funding of a River Almond Flood Study from the £2 million capital funding allocated for flooding.

Decision

- 1) To note that it was not possible to fund a River Almond Flood Study from the £2 million capital funding allocated for flooding, and that no alternative options had been identified to meet the cost of this study in advance of the planned programme (as part of Cycle 3 of the Plan for the Forth Estuary Local Plan District (2028 - 2034).
- 2) To note that officers would progress the programmes of work identified as part of the £2 million and the actions identified for the Council within the current Cycle 2 of the Local Flood Risk Plan.

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

11. Strategic Review of Parking: Progress Update

A report provided an update on progress with the implementation of the Strategic Review of Parking and on the interdependencies between the Strategic Review and the Stadiums Review. A response to a motion approved by the Council on 22 June 2023 in respect of anomalies in the Controlled Parking Zone N6 Abbeyhill was also included.

Motion

- 1) To note the update provided on the implementation of the Strategic Review of Parking.
- 2) To approve the methodology and approach, set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place, for assessing the monitoring results for the western extent of Zone S6.
- 3) To note the information provided in Appendix 2 in response to an approved Council motion on Controlled Parking Zone anomalies.
- 4) To approve the approach detailed in Appendix 5 with regard to permit eligibility for new developments.
- 5) To approve the approach outlined in Appendix 6 with regard to the Stadiums Review, aligning this with consideration of Phase 2 of the Review of Parking.

- 6) To circulate an updated timeline for the Strategic review of Parking.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the update provided on the implementation of the Strategic Review of Parking.
- 2) To approve the methodology and approach, set out in Appendix 1, for assessing the monitoring results for the western extent of Zone S6.
- 3) To note the information provided in Appendix 2 in response to an approved Council motion on Controlled Parking Zone anomalies.
- 4) To approve the approach detailed in Appendix 5 with regard to permit eligibility for new developments.
- 5) To approve the approach outlined in Appendix 6 with regard to the Stadiums Review, aligning this with consideration of Phase 2 of the Review of Parking.
- 6) To circulate an updated timeline for the Strategic review of Parking.
- 7) Committee welcomes the work of officers in delivering the Strategic Review of Parking, which is the most wide-ranging reform of parking controls in the city since the original city centre zone was introduced, and recognises the benefit that many residents who have experienced the impact of commuter parking pressures are already seeing on their streets.
- 8) To acknowledge however that in such a large undertaking, it is unavoidable that some anomalies and errors may creep in.
- 9) To agree therefore to request a report in three cycles to update on the implementation of all new phase 1 CPZs with a full audit of the new parking control measures. This should include, how much total new length of double yellow lines and any other additional controls have been added broken down by:
 - improvements to accessibility;
 - improvements to connectivity (preventing double parking, etc.);
 - improved access to utilities like bin hubs;
 - improvements to safety at junctions and other areas;
 - a full explanation of every stretch of controls that does not fit into the above list;and should include a list of measures which were set out in TROs but which have not been marked on roads and therefore not been implemented.
- 10) To agree that detailed maps of all proposed new CPZ schemes will always be provided to ward councillors and community councils ahead of the promotion of the TROs relevant to them and to this committee when it is considering reports on progression to a TRO.
- 11) To note the update contained in Appendix 2 and the legal obstacles to granting permits to households which are part of streets which are currently not adopted or

were not adopted at the time of the promotion of the enabling TRO and which therefore have not been included in the CPZ area in which they are located.

- 12) To reiterate Council's recognition in the meeting of June 2023 that 'it is not fair that residents in these new developments should be concerned that they will be under disproportionate pressure from neighbouring streets if they are not included in the CPZ'.
 - 13) To acknowledge that until the legal process of extending parking controls to the two streets that were adopted within zone N6 is completed it cannot be definitively concluded that controls will be implemented there.
 - 14) To agree therefore to ask officers to liaise with the Council's parking enforcement contractor with a view to ensuring that households in the affected streets in N6 will receive a parking dispensation: for instance being able to provide registration details for one car each to the contractor via the Council and that these nominated vehicles will face no penalty for parking in N6 CPZ permit holders' bays until the legal process of extending parking controls has been completed and an outcome determined
- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the update provided on the implementation of the Strategic Review of Parking.
 - 2) To approve the methodology and approach, set out in Appendix 1, for assessing the monitoring results for the western extent of Zone S6.
 - 3) To note the information provided in Appendix 2 in response to an approved Council motion on Controlled Parking Zone anomalies; and requests that relevant ward councillors are briefed on individual assessments and outcomes as they arise on CPZs on private roads, and that assessments are completed within two months of notification of issues arising.
 - 4) To approve the approach detailed in Appendix 5 with regard to permit eligibility for new developments.
 - 5) To approve the approach outlined in Appendix 6 with regard to the Stadiums Review, aligning this with consideration of Phase 2 of the Review of Parking.
 - 6) To circulate an updated timeline for the Strategic review of Parking.
 - 7) To agree that the monitoring report set out in 5.2 should also include an update on engagement with traders/uptake of traders permits, feedback from local businesses, feedback from garage permits, other resident issues arising, and any lessons learned ahead of any decision on Phase 2.
- moved by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie, seconded by Councillor Lang

In accordance with Standing Order 22.12, Amendments 1 and 2 were adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22.12, Amendment 2 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

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

(For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Arthur, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda and Lang.
For the amendment (as adjusted) – Councillors Aston, Bandel, Cowdy, Dobbin, McFarlane, Munro and O’Neill.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted amendment by Councillor Aston:

- 1) To note the update provided on the implementation of the Strategic Review of Parking.
- 2) To approve the methodology and approach, set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place, for assessing the monitoring results for the western extent of Zone S6.
- 3) To note the information provided in Appendix 2 in response to an approved Council motion on Controlled Parking Zone anomalies; and to request that relevant ward councillors be briefed on individual assessments and outcomes as they arose on CPZs on private roads, and that assessments were normally completed within two months of notification of issues arising.
- 4) To approve the approach detailed in Appendix 5 with regard to permit eligibility for new developments.
- 5) To approve the approach outlined in Appendix 6 with regard to the Stadiums Review, aligning this with consideration of Phase 2 of the Review of Parking.
- 6) To circulate an updated timeline for the Strategic Review of Parking.
- 7) To welcome the work of officers in delivering the Strategic Review of Parking, which was the most wide-ranging reform of parking controls in the city since the original city centre zone was introduced, and to recognise the benefit that many residents who had experienced the impact of commuter parking pressures were already seeing on their streets.
- 8) To acknowledge however that in such a large undertaking, it was unavoidable that some anomalies and errors may creep in.
- 9) To agree therefore to request a report in three cycles to update on the implementation of all new phase 1 CPZs with a full audit of the new parking control measures. This should include how much total new length of double yellow lines and any other additional controls had been added broken down by:
 - improvements to accessibility;
 - improvements to connectivity (preventing double parking, etc.);

- improved access to utilities like bin hubs;
 - improvements to safety at junctions and other areas;
 - a full explanation of every stretch of controls that does not fit into the above list;
- and should include a list of measures which were set out in TROs but which had not been marked on roads and therefore not implemented.
- 10) To agree that detailed maps of all proposed new CPZ schemes would always be provided to ward councillors and community councils ahead of the promotion of the TROs relevant to them and to this committee when it was considering reports on progression to a TRO.
 - 11) To note the update contained in Appendix 2 and the legal obstacles to granting permits to households which were part of streets which were currently not adopted or were not adopted at the time of the promotion of the enabling TRO, and which therefore had not been included in the CPZ area in which they were located.
 - 12) To reiterate Council's recognition in the meeting of June 2023 that 'it is not fair that residents in these new developments should be concerned that they will be under disproportionate pressure from neighbouring streets if they are not included in the CPZ'.
 - 13) To acknowledge that until the legal process of extending parking controls to the two streets that were adopted within zone N6 was completed it could not be definitively concluded that controls would be implemented there.
 - 14) To agree therefore to ask officers to liaise with the Council's parking enforcement contractor with a view to ensuring that households in the affected streets in N6 would receive a parking dispensation: for instance being able to provide registration details for one car each to the contractor via the Council and that these nominated vehicles would face no penalty for parking in N6 CPZ permit holders' bays until the legal process of extending parking controls had been completed and an outcome determined.
 - 15) To agree that the monitoring report set out in paragraph 5.2 of the report should also include an update on engagement with traders/uptake of traders permits, feedback from local businesses, feedback from garage permits, other resident issues arising, and any lessons learned ahead of any decision on Phase 2.

(References – Act of Council No. 22 of 22 June 2023; report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

12. Response to Consultation on the draft Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging and Packaging Waste) Regulations 2024

Approval was sought of the Council's draft response to the UK Government's consultation on the draft Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging and Packaging Waste) Regulations 2024.

Motion

To approve the Council's draft response to the UK Government's consultation on the draft Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging and Packaging Waste) Regulations 2024, set out in Appendix 1.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment

- 1) To approve the Council's draft response to the UK Government's consultation on the draft Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging and Packaging Waste) Regulations 2024, set out in Appendix 1.
- 2) To give transparency as to how The Scheme Administrator will cover the cost of litter and clarity on the money being additional to local authorities, and paid directly to local authorities as opposed to being part of a block grant

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

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 Council's draft response to the UK Government's consultation on the draft Producer Responsibility Obligations (Packaging and Packaging Waste) Regulations 2024, set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To give transparency as to how The Scheme Administrator would cover the cost of litter and clarity on the money being additional to local authorities, and paid directly to local authorities as opposed to being part of a block grant.

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

Declaration of interest

Councillor O'Neill made a transparency statement in respect of the above item of business as an employee of the MSP responsible for bringing the Circular Economy (Scotland) Bill in her role as minister.

13. Motion by Councillor Bandel – Greenbank-Meadows Quiet Route Consultation

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

“Committee:

- 1) Notes the contested decision of the Transport & Environment committee in June 2023 to separately readvertise the ETRO for the Greenbank-Meadows Quiet Route scheme whilst agreeing that the aims of the scheme should not be “diluted”.
- 2) Considers that the aim of the Quiet Route is about more than just facilitating safe cycling routes for residents and instead is about reducing traffic levels and making residential areas safer and quieter, in line with the Council target of reducing car km usage by 30% by 2030.

- 3) Therefore, notes with concern that multiple options put forward for consideration as part of the readvertised ETRO include the removal of modal filters which will reintroduce motor traffic into residential areas, including an option to wholly remove all filters in the southern section of the route, and considers that these proposals do “dilute” the scheme.
- 4) Recognises that whilst a workshop with ward Cllrs was held to discuss options, no consensus was reached about what options were appropriate to bring forward as part of the consultation, and notes with concern that some options – for example, to reopen sections of Whitehouse Loan to motor vehicles – were discussed when some Cllrs were not present owing to the workshop significantly overrunning.
- 5) Notes that whilst it is important and useful to bring in local knowledge via engagement with ward members, private officer-member workshops are neither democratic nor a decision-making body in the Council.
- 6) Reaffirms that Transport & Environment committee is the decision-making body for this matter and that the final option for the Quiet Route will be agreed at committee, following consideration of comments put forward by residents through the consultation process.
- 7) Encourages residents to participate in the consultation so that their views are heard.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Bandel.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Burgess

Amendment

- 1) Notes the contested decision of the Transport & Environment committee in June 2023 to separately readvertise the ETRO for the Greenbank-Meadows Quiet Route scheme whilst agreeing that the aims of the scheme should not be “diluted”.
- 2) Reaffirms that Transport & Environment committee is the decision-making body for this matter and that the final option for the Quiet Route will be agreed at committee, following consideration of comments put forward by residents through the consultation process.
- 3) Encourages residents to participate in the consultation so that their views are heard.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Voting

The voting was as follows:

- | | | |
|-------------------|---|---------|
| For the motion | - | 4 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 6 votes |

(For the motion – Councillors Aston, Bandel, Burgess and McFarlane.

For amendment – Councillors Arthur, Cowdy, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Lang and Munro.)

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor Arthur.

14. Motion by Councillor Arthur - Bike Hire, Car Hire, and Congestion

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

- “1) Notes that in January 2023 the Transport & Environment Committee committed to considering operating a bike hire scheme as a concession with no direct cost to the city. Therefore agrees to receive an update on this issue no later than January 2024.
- 2) Agrees that any concession should be aligned with the City Mobility Plan.
- 3) Notes that Edinburgh’s Car Club contract is due for renewal in September 2024 and therefore requests an update no later than January 2024 on how any new service could be better aligned with the City Mobility Plan.
- 4) Notes and regrets the ongoing impact congestion is having on public transport in Edinburgh and agrees this is a barrier to modal shift.
- 5) Agrees to receive an update no later than February 2024 detailing the steps being taken, or are planned, to resolve the issue. This should be compatible with the Public Travel Action Plan and include consideration of (1) better co-ordination of roadworks and (2) operators co-funding capacity in the Urban Traffic Control Team.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Arthur.

Declaration of interest

Councillor Cowdy made a transparency statement in relation to the above item of business as a member of the Enterprise Car Club.