

# CEC AT FORUM 29.11.17 Report from Dave

I have already emailed the agenda and papers to PG (spokes planning group).

-----  
The meeting was a lot smaller than it had been, 15ish people(??), but 10 month gap since last meeting. In particular, none of the 'public' representatives turned up, only group representatives (which I thought worked better as we concentrated more on policy rather than local issues, and as most people present were reasonably up to speed with basic council objectives etc).  
-----

LM = Cllr Lesley Macinnes

## Matters arising

- **Promised reports on one-way streets, parking in cycle lanes and cycle improvements on main roads** – there'd been no further action, as the big projects are considered higher priorities. Some of the reports are largely complete, but these 3 issues will now feed into the 2018 ATAP review. I questioned whether action could not be taken on some of the most important one-ways, but they repeated the above.
- **Bike ban on trams in festival** – I raised this, as Cllr Hinds had promised to get it changed to being at guard discretion, following successful trial of that in 2016. I checked before the meeting and found the rules unchanged. LM will follow up with Ed trams.
- **Capital projects listing** – printouts were provided. I have one spare which can put in office in Sandy's p'hole at weekend or pass to Martin next week at Resources. Think it is the one we had already been sent, but it is printed on A3 so is readable. However they also said it will be on the council website in the near future, where they intend to keep it updated.

## Structure/role of AT forum

We discussed this in groups. Officers & LM will now work on a proposal. The points I made in my group (which LM seemed to view sympathetically) were...

- The Cycle Forum in pre-2012 council had allowed us to hold the council to account, with 4-5 mtgs a year, all members reasonably knowledgeable, and continuing follow-up/monitoring of issues between meetings. The AT Forum in post-2012 council had been 3 a year, too big, with several 'public members' who were often concerned about their own areas rather than policy issues, and agendas comprising one or 2 big items on which officers wanted feedback rather than monitoring/ follow-up from previous mtg.
- In the new 2017 council both Spokes, LS and Lothian Buses now separately have regular (4 or 5 a year) meetings with senior AT officers, and this largely fulfils the monitoring/ follow-up function of the old cycle forum.
- I therefore suggested the AT forum should be 3 a year, should comprise solely representatives from organisations, and could continue to discuss say 2 major items each time (the agenda also to include any significant follow-ups and an AOB). Appropriate items could be referred up by the above officer/group meetings.
- Another group suggested that when meetings are notified members should be asked for any topics they wanted to be discussed at the meeting. (this was not discussed at my table, but my thought is: yes, but be careful not to overload the AT forum, which is primarily for main policy issues, with anything too specific that would be better dealt with at the above senior officer meetings).

**We are to submit 'major' ideas for future forum topics.** I suggest

- City centre transformation process
- Tram extension
- Any other 'major' suggestions???

## Dropped kerb prioritisation method

I have already emailed PG with the Council's paper on this. At the Forum we discussed the paper in groups – it was mainly a matter for pedestrian interests, though the need to include cycling dropped kerbs was also raised. Overall, the Council's proposals seemed generally acceptable to the meeting – see paper for details.

## West – East route, brief presentation by Callum Smith

- **Section 1, Roseburn-H't.** Now at detailed design and started TRO/RSO process
- **Section 2, H't-Charlotte Sq.** Detailed design 50% complete; Melville Cres consultn ongoing; Randolph Place consultation soon.
- **Old Coltbridge area, 'place' proposals** – has been huge and positive community involvement – CC, school, businesses. 3 design concepts developed which are to be consulted on locally shortly (detailed in recent CCWEL update document?).
- I asked if the above involvement had reduced the hostility to the main scheme. Answer was a very strong 'yes' – obviously businesses still likely to object to the Orders re loading/parking but they are less hostile to the project as a whole. Has been hugely valuable to have a dedicated Stakeholder Liaison Officer who has led all the above (and therefore the CL+ bids both included cash for similar for those projects)

## CL+ projects, brief presentation by Martin Lings

- Outline info now on council website. More info will be appearing soon.
- **Stakeholder Liaison officers will be important** (see above) – they didn't say if yet appointed
- I asked about **(1) staffing and (2) funding**, given that implementation work on all 3 is likely in the same year, 2019 – will council have adequate match-funding? LM said they are very aware of these issues and working with Sustrans to put plans into place.
- They also said the **Meadows-GeoSt** project may not have the bulk of its implementation starting till 2020 because, first it will need Orders (once a final option is decided) and second it will form part of the City Centre Transformation and design options must tie in with that.
- **West Edinburgh project** – Peter asked if this could include cycle provision on the A71. Answer – this can not be a priority as it would be costly and would benefit many fewer people than the main West Ed project target population.