

TEC 02.04.26 – Draft notes on the papers

Papers are here ..

<https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CIId=136&MIId=7659&Ver=4>

Note that the reports in section 8 are to be taken as agreed unless any councillor wishes that paper to be discussed. I've only included reports I thought were of interest, but do check the full list!

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

- **June 18**
 - TRO Sub-Committee update – improvements to TRO process
 - Cycle Hire Update
 - LEZ Impact
 - People and Place Grant Funding (Funding Dependent)
 - Transport and Local Access Forum Update
 - Trams from Granton to Bioquarter - Final Strategic Business Case and Consultation Report
 - High pedestrian-flow streets
- **Future unknown date**
 - Trams to Newhaven Final Report [was originally to be Jan 2025!]
 - Pocket Gardens
 - Update on Roseburn Street and Westfield Road
 - Update on Measures on Whitehouse Road
 - A8 Corridor Update
 - Draft Detailed Design Guidance for Future Tram Projects
 - Cycle Hire Scheme - Review and Next Steps
 - Findings of the Coastal Adaptation Plan
 - Bus journey times

5.2 Rolling Actions Log

- Massive list as always – 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.

- **p1 Zebras on side roads** - Scot Govt considering if this will be allowed
- **p2 Parking on tramline** – officers looking at timing on Leith Walk bays, and more side-road loading places
- **p2-3 Road works coordination** – A stakeholder forum to be set up. *Should we ask to be on it?* NB Access Panel is to be on it.
Note from Robbie: This would be a new 'infrastructure forum' to review traffic disruption from large public and private sector projects at an early stage. Stakeholders do not include us, LSEG or EBUG (despite EBUG submitting a deputation asking to be included). To me, this forum seems unnecessary when they already have a RAUCS meeting and a monthly Traffic management meeting. However, there is unavoidable disruption to the cycle network from large developments - e.g. Port Hamilton, Powderhall and presumably George St and Trams in the future. It could be good to have someone on it to flag up impacts on cycling, which are not always obvious.
- **p5 Accessibility Commission update** To develop recommendations for action by the council. NB Ken Talbot is our rep

7.1 Transport Capital Investment Programme 2026/27

- As far as I can see, there is no mention of the policy of 10% of the capital budget for cycling. This has been in every previous report. e.g. Para 3.8 in [last year's 25/26 equivalent report](#), which said *"In addition, a 10% capital budget commitment has been made to cycling improvements (this has already been "top-sliced" from the original budget). This is in line with the Council commitment to allocate a percentage of the transport budget to improve cycling facilities throughout Edinburgh"*
- 4.7 The **integration of AT into road maintenance** has been reworded – less definite than previously? – but probably better reflects the reality!
- 4.8-4.9 **Craigmillar Park** resurfacing & smaller works brought forward for Tour de France route
- 4.15-4.21 **Delivery** – use of road closures, diversions, etc
- 4.48-4.52 **Road Safety budget**. Many schemes, including many school schemes, are in appendix 6 – see below

- 4.54-4.57 **Local Transport Improvements** – list in appendix 7, below. Nearly all are buildouts – have all been checked for cyclist safety?
- 4.58-4.62 **Consultation** *"Consultation will take place on the 2026/27 capital renewal schemes that have been selected for investment with Living Streets, Spokes, Lothian Buses and Edinburgh World Heritage. It is proposed to continue this consultation throughout the year."* **They say something like this every year – but I don't recall it happening for some time??**
- **Appendices – these lists need checked carefully, ideally with a view to asking for an early consultation meeting on relevant schemes, given that they are for the current year**
 - **Appendix 2 Strengthening/resurfacing schemes 26/27** - includes several major roundabouts, e.g. Crewe Toll
 - **Appendix 6 Road Safety schemes 26/27** Major schemes include..
 - Kings Road jn £2m. Misprinted delivery date 2025 !
 - Davidsons Mains rbt £300k – install single stage zebra crossings
 - Also very long list of smaller schemes, many being school safety schemes
 - **Appendix 7 Local Traffic Improvements** Minor schemes. Nearly all are buildouts – have all been checked for cyclist safety?

7.4 Petition for Consideration: Repair and Improve Broomhouse Pavements

- Not directly relevant to cycling but interesting descriptions of footway problems which probably apply throughout the city, not just Broomhouse

7.5 Petition for Consideration: Safe pedestrian route constructed, including a zebra crossing between Treverlen Park and Figgate Park on Hamilton Drive

- Seeking a safe route to school, including a crossing of Hamilton Drive – no mention of cycling to school

8.1 Road Safety and Local Traffic Improvement Delivery Programme Update

- Report (appendix 1) on projects undertaken with Road Safety budget 25/26 (some of which continue in the 26/27 budget in 7.1 appendix 6 above)
- Ditto (appendix 2) for Local Traffic Improvements programme
- Update on progress towards meeting Council & Scot Gov road safety targets – figures sound quite positive

8.2 Communicating Road and Pavement Improvements

- Lots more council transport info, e.g. capital programme to go on their website
- Roadworks info is on a (Scottish) [national website](#), which is to be expanded at some point
- TRO presentation on the council website is to be improved, but “*unfortunately, it is not possible to provide information for all operational TROs at this time.*” Seems odd that it is not possible!

8.3 Improved signalised crossings (update)

- All 378 standalone ped crossings have been investigated, and ped crossing times reduced to 20seconds where not already there and where possible (93% of crossings)
- “*As part of any signal refurbishment Officers will continue to promote the upgrade of existing Pelican crossings to more contemporary Puffin or Toucan crossings.*”

9.1 Motion by Councillor Mowat - RSAs and TROs

- She is concerned that TRO subcttee does not see the Road Safety Audit for schemes, and so she asks for a report on a-e below. [This feels like it could result in more reasons for TRO sub to reject/delay TRO approvals!]

(a) What does “safe” mean in Road Traffic Legislation;

(b) Whether any RSA recommendations need to be implemented to render the TRO safe;

(c) Whether Roads legislation requires TROs to be implemented only when they are safe;

(d) Why RSAs aren’t routinely published as part of TRO papers;

(e) What process is in place to address RSA recommendations and how are these tracked and reported?

Note from Robbie: Councillor Mowat's motion to present Road Safety Audits to the TRO Subcommittee, at the urging of NTBCC, is a very bad idea. Councillors on the TRO Sub are already overwhelmed with information and would likely be very concerned by issues in the RSA, which often include unusual or inherent risks that it is not possible to fully design out. I fear councillors would see these issues and delay decisions over safety concerns. A road safety audit is a document for the designer, who must respond to the auditor. CEC, as roads authority, already provide oversight by accepting or refusing the response - it's not necessary for councillors to double check. *This is a complex issue that I think we should write to Cllr Jenkinson on.*

9.2 Motion by Cllr Booth - Implications of Standards Commission decision for Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route

Deputation in support?

Supporting Information

Committee notes:

1.1 The decision of the Standards Commission of 11 March 2026 in respect of complaints against Cllr Ross and Cllr Munro.

1.2 That the standards commission decision calls into question the decision of Transport and Environment Committee of 7 March 2024 to implement option 3 in the report to committee on the Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route.

1.3 Notes that the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) for the quiet route (ETRO/21/29D) expires on 15 June 2026 if not made permanent by a decision of the council or one of its committees.

1.4 Notes that a new ETRO to enact the March 2024 decision has been on hold pending the Standards Commission hearing, but that given the standards commission decision, proceeding with this may be procedurally unwise.

Proposed Action/Decision

Committee:

2.1 Agrees that the members of Transport and Environment Committee will be briefed by officers on the options available to the council in respect of the Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route, and in particular what options officers have already explored but ruled out within two weeks of this decision.

2.2. Agrees to consider whether an urgent TRO sub-committee should be convened before 15 June 2026 in order to regularise the situation.

2.3 Agrees that officers should take such measures as are necessary under delegated authority to ensure the existing modal filters and other measures that make up the Quiet Route are not removed until a procedurally correct re-run of the decision of 7 March 2024 is taken.