ABERDEEN, 3 September 2024. Minute of Meeting of the NET ZERO, ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE. <u>Present</u>:- Councillor Yuill, <u>Convener</u>; Councillor Radley, <u>Vice-Convener</u>; and Councillors Allard (as substitute for Councillor Hutchison from article 12 onwards), Ali, Blake, Farquhar (as substitute for Councillor Massey from article 11 onwards), Henrickson, Hutchison (for articles 1 to 11), Massey (for articles 1 to 10), Nicoll and van Sweeden.

The agenda and reports associated with this minute can be located here.

Please note that if any changes are made to this minute at the point of approval, these will be outlined in the subsequent minute and this document will not be retrospectively altered.

DETERMINATION OF EXEMPT BUSINESS

1. The Convener proposed that the Committee consider item 11.1 (Operation of a Future Aberdeen eBike Hire Scheme) with the press and public excluded from the meeting.

The Committee resolved:-

in terms of Section 50A(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, to exclude the press and public from the meeting during consideration of the above item so as to avoid disclosure of information of the class described in paragraph 8 of Schedule 7(A) to the Act.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST AND TRANSPARENCY STATEMENTS

- **2.** The following declarations of interest and transparency statements were intimated:-
 - Councillor Blake declared an interest in item 9.2 (Local Environmental Action Fund) as she was a close friend of Alison Stuart, the director of NESCAN Hub, who also founded Aberdeen Climate Action, for which Councillor Blake was a volunteer. She therefore advised that she would leave the meeting at that point and would not participate in the discussion of the item.
 - The Convener made a transparency statement in respect of items 10.1 (Westhill to Aberdeen City Centre Active Travel Improvements), 10.2 (Bucksburn Roundabout to Parkhill Junction Multi-Modal Corridor Study Detailed Appraisal) and 10.4 (Draft Aberdeen Local Transport Strategy) due to his membership of Cycling UK and the AA, but advised that he did not consider this amounted to a declaration which would require him to withdraw from the meeting for those items.
 - Similarly, Councillor Ali also made a transparency statement in respect of the above items due to his membership of the RAC, but again, did not consider that this amounted to a declaration which would require him to withdraw from the meeting for those items.

DEPUTATION FOR ITEM 9.1 - AIR QUALITY PROGRESS REPORT - ELIZABETH LESLIE

3. The Committee received a deputation in relation to item 9.1 (Air Quality Progress Report) from Elizabeth Leslie, who was accompanied by Sheila Harper and Louise Leil.

Ms Leslie began by thanking the Committee for the opportunity to present concerning air pollution reduction measures implemented in Aberdeen. She advised that she recognised the report was for noting only, but hoped that the deputation would add value to the decision making process she understood would be before the November meeting.

She began by highlighting the significant improvement in Aberdeen's air quality as detailed in the report, noting that there was no exceedance of air quality objectives for nitrogen dioxide and particular matter across the city in 2023. She noted that it suggested that certain air quality management areas were being considered for revocation or amendment. In light of the improvements, she asked why stringent air pollution reduction measures such as the enforcement of the low emission zone (LEZ) were still being pursued.

She noted that the air quality objectives were largely already being met, and considered it counterintuitive to continue imposing such measures. She felt that public opinion should also be considered, with surveys conducted in Aberdeen in 2023 and 2024 which indicated overwhelming opposition to climate based travel restrictions in the city. Ms Leslie referred to a poll reported by Aberdeen Live in August 2023 which showed that 90% of respondents opposed the LEZ plans. Similarly, a survey published in the Press and Journal in January 2024 showed the majority were against the implementation of the LEZ in the city centre. Ms Leslie stated that requiring no studies and through simple visual observation, it was obvious that city centre store closures had increased since June 2024. Despite these findings, she noted that the report stated that a proper public consultation had been carried out. She highlighted what she stated were significant discrepancies between the survey results and the Council's claim of proper public consultation, and suggested that the consultation may not have accurately captured the views of Aberdeen's residents. She therefore asked the Council how it reconciled the enforcement of the measures with the clear lack of public support.

Ms Leslie stated that she would next like to address the Council's ongoing commitment to the Covenant of Mayors as referenced in the report. She noted that the Council had initially signed this voluntary agreement in 2008, aligning with the European Union's climate and energy targets, including the development of a sustainable energy action plan aimed at reducing CO2 emissions by 20% by 2020. Ms Leslie stated that it was important to recognise that this commitment was voluntary and part of a broader EU agenda, rather than a targeted response to Aberdeen's specific local environmental conditions. Despite this commitment dating back to 2008, Ms Leslie noted that the Council continued to align its policies with the Covenant of Mayors, as seen in the Powering Aberdeen initiative, Aberdeen's sustainable energy action plan. Ms Leslie felt that the ongoing alignment, particularly in the post-Brexit context where the UK was no

longer bound by EU regulations, raised questions. Ms Leslie suggested that the Council's policies should be more reflective of Aberdeen's specific needs, especially in a post-Brexit environment. She stated that the Council's continued commitment to the Covenant of Mayors was further demonstrated by its collaboration with various partners. As outlined in the Air Quality Annual Progress report, Ms Leslie said that initiatives such as low emission zones, the revised Local Transport Strategy and the regional active travel network review were developed in partnership with organisations such as Transport Scotland, SEPA and SUSTRANS. She stated that these collaborative efforts reflected the Council's adherence to the Covenant's principles of working with partners to achieve sustainable climate energy targets. However, Ms Leslie felt that by aligning its policies and actions with EU-derived guidance often shaped by unelected bodies, the Council was enforcing measures that might be unnecessary or even counter-productive for Aberdeen.

She highlighted that the report's statistics clearly showed that there was no current air quality issue in the city, and the ongoing adherence to EU-influenced policies raised critical questions about whether such measures were being driven by outdated commitments to broader EU agendas, and by extension, the unelected United Nations and its sustainable development goals, rather than a focused approach tailored to Aberdeen's unique socio-environmental context. She asked the Council, should its policies not now reflect more closely the specific needs of Aberdeen, rather than being guided by directives that may no longer be relevant to the local area, or perhaps which never were relevant.

She highlighted the joint statement from Councillors Nicoll and Yuill, "The climate emergency that we face is not in dispute", as outlined in the Working in Partnership Policy Statement, appeared to be in conflict with the findings of the Council's 2024 Air Quality Annual Progress report. She noted that the report showed that there were minimal current air qualities in Aberdeen, with pollutant levels well below harmful thresholds. Ms Leslie stated that declaring an emergency in this context suggested a level of environmental threat that was not substantiated by the report data.

Ms Leslie felt this raised significant concerns about whether the Council was pursuing policies based on actual local evidence or if it was influenced by external narratives that might not align with Aberdeen's specific needs. She asked should the Council's actions and policies not be informed by the concrete findings in the report, rather than declarations that did not accurately reflect the current reality. She asked, were people to assume that Aberdeen City Council had already, or planned to declare, a climate emergency? She felt it was essential to clarify the origins and motivation of the low emission zone in Aberdeen. She referred to a letter dated April 2024 from Liam Kerr, MSP, which refuted the Council's claim that the LEZ enforcement was a compulsory directive from the Scottish Government. She said that Mr Kerr made it clear that the decision to introduce the LEZ in Aberdeen was a voluntary initiative by the Council, and not a mandate from the Scottish Parliament. Ms Leslie said this added to concerns about the underlying reasons for implementing these measures.

3 September 2024

Finally, Ms Leslie stated that she wished to address the resource implications of the initiatives. She referred to the Covenant of Mayors report which highlighted that developing and implementing a sustainable energy action plan required significant resourcing and strategic leadership. Ms Leslie said that in the current economic climate with widespread opposition to these measures, was the continued allocation of these resources to these initiatives truly in the best interests of the use of Aberdeen's funds. In conclusion, she requested that the Council consider taking the following actions:- (a) reassess the need for continued enforcement of the LEZ and other related measures which could include city-wide plans to limit vehicular speed to 20mph; (b) in the light of the recent air quality improvements, re-evaluate the commitment to the Covenant of Mayors, particularly in the context of the UK's departure from the EU; and consider whether it aligned with Aberdeen's current needs; (c) explore alternative strategies that could maintain or further improve air quality, without imposing unnecessary public restrictions, costs or business closures; and (d) provide a clear explanation to the residents of Aberdeen regarding the rationale behind these measures, especially given the improved air quality statistics and the public's opposition. She closed by referring to the Council's document 'Empowering Communities' where it stated that the Council believed that individual communities, and not the Council, were best placed to decide their own priorities.

Members asked a number of questions of the deputation.

The Committee resolved:-

to thank Ms Leslie for her deputation.

DEPUTATION FOR ITEM 10.1 - WESTHILL TO ABERDEEN CITY CENTRE ACTIVE TRAVEL - LINDA WALKER

4. The Committee then received a deputation from Linda Walker, Alex Mitchell and Ken Vettese in relation to item 10.1 (Westhill to Aberdeen City Centre Active Travel).

Mr Vettese advised that he lived in Albert Terrace. He stated that the idea of introducing a cycle way from Westhill to the city centre had no doubt been proposed with the most noble of intentions, but the reality was that this plan would not improve the wellbeing of the city and would in all probability achieve the opposite. He advised that the impact on Queens Road, Carden Place and Skene Street would be significant, and far from making lives better, would make the lives of the residents thoroughly miserable, with increased pollution and a major increase in noise. He added that noise pollution in particular would be a significant issue as the residences were B-listed and currently single glazed. If double-glazing was to be permitted, it would be heritage and extremely expensive in order to retain the appearance of the properties. He stated that one would assume a grant from the Council would be appropriate, but unlikely in these days of financial constraints. He explained that the proposed route also passed by a number of primary and secondary schools, which should raise safety concerns, not necessarily from cars but also from bicycles, electric bicycles and scooters which could be very dangerous at

high speed, particularly as they were silent. He added that the removal of a very large number of parking places on residential streets would inevitably create issues on any side street where spaces could be found. It was also unclear how this would allow delivery vehicles and general trades vehicles to access residences without blocking the proposed cycle lanes. If scaffolding were required, this could take a significant amount of time. Mr Vettese added that the hospitality industry was only just recovering from the pandemic, and he asked how the Council proposed to support the hotels on Queens Road with their limited parking for large functions and the requirement for numerous taxis at the end of the evening.

The Committee then heard from Mrs Walker, who was a resident of Carden Place. Mrs Walker advised that she could only speak from her observations as a resident of Carden Place, having lived there for a number of years. She referred to page 161 of the committee report, where she noted it said that there was currently no identified budget to proceed beyond outline business case stage, therefore any progress beyond that stage would be dependent on the sourcing of continued external funding. She added that the Stantec report, based on public consultation, stated that only 28% of those asked thought that wheeling and cycling connectivity and infrastructure needed improvement, against 67% who stated that it did not. 64% of those asked did not think that the route should be progressed. 79% of those who took part did not think that they would change the way they travelled if the wheeling and cycling between Westhill and Aberdeen city centre were improved. She added that the report highlighted that respondents had concerns about the economic impact it would have on local businesses and the city centre. There were concerns about parking issues which would create significant inconvenience, such as accessing eateries, banks and the two local churches on Carden Place where funeral parking would be an issue. Mrs Walker asked if any traffic modelling had been done. and if so, where was it available for members of the public to see. She added that they had observed that very few cyclists travelled in and out of the city, and therefore why were double cycling lanes needed on Albyn Place and two single lanes on Carden Place. She noted that the loss of parking on Carden Place to residents and local businesses would have a significant impact. Mrs Walker stated that if the proposals went ahead, parking zones would have to be reviewed as Carden Place residents would be disadvantaged by the loss of parking.

The proposals would have a significant impact on the B and C listed buildings which required ongoing maintenance and repair, as there would be no on-street parking available for contractors. She added that there would be no on-street parking for carers, delivery drivers, Royal Mail, visitors and families visiting the residents on Carden Place from outwith the area who could not easily access public transport, which was also very unreliable. Mrs Walker explained that removal of parking on Carden Place would have a big impact on street parking in neighbouring residential streets. She noted that the regeneration of Aberdeen city centre relied on people coming into the city to shop, eat, visit places of entertainment and conduct business. The loss of parking in the area would deter the free movement of people coming into the city. She asked where all the secure parking spaces for cycles were located in the city centre, and if an increase in cyclists would bring prosperity to the local economy in comparison with the revenue raised from

motorists who chose to park in the city centre and did not choose cycles or public transport. Mrs Walker asked if the effect of the increase in noise and pollution on the

hundreds of school pupils who walk to and from the two schools in the vicinity had been considered. The road safety concerns for cyclists and pupils because of the significant amount of extra traffic being diverted onto Carden Place was of great concern. She added it was clear from their observations that running groups, walkers, children from schools, nurseries and families regularly walked and ran on Carden Place, and stated that rather than progress the proposal, it would be far better to improve the pavements and street lighting to encourage people to walk in and out of the city centre, with zero impact on the environment. She noted that if the proposal went ahead, it would cause a significant increase in noise, smells, fumes and other pollution in Carden Place, where most of the properties were residential. On the south side of Carden Place, she advised that the front walls of properties were only five metres from the carriageway. It would detrimentally affect access to the dental and medical practice and local businesses in the area. The extra congestion in the area would cause a big increase in rat-running on other roads and side streets, mainly on King's Gate, Rosemount Place, Cromwell Road, Union Grove or Great Western Road, to avoid the undoubted congestion on Albyn Place and Carden Place. She concluded by stating that the back lanes would also become dangerous and rat-run.

The Committee then heard from Mr Mitchell, who advised that he was a very keen cyclist and although he did not know how many other cyclists there were in the room apart from the Convener, he explained about the journey he had experienced on his way to the meeting. He had left the Bridge of Don and advised that in the cycle lanes, which had been there for some time, he encountered twelve potholes. He explained that if people had ever been on a very narrow cycle lane, when a pothole was encountered, as a cyclist you felt extremely vulnerable when there was a thirty tonne lorry alongside, or a bus or even a car. He advised that his main concern was that while he thought it was a great idea to put in lots of cycle lanes, it was important to have cycle lanes that were wellmaintained. He noted that the other issue with the current cycle lanes was on the approach to junctions where there was a facility for cycles to jump in front of the traffic into a protective box. He stated that when driving around Aberdeen, it could be found that most of those boxes no longer had the cycle markings on them, and often a car could be found in them. He explained that he was very concerned that cycle lanes were put in place, but were not maintained, and that would put people off cycling. He also suggested that if a person was to breach the low emission zone, and was fined, they could be given a voucher towards buying a bicycle. If they continued to be fined and collected enough vouchers, they would have a bicycle and would no longer require to take their car into town.

Members asked a number of questions of the deputation.

At this juncture, the Committee agreed to suspend Standing Order 14.14 to enable all questions to be asked once the allotted ten minutes for questions had passed.

3 September 2024

The Committee resolved:-

to thank Mrs Walker, Mr Vettese and Mr Mitchell for their deputation.

MINUTE OF PREVIOUS MEETING OF 11 JUNE 2024

5. The Committee had before it the minute of its previous meeting of 11 June 2024 for approval.

The Committee resolved:-

to approve the minute as a correct record.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS PLANNER

6. The Committee had before it the business planner as prepared by the Interim Chief Officer – Governance.

The Committee resolved:-

- in relation to item 43 (Bus Lane Enforcement Programme), to note that officers had advised that it was expected that a report would be presented to Committee within the next two cycles;
- to note that the Clerk would liaise with the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning and his team to allocate reports in the 'reporting date to be confirmed' section of the planner to future meeting dates;
- (iii) to note that officers would circulate an update to Members outwith the Committee in relation to the Northern Roads Collaboration Joint Committee; and
- (iv) to otherwise note the planner.

NET ZERO, ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT PERFORMANCE REPORT - CORS/24/228

7. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director Corporate Services which presented the status of appropriate key performance measures relating to the services falling within its remit.

The report recommended:-

that the Committee note the report and provide comments and observations on the performance information contained in the report Appendix A.

The Committee resolved:-

(i) to note that officers would liaise with Councillor van Sweeden outwith the meeting in relation to the scheme in Kirkcaldy which had recycling competitions between blocks of flats:

3 September 2024

- (ii) to note that officers could give further consideration to the siting of recycling facilities within the city centre, noting that this might not be possible due to limited space available; and
- (iii) to otherwise note the report.

AIR QUALITY PROGRESS - CORS/24/209

8. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director Corporate Services which presented an update on the annual air quality monitoring results for 2023.

The report recommended:-

that the Committee note the findings of the 2024 Air Quality Progress Report (APR) for Aberdeen City Council.

Members asked a number of questions of officers.

During questioning, there was mention of Aberdeen Health and Social Care Partnership, and the Convener therefore made a transparency statement due to his role as a member of NHS Grampian Board, but did not consider that this amounted to an interest which required him to leave the meeting.

The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to note that officers would report to the November meeting on the review of certain Air Quality Management Areas and would ensure this report was added to the business planner:
- (ii) to note that there would be a delay to the reporting of the Air Quality Action Plan due to the amended timelines with the Local Transport Strategy;
- (iii) to note that the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning would arrange for officers to circulate a service update to Members on the EV Infrastructure Joint Procurement Exercise timeline; and
- (iv) to note the findings of the 2024 Air Quality Progress Report (APR) for Aberdeen City Council.

In accordance with the declaration made under article 2, Councillor Blake withdrew from the meeting for this item and did not participate in the discussion or decision.

LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION FUND (LEAF) - CR&E/24/256

9. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director City Regeneration and Environment which provided on the Local Environmental Action Fund ('the Fund') Pilot and advised of the intention to continue this funding model on an annual basis.

3 September 2024

The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) note that the Council's Climate and Environment Policy Service had an existing £44,000 annual budget for supporting community environmental improvements, historically directed to communities through a partnership with the now defunct Aberdeen Greenspace Trust. To maximise the benefits of this funding in empowering communities to act on the city's climate and nature commitments, different funding models had been explored by the Service;
- (b) note the Local Environmental Action Fund Pilot summary (Section 3.15) which provided a summary of the project applications received for the recent Pilot with the registered charity NESCAN Hub Limited (North East Scotland Climate Action Network);
- (c) approve £44,000 being allocated towards this funding model with NESCAN Hub Limited for 2024/25, which would be met through the existing budgets, and to note that an additional one-off £14,000 underspend carried over from 2023/24 would give a £58,000 allocation in 2024/25;
- (d) delegate authority to the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to continue this funding model and agreement with NESCAN Hub Limited on a yearly basis, subject to the annual budget process, in consultation with the Chief Officer of Commercial and Procurement Services on the terms and conditions of the grant;
- (e) instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to explore options to expand the size and impact of the Fund, e.g. through integrating the Fund with aspects of the Housing Revenue Account and / or other funds, as appropriate. Any such expansion would follow all due internal governance processes; and
- (f) instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to include updates on the Fund and impacts thereof within the Council's existing Annual Climate and Nature Reports, presented to this Committee each autumn.

The Committee resolved:-

to approve the recommendations.

PROPERTY LEVEL FLOOD PROTECTION SCHEME UPTAKE AND CHANGES TO THE PROPERTY LEVEL PROTECTION GRANT SCHEME - CR&E/24/249

10. With reference to article 4 of the minute of its meeting of 7 March 2023, the Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director City Regeneration and Environment which presented the uptake of the Property Level Protection Scheme and sought approval to expand the current grant support in relation to increasing the percentage of costs and maximum amounts to be claimed.

The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

(a) note that as of 12 August 2024, the uptake of the grant since 1 March 2023 was as follows:

	Enquiries	Survey Grants applied for	Survey Grant Paid	Installation Grant applied for	Installation Grant Paid
Commercial	4	2	2	2	2
Amount Paid			£300		£5000
Residential	7	4	3	2	2
Amount Paid			£450		£2858

- (b) approve that the existing Property Level Protection Grant Scheme be changed to allow an increase in the percentage to be claimed back for the installation of Flood Protection schemes to property, from 50% to 75% with effect from the date of the Committee decision;
- (c) note that costs would be covered from the remaining amount of the original £500,000 budget, recorded in the General Fund Capital Programme and standing at £451,000:
- (d) authorise the Chief Officer Operations to make grants of (a) 75% of the cost of installing Property Level Protection up to a maximum of £7500 per commercial property over 200m2 ground floor area; (b) 75% of the cost of installing Property Level Protection up to a maximum of £3750 per commercial property less than 200m2 ground floor area; and (c) 75% of the cost of installing Property Level Protection up to a maximum of £3750 per domestic property to eligible property owners on receipt of proof of expenditure; and
- (e) instruct the Chief Officer Operations to monitor take up of the grant and to report back to the Committee in the form of a service update in Spring 2026 ahead of the Council Budget meeting.

The Committee resolved:-

- to note that officers would consider the suggestion from Members that there could be some contact made with insurance companies to expand the reach of the scheme; and
- (ii) to approve the recommendations.

WESTHILL TO ABERDEEN CITY CENTRE ACTIVE TRAVEL IMPROVEMENTS - CR&E/24/254

11. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director City Regeneration and Environment which provided an update on a preferred package of active travel improvements arising from the Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Study for the Westhill to Aberdeen City Centre corridor (elements within the Aberdeen City boundary only), and sought approval for the next steps.

3 September 2024

The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) note the outcomes of the Detailed Appraisal (Appendix 2) undertaken for the Westhill to Aberdeen City Centre Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Study;
- (b) agree that those measures, described in paragraph 3.11 of the report, relevant to the Aberdeen City area, form a preferred package of active travel improvements on the Westhill to Aberdeen City Centre corridor; and
- (c) instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to report an Outline Business Case for the elements of the preferred package within the city boundary to the Finance and Resources Committee at the earlier opportunity.

Members asked a number of questions of officers.

As part of the questioning, mention was made of NESTRANS, and the Convener and Councillors Hutchison and Radley made transparency statements at this juncture due to being members of NESTRANS. They did not consider however that this amounted to an interest which would require them to leave the meeting.

Councillor Cooke, in attendance at the meeting and participating in the questioning, also made a transparency statement as he was a member of the vestry of St Mary's Cathedral which was on Carden Place, one of the routes which was mentioned in the report. He did not consider that this amounted to an interest which would require him to leave the meeting.

The Committee was addressed by Councillor Greig, Councillor Mrs Stewart, Councillor Delaney and Councillor Cooke, raising concerns in relation to the recommendations on behalf of their constituents.

Prior to speaking, Councillor Greig made a transparency statement as he was an Elder at Fountainhall Church which was on Carden Place, one of the routes which was mentioned in the report. He did not consider that this amounted to an interest which would require him to leave the meeting.

The Committee was advised by the Clerk that a motion had been received from the Convener, an amendment from the Vice Convener, an amendment from Councillor Massey (who had now been substituted by Councillor Farquhar) and that Councillor Blake would be moving the recommendations in the report.

In terms of Standing Order 29.8, Councillor Massey's amendment was withdrawn at this juncture.

The Convener, seconded by Councillor Farquhar, moved:-

That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the outcomes of the Detailed Appraisal (Appendix 2) undertaken for the Westhill to Aberdeen City Centre Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Study; and
- (b) notes that there is no funding for this project and agrees to take no action.

The Vice Convener, seconded by Councillor Hutchison, moved as an amendment:-

That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the outcomes of the Detailed Appraisal (Appendix 2) undertaken for the Westhill to Aberdeen City Centre Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Study;
- (b) notes the preferred package of active travel improvement, as outlined in the report, however disagrees with the outcome of the options appraisal which uses the A9119 to link Kingswells to the City Centre;
- (c) recognises that the outcome of the Detailed Appraisal report outlines "Gradient issues heading westbound on the A944 are clearly unfavourable with cyclists, and cycle conditions on the A9119 appear preferable (as seen through the Strava data analysis); and As there is insufficient space at numerous locations along each corridor to accommodate both bus lanes and segregated cycle lanes (those which can meet current design best practice standards), these end-to-end options were developed on the basis that the infrastructure required for one mode may therefore need to be prioritised over the other.";
- (d) agrees that despite this, the Kingswells to City Centre via A944 is the most appropriate route for active travel provision and agrees that the route should only extend to ARI at this point;
- (e) notes that the Aberdeen Rapid Transit report, which uses the A944 as its preferred route, is due to be reported back by the end of the financial year 24/25;
- (f) instructs the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to incorporate the options for active travel provision into the Aberdeen Rapid Transit report to be reported back at the earliest opportunity; and
- (g) recognises that there is currently no funding identified for this project and instructs the Chief Officer – Strategic Place Planning to work with NESTRANS to identify potential external funding sources.

Councillor Blake, seconded by Councillor Ali, moved as a further amendment:-

That the Committee approve the recommendations contained in the report.

During the debate, there was mention of Gilcomstoun School and Councillor Hutchison made a transparency statement to advise that his daughter attended Gilcomstoun, however he did not consider this amounted to an interest which would require him to withdraw from the meeting.

There being a motion and two amendments, the Committee first divided between the two amendments.

On a division, there voted:- for the amendment by the Vice Convener (5) – the Vice Convener and Councillors Henrickson, Hutchison, Nicoll and van Sweeden; for the

3 September 2024

<u>amendment by Councillor Blake</u> (2) – Councillor Ali and Councillor Blake; <u>declined to vote</u> (2) – the Convener and Councillor Farquhar.

The Committee then divided between the motion and the amendment by the Vice Convener.

On a division, there voted:- <u>for the motion</u> (2) – the Convener and Councillor Farquhar; <u>for the amendment</u> (5) – the Vice Convener and Councillors Henrickson, Hutchison, Nicoll and van Sweeden; declined to vote (2) – Councillors Ali and Blake.

The Committee resolved:-

- to note that the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning would ask officers to circulate information to Members in relation to the active travel solution in place for Ashgrove Connects;
- (ii) to note that officers would provide Councillor Mrs Stewart with the analysis of the expected uptake by cyclists if the scheme were implemented;
- (iii) to note that Councillor Mrs Stewart had advised that she had received reports that the filter on the Mounthooly Roundabout onto King Street was often not working which caused problems for cyclists, and to note that the Chief Officer Operations would highlight this to the Roads Operation Manager;
- (iv) to note that the Chief Officer Operations would ask the Roads Operations Manager to provide information to Members outwith the meeting on (a) any data held in respect of vehicles, including buses, going through red lights; and (b) whether members of the public would be able to apply for disabled parking bays on the proposed route while this project was being progressed or whether that would not be possible;
- (v) to note that officers would continue to review and update the Integrated Impact Assessment throughout the project; and
- (vi) to adopt the amendment by the Vice Convener.

A947 BUCKSBURN ROUNDABOUT TO PARKHILL JUNCTION MULTI-MODAL CORRIDOR STUDY DETAILED APPRAISAL - CR&E/24/257

12. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director City Regeneration and Environment which provided an update on a preferred package of active travel improvements as part of the Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Study for the A947 Bucksburn Roundabout to Parkhill Junction corridor, and sought approval for the next steps.

The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

(a) note the outcomes of the Detailed Appraisal (Appendix 1) undertaken for the A947 Multi-Modal Transport Corridor Study;

3 September 2024

- (b) agree that the measures described in paragraph 3.7 of this report as relevant to the Aberdeen City area, formed a preferred package of active travel improvements on the A947 Bucksburn Roundabout to Parkhill Junction corridor; and
- (c) instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to report an Outline Business Case for the elements of the preferred package within the city boundary to the Finance and Resources Committee at the earliest opportunity.

The Committee resolved:-

- in relation to page 599 of the report and the section regarding Stoneywood Road, to note that while provision of more bus shelters there had not been an option which had been considered, that officers could consider this with partners in the Bus Partnership in future;
- (ii) similarly in relation to the section to Stoneywood Road, to note that officers would liaise with Councillor van Sweeden in respect of her comments on covered bus stops and cycle tracks in this area; and
- (iii) to approve the recommendations contained in the report, with an additional recommendation (d) recognising that there was currently no funding identified for this project beyond Outline Business Case stage, to instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to work with NESTRANS to identify potential funding sources.

ROADS WINTER SERVICE PLAN 2024-2025 - CR&E/24/250

13. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director City Regeneration and Environment which presented the Roads Winter Service Plan for the coming winter for approval and highlighted any significant changes.

The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) approve the Roads Winter Service Plan 2024/2025 (Appendix 1);
- delegate authority to the Chief Officer Operations, following consultation with the Chief Officer - Finance, to continue to deliver the Winter Maintenance Service; and
- (c) instruct the Chief Officer Operations to hold an induction meeting on a date to be arranged, for elected members on the winter service process.

During questioning of officers, there was mention of NHS Grampian, and the Convener therefore made a transparency statement due to being a member of NHS Grampian Board, however he did not consider that this amounted to an interest which would require him to withdraw from the meeting.

The Committee resolved:-

(i) to note that officers would circulate information to Members outwith the meeting on the number of cyclists using the Deeside Way;

3 September 2024

- (ii) to note that officers would prepare a statement for Members to use when responding to constituent enquiries on roads winter maintenance and gritting, to include information on resource allocation between gritting and filling of salt bins, and the issues caused by freeze thaw;
- (iii) to note that officers were liaising with NHS Grampian in relation to data held on slips and trips and their locations;
- (iv) to instruct officers to highlight any specific changes to the winter maintenance plan in future reports;
- (v) to note that two new cycle paths had been opened by Aberdeen City Council in 2024 South College Street and Craigshaw Drive and these had not been added to appendix G cycleways to be gritted in line with priority 2 footpaths; and
- (vi) to approve the report recommendations, with the addition of the two new cycle ways highlighted above.

DRAFT ABERDEEN LOCAL TRANSPORT STRATEGY CONSULTATION - CR&E/24/258

14. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director City Regeneration and Environment which presented the results from the consultation on the Draft Aberdeen Local Transport Strategy (LTS) and sought agreement to progress with the proposed next steps.

The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) note the results of the consultation on the Draft Aberdeen Local Transport Strategy (Appendix A) and the reasons for the changes to the proposed timescales for developing a final Local Transport Strategy outlined in paragraphs 3.10 and 3.12-3.12.5; and
- (b) instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to develop a refreshed Draft Aberdeen Local Transport Strategy, appendices and supporting documents and report these back to this Committee at the earliest opportunity to seek Committee approval for a further period of public consultation.

The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to approve the recommendations;
- (ii) to note the need for a broader representation of the residents of Aberdeen in the responses to the consultation and instructs the Chief Officer – Strategic Place Planning following consultation with Chief Officer – Data & Insights to report back to committee via a service update the measures in place to increase the response from underrepresented groups and to align more closely to the demographic profile of the city; and
- (iii) recognising that empowerment was one of the six enabling strategies of Net Zero Aberdeen, to instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning following consultation with the Chief Officer People and Citizen Services, to develop a marketing and engagement strategy and report this to the January 2025 meeting

3 September 2024

of the Committee with the objective of increasing understanding of the impact transport had on climate change and how transport solutions could contribute to making Aberdeen a great place, to live, work, study and visit.

In accordance with article 1 of this minute, the following item was considered with the press and public excluded.

OPERATION OF A FUTURE ABERDEEN EBIKE HIRE SCHEME - CR&E/24/255

15. The Committee had before it a report by the Executive Director City Regeneration and Environment which set out the options available to operate a future eBike hire scheme in Aberdeen.

The report recommended:-

that the Committee -

- (a) note the work undertaken by officers to investigate options around how a future eBike hire scheme for Aberdeen might operate; and
- (b) instruct the Chief Officer Strategic Place Planning to prepare a Business Case for a new eBike scheme based on the public/private partnership model and to report this Business Case to a subsequent meeting of the Finance and Resources Committee.

During the questioning on this item, the Convener sought Committee agreement to suspend Standing Order 40.2 to enable the rest of the business to be considered that day. The Committee agreed to suspend Standing Order 40.2.

The Committee resolved:-

- (i) to note that officers would circulate the financial information in respect of the previous operator to Members outwith the meeting;
- (ii) to note the suggestion that Scotrail could be approached in relation to partnering with the Council on the eBike scheme and that officers could discuss this with Scotrail contacts; and
- (iii) to approve the recommendations.
- COUNCILLOR IAN YUILL, Convener