

Minutes

Transport and Environment Committee

10.00am, Thursday 15 August 2024

Present

Councillors Arthur (Convener), Aston (except item 10), Booth, Dijkstra-Downie, Dobbin, Faccenda, Hyslop, Lang, Munro, Nicolson (item 10 only), O'Neill, and Whyte

In attendance

Councillor Thornley (as a ward member in respect of item 10)

Sarah Boyd, Sarah Singh and George Lowder (Transport for Edinburgh - in respect of item 6)

1. Deputations

a) Spokes Planning Group

(in relation to item 5 - Business Bulletin (Meadows to Union Canal Update))

The deputation shared support for the Meadows to Canal project highlighting it would make a significant impact towards a truly connected cycle network in Edinburgh. They expressed views that with the extensive history of consultation as well as the limited size of the project, it should progress directly to statutory orders to avoid further delay.

(in relation to item 11 – Trail of 7-7-7 Bus Lanes)

The deputation strongly opposed the use of bus lanes for private hire car vehicles as it would make it less safe for cyclists and also busier for buses. They highlighted the implementation of the 7-7-7 bus lanes project should be made priority as soon as possible.

b) The Lockharton Parking Group

(in relation to item 8 – Strategic Review of Parking Monitoring Update)

The deputation advised prior to November 2023 they had no parking issues, however since the extension of the CPZ, parking saturation is now a daily occurrence. They noted their quality of life had been compromised with visitors, carers, tradesman and delivery drivers being unable to park, and residents worry if they use their own car, they will be unable to park close to their homes on their return due to commuters and those within the CPZ parking in their streets. They further noted the situation eases slightly in the evenings and at weekends. They requested an urgent solution is found.

c) Blinkbonny Neighbourhood Watch

(in relation to item 10 – Local Traffic Improvement -Delivery Programme)

The deputation provided information on Craighleith Drive – specifically the tunnel at the pinch point of the road. They are pleased to see proposals had been put forward to improve the safety for all users but believe closing the tunnel is not the correct solution, nor is the costly installation of traffic lights. They requested the implementation of speed reduction measures such as appropriate signage along with a simple speed ramp at either side of the tunnel.

d) Edinburgh Bus Users Group

(in relation to item 11 – Trial of 7-7-7 Bus Lanes)

The deputation shared the history of bus lane changes and proposals in Edinburgh since 2015 and the effects they have had on the city. They shared support for the trial of 7-7-7 bus lanes, but strongly objected to the inclusion of private hire car access to bus lanes along the corridor in the experiment. They highlighted bus lanes are in place to provide priority through congestion for the most efficient ways of moving people about. As more vehicle types are allowed to use them, the less effective they will be.

e) Uber

(in relation to item 11 – Trial of 7-7-7 Bus Lanes)

The deputation supported the proposed trial of 7-7-7 bus lanes with the inclusion of private hire cars having access to the bus lanes within the corridor of the experiment, adding this would create a more efficient transport network. The deputation shared all the benefits the city, their passengers and their drivers would experience if the proposal was agreed.

f) Capital Cars and Intercity Management

(in relation to item 11 – Trial of 7-7-7 Bus Lanes)

The deputation supported the trial of 7-7-7 bus lanes and the report recommendations to include access to bus lanes for Private hire cars during the trial. They shared confidence the inclusion would result in a positive outcome, with no negative impact for bus operators or timetables. The deputation noted their customers deserve the same rights of passage as licenced taxi passengers.

g) Scottish Private Hire Association

(in relation to item 11 – Trial of 7-7-7 Bus Lanes)

The deputation requested trial access for private hire cars is included in the trial of 7-7-7 bus lanes as both Taxi's and private hire cars are recognised as an integral part of the city's mass transit system. The deputation noted having the opportunity would allow data to be collected on the impacts of private hire care access in bus lanes – both positive and negative.

h) GMB Union

(in relation to item 11 – Trial of 7-7-7 Bus Lanes)

The deputation requested private hire cars are granted access to all bus lanes and bus gates within the City of Edinburgh and provided key points highlighting their significance to the city.

i) Lennymuir Residents Association

(in relation to item 16 – Motion by Councillor Lang – Delivering the Committee’s Decision on Cammo Road)

The deputation questioned why now would be a suitable time to close Cammo Road. The closure would result in fewer options for residents to be able to visit the supermarket or attend appointments which can be located 3 to 4 miles away. They stated the speed reduction measures promised on Lennymuir had not materialized and the surrounding streets are in very poor condition with poor lighting for pedestrians. The deputation requested the motion is rejected.

2. Minutes

Decision

To continue the minute of the Transport and Environment Committee of 20 June 2024 to the next meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee on 12 September 2024. This is to allow the accuracy on the decision for “Petition for and Exemption to the Pavement Parking Ban in Bangholm” to be checked.

3. Work Programme

The Transport and Environment Committee Work Programme was presented.

Decision

- 1) To circulate an update to ward and committee members on the Stadium Parking Ban – (Now covered within the Strategic Review of Parking)
 - 2) To otherwise note the work programme
- (Reference – Work Programme 15 August 2024, 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 16 (2) – Update on Council Transport Arm’s Length Companies
 - Action 18 – Emergency Motion by Morningside Ward Councillors – Canaan Lane
 - Action 22 (1) – Response to Motion by Councillor Burgess – Sciennes Primary Playground on Sciennes Road
 - Action 25 (3) – Phased Reduction on Use of Glyphosate

- Action 28 – St James Quarter – Introduction of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order
- Action 32 (1&2)– Implementing the new Parking Prohibitions
- Action 39 (3)– Motion by Councillor Mitchell – Telford and Hillhouse Junction
- Action 42 (2) – Major Junctions Review
- Action 44 (1,2,5 &6) – Strategic Review of Parking; Progress Update
- Action 47 (2) – City Mobility Plan – 1ST Review
- Action 56 (2) – Motion by Councillor Lang – Additional Capital Investment in Transport
- Action 61 (2) – Rolling Actions Log
- Action 63 (1) – Road Safety Delivery Plan 2024/25
- Action 65 – Local Traffic Improvement – Programme Proposal and Assessment Criteria
- Action 69 (1,2,3 &4) – Parkgrove Drive
- Action 73 (1 2 &4) – Motion by Councillor Bandel – Zero Waste Hierarchy
- Action 76 (2)– Business Bulletin
- Action 77 (1&2) – Petition for Consideration – Make Ellersly and Kinellan Roads Safer for Everyone
- Action 87 – Rolling Actions Log – Motion by Councillor Mitchell – Bin Hubs Noise Mitigation
- Action 89 – Business Bulletin – Footbridge over the Union Canal
- Action 90 – Business Bulletin – Implementing the new parking prohibitions
- Action 92 – Street Cleansing Performance Report
- Action 97 (2&3) – Business Bulletin – Local Improvement Programme

2) To note the remaining outstanding actions.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, 15 August 2024, submitted)

5. Business Bulletin

The Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin was submitted.

Motion

- 1) To note the section on “Road Safety – Developer Contributions (Section 75 Agreements)”
- 2) To recognise the potential financial and reputational risks associated with delays to spending monies received via historic Section 75 agreements.

- 3) To therefore, request a full report on the outcomes of this review to allow for scrutiny and, if necessary, referral to GRBV.
 - 4) To otherwise note the business bulletin.
- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment 1

In relation to section “Travel Tracker Update”

- 1) At the end of the last paragraph after “provided in future Business Bulletins.”, insert:

To address concerns from constituents city-wide, with Committees approval, officers will look at organising a cross-party meeting that includes officers, committee members, other interested members and Lothian Buses. This should aim to take place ahead of the next Committee cycle.

In relation to section “Meadows to Union Canal Update”

- 1) To note that this project could provide a crucial strategic ‘missing link’ in the city’s active travel infrastructure, notes that this project has already been subject to numerous delays, notes that numerous non-statutory consultations have already taken place including as long ago as 2014 and further note that the Traffic Order process must include a consultation.
- 2) To therefore, agree not to undertake any further non-statutory consultations on this project, but rather to engage with affected businesses and then to proceed to the statutory process for traffic orders without delay.

In relation to section “Canaan Lane”

- 1) Welcomed updates on work around Canaan Lane to improve safety.
- 2) To note the Committee’s previous decision about the Greenbank-Meadows Quiet Route on 7th March 2024 which included a commitment to “any necessary updates [being made] to School Travel Plans” which should include Canaan Lane Primary and South Morningside Primary, given their proximity to the route.
- 3) To note that, to date, no specific engagement has taken place with the school community around what changes will need to be made to the Canaan Lane / South Morningside Primary School travel plans following the committee decision to remove modal filters along the “quiet” route, despite these concerns being raised by the Parent Council in advance of and following that meeting.
- 4) To regret that the school community has expressed concern over the latest iteration of the school travel plan which includes errors and has not had appropriate sign off from the Parent Council.
- 5) To agree that officers meet with ward Councillors and the school community to determine:
 - a. The current status of the school travel plan, including amending errors contained within it

b. The scope of possible revisions to the school travel plan in the face of the Committee's decision to remove modal filters from the "quiet" route, as well as a timescale for those revisions to be implemented

6. To agree that updates from this meeting would be included in the next report on school travel plans due at Transport and Environment committee in November 2024.

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

Amendment 2

In relation to section "Scrub my Streets Update"

Committee:

- 1) To note that the update indicates that officers have ignored the impactful parts of the proposal agreed by Full Council through the budget process which involved a public involvement campaign and the ability for residents to nominate their area for additional cleaning, instead simply using the funding to increase the cleansing team.
- 2) To note that the aim of the proposal to engage the public city wide has been considerably weakened by officer proposals to concentrate in specific and limited areas (SIMD 1 and 2 and poor LEAMS scores)
- 3) To therefore agree to review the scheme and other resources for the 2025/26 financial year and outline how a proper "Scrub My Streets" campaign can be initiated using wide public involvement and with impacts across the whole city.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, amendment 1 and 2 were accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

In relation to section "Road Safety – Developer Contributions (Section 75 Agreements)"

- 1) To note the section on "Road Safety – Developer Contributions (Section 75 Agreements)"
- 2) To recognise the potential financial and reputational risks associated with delays to spending monies received via historic Section 75 agreements.
- 3) To therefore, request a full report on the outcomes of this review to allow for scrutiny and, if necessary, referral to GRBV.

In relation to section "Travel Tracker Update"

- 4) At the end of the last paragraph after "provided in future Business Bulletins.", insert:

To address concerns from constituents city-wide, with Committees approval, officers will look at organising a cross-party meeting that includes officers,

committee members, other interested members and Lothian Buses. This should aim to take place ahead of the next Committee cycle.

In relation to section “Meadows to Union Canal Update”

- 5) To note that this project could provide a crucial strategic ‘missing link’ in the city’s active travel infrastructure, notes that this project has already been subject to numerous delays, notes that numerous non-statutory consultations have already taken place including as long ago as 2014 and further note that the Traffic Order process must include a consultation.
- 6) To therefore, agree not to undertake any further non-statutory consultations on this project, but rather to engage with affected businesses and then to proceed to the statutory process for traffic orders without delay.

In relation to section “Canaan Lane”

- 7) Welcomed updates on work around Canaan Lane to improve safety.
- 8) To note the Committee’s previous decision about the Greenbank-Meadows Quiet Route on 7th March 2024 which included a commitment to “any necessary updates [being made] to School Travel Plans” which should include Canaan Lane Primary and South Morningside Primary, given their proximity to the route.
- 9) To note that, to date, no specific engagement had taken place with the school community around what changes would need to be made to the Canaan Lane / South Morningside Primary School travel plans following the committee decision to remove modal filters along the “quiet” route, despite these concerns being raised by the Parent Council in advance of and following that meeting.
- 10) To regret that the school community had expressed concern over the latest iteration of the school travel plan which included errors and has not had appropriate sign off from the Parent Council.
- 11) To agree that officers meet with ward Councillors and the school community to determine:
 - a. The current status of the school travel plan, including amending errors contained within it
 - b. The scope of possible revisions to the school travel plan in the face of the Committee’s decision to remove modal filters from the “quiet” route, as well as a timescale for those revisions to be implemented
- 12) To agree that updates from this meeting would be included in the next report on school travel plans due at Transport and Environment committee in November 2024.

In relation to section “Scrub my Streets Update”

Committee:

- 13) To note that the update indicated that officers had ignored the impactful parts of the proposal agreed by Full Council through the budget process which involved a public involvement campaign and the ability for residents to nominate their area

for additional cleaning, instead simply using the funding to increase the cleansing team.

- 14) To note that the aim of the proposal to engage the public city wide had been considerably weakened by officer proposals to concentrate in specific and limited areas (SIMD 1 and 2 and poor LEAMS scores)
- 15) To therefore agree to review the scheme and other resources for the 2025/26 financial year and outline how a proper “Scrub My Streets” campaign can be initiated using wide public involvement and with impacts across the whole city.
- 16) To otherwise note the business bulletin.

(Reference – Business Bulletin, 15 August 2024, submitted.)

6. Update on Council Transport Arm’s Length Companies

The report summarised the performance of Transport for Edinburgh (TfE), Edinburgh Trams (ET) and Lothian Buses (LB) during 2023. The report was read in conjunction with the audited annual accounts for the companies for 2023, which had been approved by the respective company boards and posted on Companies House on 28 June 2024

Decision

- 1) In accordance with the Council’s governance arrangements, to note the information provided by the Council’s Transport Arm’s Length External organisations (ALEOs) and scrutinises the performance of the ALEOs for 2023
- 2) To refer the performance element of this report to Governance Risk and Best Value Committee for noting and scrutiny (as set out in paragraph 3.1.2 of the report by the Service Director of Operational Services)

(Reference – report by the Service Director, Operational Services submitted.)

7. St James Quarter – Introduction to a Traffic Regulation Order

The report sought approval from Committee to commence the statutory procedures to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), necessitated by the St James Quarter regeneration project as described in the report. This would have revisited the Committee’s decision of 12 October 2023 in view of additional information provided by the St James Quarter developer.

Motion

- 1) To note the content of the report.
 - 2) To agree not to commence with the statutory procedures for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) detailed in the report". Further agree that the space should be defined and maintained as a pedestrian zone.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To agree to revisit its decision of 12 October 2023 and reconsider the access arrangements for St James Square.

- 2) To approve the commencement of the statutory procedures for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as detailed in this report.
- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Munro

Voting

The voting was as follows:

- | | | |
|-----------------|---|---------|
| For the motion | – | 9 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | – | 2 votes |

(For the motion– Councillors Arthur, Aston, Booth, Dobbin, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Hyslop, Lang and O'Neill

For Amendment 2 – Councillors Munro and Whyte)

Decision

To approve the following motion by Councillor Arthur

- 1) To note the content of the report.
- 2) To agree not to commence with the statutory procedures for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) detailed in the report". Further agree that the space should be defined and maintained as a pedestrian zone.

(Reference – report by the Service Director - Sustainable development, submitted.)

8. Strategic Review of Parking Monitoring Update

The report provided an update on actions arising from the Strategic Review of Parking. It provided the results of monitoring surveys carried out before, during and after the implementation of Phase 1 of the review and made recommendations for future action.

The report also set out details of planned surveys in the recently completed Phase 1 areas, seeking feedback from residents and businesses on the new controls.

Motion

- 1) To note the recommendations in the report and that it will be late 2025 before any measures are introduced to ease the parking pressures in the Lockhartons.
- 2) To note these pressures are a direct result of the introduction of the CPZ as agreed by the Committee
- 3) To recognise that the consultation will still need to take place
- 4) To therefore, ask that Officers reflect on the written deputation from residents, and give greater priority to introducing PPA traffic restrictions in the Lockharton area.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note this update on the Strategic Review of Parking, including proposals for engagement with Community Councils and resident groups in Bonnington, Easter Road and Roseburn.

- 2) To note the proposed actions to mitigate the parking pressures in the Lockharton area and approve the commencement of the design and subsequent legal processes required to make this area a Priority Parking Area, with this area to become a fifth phase of the Review with charges (as set out in Appendix 3);
 - 3) To note that the design process for the Lockharton area will be accompanied by a process of engagement with the remainder of the Craiglockhart North area, recognising that proposing controls for Lockharton alone has the potential for further migration of parking pressures.
 - 4) To note the ongoing monitoring in the Abbeyhill Colonies and approve the commencement of the legal process to make minor amendments to the layout of parking in Rossie Place.
 - 5) To approve the commencement of legal processes as set out in Appendix 4 and set the associated parking charges at the rate approved for all streets in extended Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) in line with the agreed Council's Fees and Charges.
 - 6) To note that the report did not set out the context of a number of relevant wider council policies or strategies, such as the 2030 Climate Strategy or the City Mobility Plan, and in particular CMP objectives on parking including policy measure Movement 34 on parking controls, policy measure Movement 22 on tackling inconsiderate parking, or Policy measure Place 4 on liveable places; agrees that any future reports to committee on this subject, and any publicity around the parking review, would include this wider context where relevant, and would not solely mention parking pressure as the justification for extension of CPZ.
- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor O'Neill

Amendment 2

- 1) To note this update on the Strategic Review of Parking, including proposals for engagement with Community Councils and resident groups in Bonnington, Easter Road and Roseburn. To note that any further changes in these areas are likely to have a knock-on impact in adjacent areas and given the location of the Easter Road area outlined in the report that a similar engagement programme would also take place in Lochend (West Leith) and Willowbrae North, noting the parking pressures in these areas are similar, with a view to determining local views.
- 2) To note the proposed actions to mitigate the parking pressures in the Lockharton area and approve the commencement of the design and subsequent legal processes required to make this area a Priority Parking Area, with this area to become a fifth phase of the Review with charges (as set out in Appendix 3);
- 3) To note that the design process for the Lockharton area will be accompanied by a process of engagement with the remainder of the Craiglockhart North area, recognising that proposing controls for Lockharton alone has the potential for further migration of parking pressures.

- 4) To note the ongoing monitoring in the Abbeyhill Colonies and approve the commencement of the legal process to make minor amendments to the layout of parking in Rossie Place.
 - 5) To approve the commencement of legal processes as set out in Appendix 4 and set the associated parking charges at the rate approved for all streets in extended Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) in line with the agreed Council's Fees and Charges.
 - 6) To note with concern the slow progress in taking forward the Strategic Review of Parking as highlighted in the timetable for Phases 3, 4 and 5 illustrated in Appendix 3, and seek a further update on how processes can be improved to ensure swifter and more responsive consultation with Community Councils and the public, and swifter implementation of public wishes should parking pressures migrate to further areas following the implementation of parking controls adjacent to them.
- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion. Amendment 2 was adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the recommendations in the report and that it would be late 2025 before any measures are introduced to ease the parking pressures in the Lockhartons.
- 2) To note these pressures are a direct result of the introduction of the CPZ as agreed by the Committee
- 3) To recognise that the consultation would still need to take place
- 4) To therefore, request that Officers reflect on the written deputation from residents, and give greater priority to introducing PPA traffic restrictions in the Lockharton area.
- 5) To note that the report did not set out the context of a number of relevant wider council policies or strategies, such as the 2030 Climate Strategy or the City Mobility Plan, and in particular CMP objectives on parking including policy measure Movement 34 on parking controls, policy measure Movement 22 on tackling inconsiderate parking, or Policy measure Place 4 on liveable places; agreed that any future reports to committee on this subject, and any publicity around the parking review, would include this wider context where relevant, and would not solely mention parking pressure as the justification for extension of CPZ.
- 6) To note this update on the Strategic Review of Parking, including proposals for engagement with Community Councils and resident groups in Bonnington, Easter Road and Roseburn. To note that any further changes in these areas were likely to have a knock-on impact in adjacent areas and given the location of the Easter

Road area outlined in the report that a similar engagement programme would also take place when data is available in Lochend (West Leith) and Willowbrae North, noting the parking pressures in these areas are similar, with a view to determining local views.

- 7) To note with concern the slow progress in taking forward the Strategic Review of Parking as highlighted in the timetable for Phases 3, 4 and 5 illustrated in Appendix 3, and sought a further update on how processes can be improved to ensure swifter and more responsive consultation with Community Councils and the public, and swifter implementation of public wishes should parking pressures migrate to further areas following the implementation of parking controls adjacent to them.

(Reference – report by the Service Director - Operational Services, submitted.)

9. Low Emission Zone – Summer 2024 Update

The report provided an update on the Council's Low Emission Zone (LEZ) Local Exemption and Temporary Suspension Decision-making Framework and sought approval to update the Council's Local Exemption policy.

The report also outlined the LEZ Annual Report process and noted that officers were seeking further guidance from Transport Scotland on developing a consistent approach across all four LEZ cities.

Decision

- 1) To refer the report to Full Council on 29 August 2024

(Reference – report by the Service Director - Operational Services, submitted.)

Transparency Statement

Councillor Whyte made a transparency statement in relation to an amendment for the above item as The Chairman of Edinburgh Riding of the Marches.

10. Local Traffic Improvement – Delivery Programme

The report provided an update on the newly approved Local Traffic Improvement (LTI) programme, describing progress to date and recommending schemes to be developed in 2024 and prioritised for delivery into 2025

Motion

- 1) To note the update on the Local Traffic Improvement (LTI) Programme.
 - 2) To agree to consider projects which score 15 or above, based on agreed evaluation
 - 3) To approve the proposed LTI Programme of works for 2024/25 (see paragraph 4.8 in the Report by the Service Director of Operational Services).
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the update on the Local Traffic Improvement (LTI) Programme.
 - 2) To agree to consider projects which score 15 or above, based on agreed evaluation
 - 3) To approve the proposed LTI Programme of works for 2024/25 (see paragraph 4.8 in the Report by the Service Director of Operational Services).
 - 4) To note that residents in Parkgrove, particularly Parkgrove Drive, have been campaigning for safer streets for over a decade.
 - 5) To note that the Transport and Environment Committee passed a motion in April 2023 requesting a report in 3 cycles to outline measures which could be taken to 'make Parkgrove Drive safe for pedestrians and cyclists, especially school pupils', to reduce rat running and to improve the road and footway surface.
 - 6) To note it took over a year for that report to be presented to committee.
 - 7) To note that the report which was presented to Committee in May 2024 in response to the 2023 Parkgrove Drive Motion presented this LTI scheme as a means of funding these works and that it stated in no uncertain terms that 'officers will work with ward Councillors on the nature of the proposed project.
 - 8) To note that there was no communication with ward Councillors on the scope of the project as explicitly agreed.
 - 9) To express concern that the scoring of this project went ahead anyway despite no identified project scope.
 - 10) To agree that the process surrounding Parkgrove Drive represented a failure of the Council to respond to the decisions of ward Councillors and Committee members.
 - 11) To note that Committee decided in May 2024 'that this scheme, if ultimately not funded through the LTI Programme is considered for inclusion in the main road safety programme.
 - 12) To request that Officers bring a report to this Committee in 1 cycle outlining the scope of the proposed 'Parkgrove Drive' scheme following discussion with ward Councillors and representatives of Clermiston PS Parent Council. Further, the report should consider whether funding for this project should come from the main road safety programme or the £178,000 project contingency from the LTI Scheme as identified in this report.
- moved by Councillor Hyslop, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the update on the Local Traffic Improvement (LTI) Programme.
- 2) To agree to consider projects which score 15 or above, based on agreed evaluation
- 3) To approve the proposed LTI Programme of works for 2024/25 (see paragraph 4.8 in the Report by the Service Director of Operational Services).

- 4) To note assurances were given to committee at its meeting in May 2024, and to members individually that, in the case of the proposed scheme for Parkgrove Drive, there would be consultation and discussion with local ward members to develop proposals for the scheme.
- 5) To note that this was also a decision of the committee, reflected by the acceptance of the Liberal Democrat addendum on that item.
- 6) To note with disappointment that this engagement had not taken place and had concern about how a scheme can be considered for prioritisation for delivery, when no proposals have been discussed.
- 7) To therefore, request that officers from the Road Safety team meet with ward councillors regarding the Parkgrove Drive scheme to develop proposals for the scheme, and that take place before the committee's meeting in October so progress and the outcomes can be reported back to that meeting via the business bulletin.
- 8) To agree to adjust the proposal set out in Appendix 1, reference 20 on Craighleith Drive so it reads "Including Improved signage, traffic calming and pedestrian prioritisation measures"

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

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1 and 2 were adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the update on the Local Traffic Improvement (LTI) Programme.
- 2) To agree to consider projects which score 15 or above, based on agreed evaluation
- 3) To approve the proposed LTI Programme of works for 2024/25 (see paragraph 4.8 in the Report by the Service Director of Operational Services).
- 4) To note that residents in Parkgrove, particularly Parkgrove Drive, have been campaigning for safer streets for over a decade.
- 5) To note that the Transport and Environment Committee passed a motion in April 2023 requesting a report in 3 cycles to outline measures which could be taken to 'make Parkgrove Drive safe for pedestrians and cyclists, especially school pupils', to reduce rat running and to improve the road and footway surface.
- 6) To note it took over a year for that report to be presented to committee.
- 7) To note that the report which was presented to Committee in May 2024 in response to the 2023 Parkgrove Drive Motion presented this LTI scheme as a

means of funding these works and that it stated in no uncertain terms that ‘officers will work with ward Councillors on the nature of the proposed project.

- 8) To note that there was no communication with ward Councillors on the scope of the project as explicitly agreed.
- 9) To express concern that the scoring of this project went ahead anyway despite no identified project scope.
- 10) To agree that the process surrounding Parkgrove Drive represented a failure of the Council to respond to the decisions of ward Councillors and Committee members.
- 11) To note that Committee decided in May 2024 ‘that this scheme, if ultimately not funded through the LTI Programme is considered for inclusion in the main road safety programme.
- 12) To request that Officers bring a report to this Committee in 1 cycle outlining the scope of the proposed ‘Parkgrove Drive’ scheme following discussion with ward Councillors and representatives of Clermiston PS Parent Council. Further, the report should consider whether funding for this project should when compared to other demands come from the main road safety programme or the £178,000 project contingency from the LTI Scheme as identified in this report.
- 13) To note assurances were given to committee at its meeting in May 2024, and to members individually that, in the case of the proposed scheme for Parkgrove Drive, there would be consultation and discussion with local ward members to develop proposals for the scheme.
- 14) To note that this was also a decision of the committee, reflected by the acceptance of the Liberal Democrat addendum on that item.
- 15) To note with disappointment that this engagement had not taken place and had concern about how a scheme can be considered for prioritisation for delivery, when no proposals have been discussed.
- 16) To therefore, request that officers from the Road Safety team meet with ward councillors regarding the Parkgrove Drive scheme to develop proposals for the scheme, and that take place before the committee’s meeting in November so progress and the outcomes can be reported back to that meeting via the business bulletin.
- 17) To agree to adjust the proposal set out in Appendix 1, reference 20 on Craighleith Drive so it reads “Including Improved signage, traffic calming and pedestrian prioritisation measures”

(Reference – report by the Service Director - Operational Services, submitted.)

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Aston made a non-financial declaration of interest in relation the above item—his employer sponsored a project mentioned in the report. He left the room and took no part in the decision.

11. Trial of 7-7-7 Bus Lanes

The report responded to a request by Committee on 1 February 2024. It set out proposals for trialling bus lanes operating between 07.00 to 19.00, seven days a week (known as 7-7-7 Bus Lanes).

Motion

- 1) To note the proposals and the timeline for the trial
 - 2) To agree the principles set out in paragraphs 4.2.1 - 4.2.6 of the report by the Service Director of operational services.
 - 3) To approve the promotion of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow the trial to proceed.
 - 4) To note the disagreement amongst the written deputation submissions on point 1.1.4 of the recommendations in the report by the Service Director for Operational Services, and agree to hold a stakeholder workshop to see if agreement can be reached on including PHC drivers as part of any future 7-7-7 expansion.
 - 5) To note the financial section of this report.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the proposals and the timeline for the trial
- 2) To agree the principles set out in paragraphs 4.2.1 - 4.2.6 of the report by the Service Director of operational services.
- 3) To approve the promotion of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow the trial to proceed.
- 4) To acknowledge that there are concerns about introducing PHCs into bus lanes as part of the trial.
- 5) To agree not to proceed with the trial of PHCs in bus lanes at this time, until levels of compliance with mandatory training (including cycling awareness training) improve, as set out in the 21 June 2024 report to the Regulatory Committee titled 'Licensing Training: Taxi and Private Hire Drivers' which details that compliance was only sitting at 49%, with 69% of that figure being Private Hire Drivers.
- 6) To further agree that the level of compliance with mandatory training would be reported on in the six month review on the 7-7-7 ETRO with potential for a trial subsequent to that if significant progress has been made
- 7) To note the financial section of this report.
- 8) To note the considerable benefits of Bus Priority Measures such as 7-7-7 bus lanes to making Edinburgh's most used mode of public transport even more

efficient and therefore even more used than it is currently but acknowledge the scope for confusion in piloting along only a single bus route.

- 9) To welcome the intention for a publicity drive at 5.1.5 and the engagement with ward councillors as detailed at 5.1.1 and request that these commence from an early a stage in the process as is possible.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the proposals and the timeline for the trial
- 2) To agree the principles set out in paragraphs 4.2.1 - 4.2.6.
- 3) To approve the promotion of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow the trial to proceed
- 4) To note the report provided no background information, evidence or justification for changing the long-standing practice in Edinburgh of not allowing private hire vehicles to use bus lanes; therefore, to agree not to proceed with this aspect of the experimental order; and instead requests a substantive report setting out:
 - a) The history surrounding the current policy of not allowing private hire vehicles to use bus lanes.
 - b) The legal basis underpinning the current policy.
 - c) Comparisons in terms of current policy with respect to other major UK cities.
 - d) The possible benefits and risks associated with changing this policy and allowing private hire vehicles to use bus lanes.
 - e) Options to mitigate any risks during any experimental trial of a change in policy.

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

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the proposals and the timeline for the trial.
- 2) To agree the principles set out in paragraphs 4.2.1 - 4.2.6 subject to paragraph 4.2.6 on PHC access not being agreed, and further agree that, should there be any changes to hours of operation or other substantive changes to the proposals set out in the report during the trial, that these will be reported to group transport leads by means of a briefing, and reported to the next available committee via the business bulletin.
- 3) To approve the promotion of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow the trial to proceed.
- 4) To note the arguments put forward at paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the report for allowing access of PHC vehicles to the bus lanes in the experiment but consider that these would not be allowed access as part of this current trial.
- 5) To note the financial section of this report.

- 6) To agree that, in tandem with this trial, council officers would undertake all necessary processes to ensure that, should the trial be successful, that it can be made permanent and that 7-7-7 bus lanes can be rolled out across the city without delay, and therefore agree that a report would return to committee within one cycle before the end of the trial to allow committee to reach a decision on wider rollout and on making the trial permanent.
- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor O'Neill

Amendment 4

- 1) To note the content of the report.
 - 2) To note that the proposal for a trial is a political one and is not based on monitoring data or specific problems being identified that delay bus services.
 - 3) To note that the trial is estimated to cost £80k in revenue plus an additional, unspecified amount of capital funding at a time when the Council has in year overspends, requires to make considerable savings over the next few financial years and is struggling to fund core services like road and footway maintenance.
 - 4) To therefore agree that officers only take forward the proposal at paragraph 4.3.1 to "collect baseline data" and thereafter bring a report indicating whether a trial is necessary, what the parameters for success might be, and providing full costs of implementation to allow councillors to determine whether such a trial is necessary or would be of benefit when bus lane hours are currently harmonised across the city allowing them to be easily understood by the public..
- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as addenda to the motion. Amendment 2 and Amendment 3 were also accepted as addenda to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	–	9 votes
For Amendment 1	–	2 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted) – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Booth, Dobbin, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Hyslop, Lang and O'Neill
For Amendment 2 – Councillors Whyte and Munro)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Arthur:

- 1) To note the proposals and the timeline for the trial
- 2) To agree the principles set out in paragraphs 4.2.1 - 4.2.6 subject to paragraph 4.2.6 on PHC access not being agreed, and further agree that, should there be any changes to hours of operation or other substantive changes to the proposals set out in the report during the trial, that these will be reported to group transport

leads by means of a briefing, and reported to the next available committee via the business bulletin.

- 3) To approve the promotion of an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to allow the trial to proceed.
- 4) To note the disagreement amongst the written deputation submissions on point 1.1.4 of the recommendations in the report by the Service Director for Operational Services, and agree to hold a stakeholder workshop to see if agreement can be reached on including PHC drivers as part of any future 7-7-7 expansion
- 5) To note the financial section of this report.
- 6) To acknowledge that there are concerns about introducing PHCs into bus lanes as part of the trial.
- 7) To note the arguments put forward at paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the report for allowing access of PHC vehicles to the bus lanes in the experiment but consider that these would not be allowed access as part of this current trial
- 8) To agree not to proceed with the trial of PHCs in bus lanes at this time, noting levels of compliance with mandatory training (including cycling awareness training) improve, as set out in the 21 June 2024 report to the Regulatory Committee titled 'Licensing Training: Taxi and Private Hire Drivers' which details that compliance was only sitting at 49%, with 69% of that figure being Private Hire Drivers.
- 9) To further agree that the level of compliance with mandatory training would be reported on in the six month review on the 7-7-7 ETRO.
- 10) To note the considerable benefits of Bus Priority Measures such as 7-7-7 bus lanes to making Edinburgh's most used mode of public transport even more efficient and therefore even more used than it is currently but acknowledge the scope for confusion in piloting along only a single bus route.
- 11) To welcome the intention for a publicity drive at 5.1.5 and the engagement with ward councillors as detailed at 5.1.1 and request that these commence from an early a stage in the process as is possible.
- 12) To note the report provided no background information, evidence or justification for changing the long-standing practice in Edinburgh of not allowing private hire vehicles to use bus lanes; therefore, to agree not to proceed with this aspect of the experimental order; and instead requests a substantive report setting out:
 - a) The history surrounding the current policy of not allowing private hire vehicles to use bus lanes.
 - b) The legal basis underpinning the current policy.
 - c) Comparisons in terms of current policy with respect to other major UK cities.
 - d) The possible benefits and risks associated with changing this policy and allowing private hire vehicles to use bus lanes.

- e) Options to mitigate any risks during any experimental trial of a change in policy.
- 13) To agree that, in tandem with this trial, council officers would undertake all necessary processes to ensure that, should the trial be successful, that it can be made permanent and that 7-7-7 bus lanes can be rolled out across the city without delay, and therefore agrees that a report would return to committee within one cycle before the end of the trial to allow committee to reach a decision on wider rollout and on making the trial permanent.

(Reference – report by the Service Director - Operational Services, submitted.)

12. Implementing the Footway Parking Prohibition

The report provided an update on the ongoing enforcement and implementation of parking prohibitions introduced by the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019. The report also provided an update on the steps taken to resolve related problems in streets where parking problems persist.

Decision

- 1) To note the update provided in relation to footway parking enforcement.
- 2) To note the advice from Legal Services that enforcement of the new parking prohibitions applies to all roads and pavements in Edinburgh, including on privately maintained footways.
- 3) To note that mitigation measures have been proposed across the city to ensure the safe and efficient movement of all road users across the city whilst supporting the Council's agreed policy regarding the enforcement and implementation of the new parking prohibitions.
- 4) To note that a suite of appropriate mitigation measures to provide the safe and efficient movement of all road users across the city is being developed which supports agreed Council policies. Elected Members and relevant stakeholders will be engaged on these measures.
- 5) To note that a further report will be submitted before the end of this calendar year, as requested by Committee, with proposals for the Bangholm area and other similar areas.

(References –report by the Service Director of Operational Services submitted.)

13. Ellersly and Kinsella Roads

The report responded to a request by Committee on 23 May 2024 in response to a petition on Ellersly and Kinellan Roads. All matters described in the petition were included in established work programmes and will be considered and potentially delivered in line with future work programmes

Decision

- 1) To note the update on traffic speed surveys which were undertaken on Ellersly and Kinellan Roads in 2020 and 2021 and that measures are likely to be introduced to improve road safety in 2025/26.
- 2) To note the update on temporary footway widening and that this had been incorporated into the citywide review of the Local Traffic Improvement (LTI) Programme (which is being reported separately to Committee)
- 3) To note that a design is being developed for a proposed pedestrian crossing (uncontrolled feature) at the Ellersly Road and Murrayfield Road junction to determine whether it would be possible to incorporate this into the programmed road resurfacing in 2024

(References –report by the Service Director of Operational Services submitted.)

14. Appointments to the Boards of Lothian Buses and Edinburgh Trams

Approval was sought for the reappointment of three non-executive directors to the Board of Lothian Buses and the appointment of Susan Deacon as chair of the Board. Approval was also sought for the appointment of a non-executive director to the Board of Edinburgh Trams.

Decision

- 1) To consent to the appointment of Susan Deacon as the Chair of Lothian Buses for a period of two years.
- 2) To consent to the reappointment of Mark Yexley, Anthony Rose and Iain Reid as non-executive directors of Lothian Buses for a further period of 18 months.
- 3) To consent to the appointment of Colin Kerr as a non-executive director of Edinburgh Trams for a period of six months.
- 4) To note that a further report will be presented to Committee in September on the appointment of additional non-executive directors to the Board of Lothian Buses.

(References –report by the Service Director of Operational Services submitted.)

15. Motion by Councillor Ross – Road Resurfacing and Resident Co-ordination

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

Motion

- 1) To note the Councils' road surface treatment contractor had again encountered difficulties this year in completing jobs as specified because vehicles remained parked on the road.
- 2) To note this had resulted in a range of missed patches, varying from single vehicle shaped patches to long, multi vehicle stretches. These missed patches have sometimes remained untreated until the contractor returns the following year.

- 3) To note residents are notified in advance of the road surface works starting.
 - 4) To request a business bulletin update in three cycles on how this process can be improved with a view to reducing, or ideally eliminating, the occurrence of missed patches and including consideration of the types of notification that could be given and to whom, the length of time in advance that leaflets are delivered, and notices are posted in the street and the effectiveness of vehicle removals/relocations.
- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the Council's road surface treatment contractor had again encountered difficulties this year in completing jobs as specified because vehicles remained parked on the road.
 - 2) To note this had resulted in a range of missed patches, varying from single vehicle shaped patches to long, multi vehicle stretches. These missed patches have sometimes remained untreated until the contractor returns the following year.
 - 3) To note residents are notified in advance of the road surface works starting.
 - 4) To further note that similar issues had arisen in areas where there is diagonal parking, "end on parking", as vehicle removals and relocations are harder to do compared to with cars parked in parallel or on typical streets. This also creates issues for teams who need to unblock gulleys to maintain drainage and reduce environmental issues.
 - 5) To request a business bulletin update in three cycles on how this process can be improved with a view to reducing, or ideally eliminating, the occurrence of missed patches and drainage issues, and including consideration of including consideration of the types of notification that could be given and to whom, the length of time in advance that leaflets are delivered and notices are posted in the street and the effectiveness of vehicle removals/relocations.
- moved by Councillor O'Neill, Seconded by Councillor Booth

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, Amendment 1 was accepted as addenda to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Ross:

- 1) To note the Council's road surface treatment contractor had again encountered difficulties this year in completing jobs as specified because vehicles remained parked on the road.
- 2) To note this had resulted in a range of missed patches, varying from single vehicle shaped patches to long, multi vehicle stretches. These missed patches have sometimes remained untreated until the contractor returns the following year.
- 3) To note residents are notified in advance of the road surface works starting.
- 4) To further note that similar issues had arisen in areas where there is diagonal parking, "end on parking", as vehicle removals and relocations are harder to do compared to

with cars parked in parallel or on typical streets. This also creates issues for teams who need to unblock gulleys to maintain drainage and reduce environmental issues.

- 5) To request a business bulletin update in three cycles on how this process can be improved with a view to reducing, or ideally eliminating, the occurrence of missed patches and drainage issues, and including consideration of including consideration of the types of notification that could be given and to whom, the length of time in advance that leaflets are delivered and notices are posted in the street and the effectiveness of vehicle removals/relocations.

6. Motion by Councillor Lang – Delivering the Committee’s Decision on Cammo Road

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

Motion

- 1) To note the decision of the committee on 25 April 2024 with respect to Cammo Road, namely *“to consider the next steps at the May committee, if no guarantee can be provided that works [on the Craigs Road / Maybury Road junction] would commence in the next six months, the agreed ETRO closure trial on Cammo Road would be commenced immediately, with the evaluation report brought back to committee in due course.”*
- 2) To note that no guarantee had since been provided.
- 3) To therefore agree that officers would commence the agreed ETRO through-road closure of Cammo Road immediately.

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

17. Motion by Councillor Whyte – Mass Rapid Transit in Edinburgh

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

Motion

- 1) To note that some six months had passed since the Committee acknowledged that the further expansion of the Tram network in the city requires an initial unfunded £44m to develop the Outline and Full Business Cases and that Committee is yet to receive a formal update on approaches to the Scottish Government seeking funding for this work
- 2) To further note that the initial estimates of the funding required to complete a north-south tram link from Granton to the Bioquarter sit at £2 Billion, that this is likely to increase as the delivery timescale is expected at 10-20 years, and that no funds have been identified to achieve this.

- 3) To additionally note that it is Council policy to press ahead with a City Mobility Plan that relies on a Mass Rapid Transit system to replace current travel modes and that suggested implementation dates are relatively short.
 - 4) To therefore agree that a report would be provided to a future Committee meeting (within six months) setting out the possible options for moving ahead with a Bus Rapid Transit system for the north-south and other potential routes recognising that such a system could be replaced by Tram in the longer term and that evidence from the Belfast Glider system indicates that this could be achieved in a quarter to a third of the time of Tram implementation, at potentially one tenth of the cost and with similar short to medium term transport outcomes.
 - 5) To further agree that the report would provide short medium and long term cost benefit analysis of alternative systems, clarify likely costs and delivery timescales within an Edinburgh context, set out the relative flexibility of each system and provide outlines of possible funding methods available to the Council.
- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Munro

Amendment 1

- 1) To note that some six months had passed since the Committee acknowledged that the further expansion of the Tram network in the city requires an initial unfunded £44m to develop the Outline and Full Business Cases and that Committee is yet to receive a formal update on approaches to the Scottish Government seeking funding for this work.
 - 2) To note that STPR2 recommendation 12 supports "Edinburgh and South East Scotland Mass Transit", and the Council are working with Transport Scotland and regional partners to progress this. Specifically, the aim is to "enhance the cross-boundary public transport system for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland region", potentially using "tram and bus-based transit modes including bus rapid transit (BRT) and bus priority measures". The aim is to complement the city region's current bus, tram and heavy rail networks, to "provide improved connectivity between Edinburgh and the surrounding communities in the region", as well as also considering direct connections between communities outside Edinburgh. An update on BRT would be included as part of the forthcoming report on the North South Tram.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the need for a mass rapid transit system across the city, acknowledging that Edinburgh's population is growing six times faster than that of Scotland's as a whole.

- 2) To additionally note, as acknowledged in the Public Transport Action Plan (PTAP), that a mixture of modes would be required in different areas of the city, and this is dependent on the character and density of those areas.
 - 3) To note that the PTAP envisages that the mixture would be composed of bus rapid transit (BRT), conventional bus, and light rail/tram.
 - 4) While acknowledging that BRT has value, note that its capacity is lower than that of light rail/tram and that therefore service capacity/frequency of service would be important factors in transit mode choices for higher demand routes, such as Granton to BioQuarter/Royal Infirmary.
 - 5) To note however that there had not been an analysis of BRT provided to councillors in this term and therefore agree that a report would be provided to a future Committee meeting (within six months) setting out the respective strengths and advantages of light rail/tram and BRT, noting the technology advances of the new generation of BRT.
 - 6) To further agree that the report would provide short medium- and long-term cost benefit analysis of alternative systems, clarify likely costs and delivery timescales within an Edinburgh context, set out the relative flexibility of each system and provide outlines of possible funding methods available to the Council, and that this report would include engagement with and input from Lothian Buses and Edinburgh Trams, as likely potential BRT operators.
- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 3

- 1) To note that some six months had passed since the Committee acknowledged that the further expansion of the Tram network in the city requires an initial unfunded £44m to develop the Outline and Full Business Cases and that Committee is yet to receive a formal update on approaches to the Scottish Government seeking funding for this work
- 2) To further note that the initial estimates of the funding required to complete a north-south tram link from Granton to the Bioquarter sit at £2 Billion, that this is likely to increase as the delivery timescale is expected at 10-20 years, and that no funds have been identified to achieve this.
- 3) To additionally note that it is Council policy to press ahead with a City Mobility Plan that relies on a Mass Rapid Transit system to replace current travel modes and that suggested implementation dates are relatively short.
- 4) To note that the current proposals for a tram extension route north of the city centre includes a controversial section along the Telford/Roseburn path, which would compromise an important nature and active travel route, and that the alternative route could involve installing tram infrastructure across the Dean Bridge
- 5) To therefore agree that a report would be provided to a future Committee meeting (within six months) setting out the possible options for moving ahead with a Bus Rapid Transit system for the north-south and other potential routes recognising

that such a system could be replaced by Tram in the longer term and that evidence from the Belfast Glider system indicates that this could be achieved in a quarter to a third of the time of Tram implementation, at potentially one tenth of the cost and with similar short to medium term transport outcomes.

- 6) To further agree that the report would provide short medium and long term cost benefit analysis of alternative systems, clarify likely costs and delivery timescales within an Edinburgh context, set out the relative flexibility of each system and provide outlines of possible funding methods available to the Council.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Munro

Amendment 4

- 1) To note that some six months had passed since the Committee acknowledged that the further expansion of the Tram network in the city requires an initial unfunded £44m to develop the Outline and Full Business Cases and that Committee is yet to receive a formal update on approaches to the Scottish Government seeking funding for this work
- 2) To further note that the initial estimates of the funding required to complete a north-south tram link from Granton to the Bioquarter sit at £2 Billion, that this is likely to increase as the delivery timescale is expected at 10-20 years, and that no funds have been identified to achieve this.
- 3) To additionally note that it is Council policy to press ahead with a City Mobility Plan that relies on a Mass Rapid Transit system to replace current travel modes and facilitate the much needed modal shift away from private car use and that suggested implementation dates are relatively short.
- 4) To highlight the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy's (ITDP) definition of bus rapid transit (BRT) – a system that sits under the MRT umbrella – which is 'a public transportation system that uses buses to provide fast, reliable, high quality, safe and cost-effective services.
- 5) To emphasise the similarities of BRT and Tram in that they offer a high quality user experience, regular and short journey times, pre-paid or off-board ticketing options, signal prioritisation, use of cleaner energy, segregated or dedicated routes.
- 6) To further emphasise the extra positive aspects of BRT in that they can run on standard tarmac roads, can be steerable, robust, flexible and adaptable for future needs or Tram plans.
- 7) To understand that MRT has been looked at previously, under modal choice analysis and further work would be required for modelling and consultation on these specific routes.
- 8) To further understand the discussion needed on the phased approach of introducing interim transit measures between now and completion of the Granton to Bioquarter tramline.

- 9) To therefore agree that a report would be provided to a future Committee meeting (within six months) setting out the possible options for moving ahead with a Bus Rapid Transit system for the north-south and other potential routes recognising that such a system could be replaced by Tram in the longer term and that evidence from the Belfast Glider system indicates that this could be achieved in a quarter to a third of the time of Tram implementation, at potentially one tenth of the cost and with similar short to medium term transport outcomes.
 - 10) To further agree that the report would provide short medium and long term cost benefit analysis of alternative systems, including existing or projected capacity of Lothian buses in the area, clarify likely costs and delivery timescales within an Edinburgh context, set out the relative flexibility of each system and provide outlines of possible funding methods available to the Council.
 - 11) To request officers approach relevant colleagues in East, West & Midlothian Council regarding regional capacity issues, interest in MRT and BRT, and other relevant areas of concern – to be reported in a future Business Bulletin.
- moved by Councillor O'Neill, seconded by Councillor Booth

In accordance with Standing Order 22.13, amendment 3 and 4 were accepted as addenda to the motion. Amendments 2 and 4 were accepted as addenda 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 Dijkstra-Downie, Lang, Munro and Whyte
For Amendment 1 as adjusted – Councillors Arthur, Aston, Booth, Dobbin, Faccenda, Hyslop and O'Neill)

Decision

To agree amendment 1 of the motion as adjusted by Councillor Arthur

- 1) To note that some six months had passed since the Committee acknowledged that the further expansion of the Tram network in the city requires an initial unfunded £44m to develop the Outline and Full Business Cases and that Committee is yet to receive a formal update on approaches to the Scottish Government seeking funding for this work.
- 2) To note that STPR2 recommendation 12 supports "Edinburgh and South East Scotland Mass Transit", and the Council are working with Transport Scotland and regional partners to progress this. Specifically, the aim is to "enhance the cross-boundary public transport system for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland region", potentially using "tram and bus-based transit modes including bus rapid transit (BRT) and bus priority measures". The aim is to complement the city region's current bus, tram and heavy rail networks, to "provide improved connectivity between Edinburgh and the surrounding communities in the region", as well as also considering direct connections between communities outside

Edinburgh. An update on BRT would be included as part of the forthcoming report on the North South Tram.

- 3) To note the need for a mass rapid transit system across the city, acknowledging that Edinburgh's population is growing six times faster than that of Scotland's as a whole.
- 4) To additionally note, as acknowledged in the Public Transport Action Plan (PTAP), that a mixture of modes would be required in different areas of the city, and this is dependent on the character and density of those areas.
- 5) To note that the PTAP envisages that the mixture would be composed of bus rapid transit (BRT), conventional bus, and light rail/tram.
- 6) While acknowledging that BRT has value, note that its capacity is lower than that of light rail/tram and that therefore service capacity/frequency of service would be important factors in transit mode choices for higher demand routes, such as Granton to BioQuarter/Royal Infirmary.
- 7) To note however that there had not been an analysis of BRT provided to councillors in this term and therefore agree that a report would be provided to a future Committee meeting setting out the respective strengths and advantages of light rail/tram and BRT, noting the technology advances of the new generation of BRT.
- 8) To further agree that the report would provide short medium- and long-term indicative cost benefit analysis of alternative systems, clarify likely costs and delivery timescales within an Edinburgh context, set out the relative flexibility of each system and provide outlines of possible funding methods available to the Council, and that this report would include engagement with and input from Lothian Buses and Edinburgh Trams, as likely potential BRT operators.
- 9) To highlight the Institute for Transportation and Development Policy's (ITDP) definition of bus rapid transit (BRT) – a system that sits under the MRT umbrella – which is 'a public transportation system that uses buses to provide fast, reliable, high quality, safe and cost-effective services.
- 10) To emphasise the similarities of BRT and Tram in that they offer a high quality user experience, regular and short journey times, pre-paid or off-board ticketing options, signal prioritisation, use of cleaner energy, segregated or dedicated routes.
- 11) To further emphasise the extra positive aspects of BRT in that they can run on standard tarmac roads, can be steerable, robust, flexible and adaptable for future needs or Tram plans.
- 12) To understand that MRT has been looked at previously, under modal choice analysis and further work would be required for modelling and consultation on these specific routes.

- 13) To further understand the discussion needed on the phased approach of introducing interim transit measures between now and completion of the Granton to Bioquarter tramline.
- 14) To request officers approach relevant colleagues in East, West & Midlothian Council regarding regional capacity issues, interest in MRT and BRT, and other relevant areas of concern – to be reported in a future Business Bulletin or report.

18. Emergency Motion – Tram Workers Industrial Action

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

Motion

- 1) To note the decision of Unite's Edinburgh Trams members to support strike action over welfare issues stemming from trams running late, and the impact that this strike action would have both on workers and passengers.
- 2) To note with concern that the welfare issues include workers not being able to take toilet breaks and missing out on hydration and that these factors were causing health problems.
- 3) To note that a recent press story reported that there was a shortfall of ten to fifteen minutes in the roundtrip average tram running time between the Airport and Newhaven and that Unite believe that some trams are running up to 30 minutes late.
- 4) To further note with concern that the recent press report suggested that, contributing to the delays, there "appeared to be a deliberate move to remove tram priority [at signalised junctions] where it previously existed, imposing yet more delays on the tram schedule and increasing stress for tram crews and passengers alike."
- 5) To note that the press report suggests that the decision to deprioritise trams at signalised junctions had allegedly been taken unilaterally by council officers, and that the effect had been to disadvantage trams to the benefit of cars, which is contrary to the transport modal hierarchy which places public transport above general traffic.
- 6) To urgently request a briefing note to the September Committee outlining the Council's account of the position with regard to the alleged changes to signal prioritisation that have instigated this industrial action and engagement with Edinburgh Trams in relation to this matter, and detail steps that could be taken to address tram workers' grievances.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Decision

To approve the adjusted motion by Councillor Aston

19. Edinburgh Bus Station Options Appraisal Update

The Committee, in terms of Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, excluded the public from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business for the reason that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

Decision

As detailed in the Confidential Schedule, signed by the Convener, with reference to this minute.

(Reference – report by the Service Director of Operational Services submitted.)