

TEC 26.6.25 – Notes on the papers

Papers are here ..

<https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=136&MId=7248&Ver=4>

Note that TRO final decisions now go to the new TRO subcommittee. A very unfortunate change, with a mostly different set of councillors on the TRO sub, thus most having no background on the decisions they are taking, other than the officer report. As shown by their Corstorphine Connections [ETRO decision to scrap the bus gate](#)] and to defer the East Edinburgh Travelling Safely ETRO.

Red Seems possibly particularly important

5.1 Work Programme - Expected dates of future Committee reports (selected Interesting ones below)

- **TEC meetings** will be on an 8-week cycle from now, instead of the current 6 weeks or so.
 - This appears also to mean that the planned August meeting has been scrapped. It is still on the TEC website but it is not included in this Work Programme
 - Also, to reduce the number of reports, various will be combined in future, examples below
- **September**
 - Mobility Plan, annual update – will be combined with report on active travel delays
 - CCWEL monitoring, final update
 - Transport Forum, update
 - Coordination of infrastructure works
 - Reducing car use
- **November**
 - Road Safety delivery plan, update – will combine with 20mph report
 - Use of visitor levy cash

5.2 Rolling Actions Log

- Massive list as always (69 pages) – not checked

6.1 Business Bulletin - info for councillors on various topics, usually with no decisions required

But deputations and councillor questions on these items are allowed. Unusually, almost zero of much relevance to us

- **p5-7 Implementation of new footway etc parking prohibitions.** Generally declining number of parking tickets [hopefully due to increased observance?]. Quite surprised/pleased to see that double parkers are also getting ticketed at a fairly high rate, even though all the publicity has been on the pavement parking rule.

7.2 George Street and First New Town Conclusion of RIBA Stage 4 and Next Steps

- **Four options presented, of which options 1 & 2 include physical measures to enforce the motor vehicles restrictions/ allowed vehicles. Options 3 & 4 rely on signage etc.**
- Option 1 is by far the most costly, £35m, e.g. high quality paving stones rather than asphalt for the central so-called 'cycle street.' [purely from cycling/CCWEL perspective, Option 2. £20m, seems as good as Option 1 ?]
- Note that this report covers the physical infrastructure to implement the 'Operational Plan' which was agreed by TEC last year, and the council is unlikely to re-visit at this TEC. What I think was the final paper about the operational plan, and our spokes TEC submission, are in para 2405 [here](#).

7.4 People and Place

- SEStran now receives govt cash for active travel promotion (not infrastructure) and passes much of this to its constituent councils, who bid for it. Their program is [here](#) (for 25/26 and beyond) and includes cash for Edinburgh and the 3 Lothians councils, with a statement (section 4.2) of how each council will use it
- One of Edinburgh's many uses of the cash (adaptive bikes for Thistle Foundation) apparently requires additional cash which has to be approved by TEC – which appears to be the reason why this paper has come to TEC
- Incidentally, the list of Edinburgh's uses of the money include *"Promotion of the use of the newly completed infrastructure, in particular the areas around the Canal-Roseburn-City Centre West East Link (CCWEL)-Leith Walk active travel corridor."* and also *"Promotion of active and sustainable travel to NHS sites."*

8.3 Delivery Cyclists - Response to various motions

- The report reckons the council can't do a great deal, due to the gig economy and the absence of relevant council or police powers. It does not request any TEC decisions, other than to note various points including the following...
- Contact made with "[The Workers Observatory](#)" an Edinburgh body fighting to better conditions, and they will be included in future active travel consultations
- A leaflet for delivery cyclists distributed as far as possible (appendix 1 [here](#))
- The [Sustrans report](#) has been discussed and makes the point that high quality bike facilities (e.g. adequate width for all bike types; joined-up network, etc) should reduce pavement cycling

9.2 Motion by Councillor Cuthbert - Traffic Impact Assessment for City Mobility Plan Road Closures and A720 Congestion

- The motion is concerned about City Bypass congestion, and asks officers to investigate the impact of city centre road closures on bypass congestion (including for events such as big concerts, but **also** pedestrianisation etc under the city mobility plan)
- Also expresses concern at delays to the Sheriffhall roundabout scheme (which is a Scot Govt project, not a council one). [NB I'm not sure of the council's position on Sheriffhall – I think it is ambiguous, whereas East and Midlothian councils are pushing hard for it].