

Section 4 Integrated Impact Assessment

Summary Report Template

Each of the numbered sections below must be completed

Interim report	X	Final report	
----------------	---	--------------	--

 (Tick as appropriate)

1. Title of proposal

Retention of Spaces for People measures to help meet longer-term Council objectives

2. What will change as a result of this proposal?

Spaces for People (SfP) measures were introduced utilising Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) legislation during 2020 and 2021 to help people to physically distance, travel safely and exercise during the COVID-19 pandemic. We have followed the notification and engagement process approved by Councillors in May 2020. An IIA was carried out in May 2020, and was then updated in October, and this IIA is an update to both of these.

In January, Transport and Environment Committee approved a citywide consultation and engagement exercise to begin the process of making decisions over the next course of action of whether to retain, remove or modify specific schemes. Supporting people to continue to be able to walk and cycle safely is an important policy objective in the context of the Council's long-term objectives outlined in the Local Transport Strategy; draft City Mobility Plan; Active Travel Action Plan 2016; and the Edinburgh City Centre Transformation (ECCT).

In summary, the following approach is recommended:

- Measures introduced under the existing Spaces for People programme under TTROs will be retained while public health advice continues to advocate maintaining physical distancing measures to manage of the impact of the virus and that ongoing liaison with Transport Scotland on the duration of measures will take place;
- For most of the schemes where retention is recommended, it is proposed to do so on an experimental basis for a limited time initially in order to monitor how the city's transport network is used, to ensure that there is protection for active travel modes and to monitor any impact on public transport.

Detailed recommendations:

Schools

Assessment of schools' measures indicates that certain closures and part-time vehicle prohibitions are worthy of retention. All school measures also had net support in for retention (with two exceptions where there was a balance of support for retention and removal).

In the case of street closures, it is recommended that those at Sciennes Primary School and James Gillespie's Primary are be advertised as closures (except cycles) under Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs). It is recommended that further consideration is given to a progressing a similar ETRO at St Catherine's Primary in consultation with the school and ward Councillors.

The current measures are generally in place around the school gates, rather than across a wider area surrounding individual schools. It is considered that, in many cases, it is likely that experimental measures should be more extensive and would require dedicated signage to indicate the restrictions in place. Therefore, officers would like to progress discussions with individual schools in term 1 of school year 2021/22 to establish the exact area which should be included in an experimental arrangement.

With the above in mind, it is proposed to re-prioritise School Travel Plan review and work with schools which have had part time vehicle prohibitions under SfP, with a view to developing measures tailored to the individual schools and have support from the school concerned and the parents. It is envisaged that the review process will be completed for the relevant schools by the end of 2021. The programme for implementation of measures will be included in the relevant School Travel Plans. Lessons learned from the implementation of measures under SfP will be taken into account as plans are developed for new schemes.

As part of discussions with schools, consideration will be given to necessary legal orders to either keep in place measures similar to those currently in place or revised in line with School Travel Plan proposals. Based on liaison with schools over the past year, it is considered likely that measures at most schools will be either retained or extended.

A number of waiting and loading restrictions have been introduced near schools under SfP, in most cases protecting crossing points etc that are considered fully justified on a permanent basis (this does not include lines introduced purely to protect temporary planters). It is proposed to bring forward full Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) (not ETROs) to make these waiting and loading restrictions permanent.

At some schools, localised footway widenings have been introduced in response to COVID-19. These have generally been specifically to facilitate physical distancing and may not be necessary when physical distancing restrictions ease. These will be retained until the public health guidance changes. In most cases it is proposed to remove these pending the review of School Travel Plans, however some may be retained. Examples include those on Craigs Road at Craigmount High School.

Four new temporary access paths have been laid at Kirkliston, Liberton, Gylemuir and St Mark's Roman Catholic Primary schools. It is proposed to replace these with permanent materials.

City centre

Street pedestrianisations introduced under SfP for Victoria Street and Cockburn Street are consistent with ECCT and are providing additional space for business trading. It is therefore proposed to keep these interventions in place on an experimental basis. ECCT also included pedestrian priority on Waverley Bridge. It is therefore proposed that this should be sustained on an experimental basis but that urgent work should take place with operators and other stakeholders to identify possible alternative locations for tour bus and airport services.

The pedestrian and cycle infrastructure on Forrest Road, George IV Bridge and the Mound has provided effective extra space for road users and the measures were supported for retention. However, there are ongoing issues with business servicing on George IV Bridge and the measures on George IV Bridge and Forrest Road are very different from the Council's permanent proposals for these streets as part of the Meadows to George Street active travel project. On this basis it is proposed to remove the SfP measures on George IV Bridge and Forrest Road when the public health guidance permits, whilst retaining the uphill segregated cycle lane on The Mound (with replacement infrastructure).

The temporary footway widening/ bus stop infrastructure at the east end of Princes Street is not considered suitable for the post-pandemic situation and should be removed.

Shopping streets

The assessment of the SfP measures concluded that, despite achieving some benefits for pedestrians, most of the temporary infrastructure should be removed. This is for the following principal reasons:

- There is limited ongoing benefit to the street environment, with the temporary infrastructure having a degree of negative impact;
- There are neutral or sometime negative impacts on public transport; and
- There have been some negative impacts on parking and servicing for both businesses and residents.

It is, however, proposed to give consideration to retaining some small lengths of footway widening, in particular where these provide extra pedestrian space in locations where the existing pavement does not provide adequate space for people to walk e.g. in Morningside, Portobello and Barony Street. It is also proposed to give consideration the materials used on Broughton Street roundabout to reflect the town centre location.

It is proposed to retain the measures introduced on Queensferry High Street under an ETRO. The one-way (except cycles) scheme has benefitted both pedestrians and cyclists, reduced traffic volumes, and had only small impacts on parking and servicing. The measures are also similar to those envisaged under a permanent project that is currently

being designed and therefore an ETRO will allow lessons to be learnt to inform a future scheme.

Protected cycle lanes

An assessment of the protected cycle lanes has been carried out, against the criteria agreed by the Transport and Environment Committee. This has identified a number where there are impacts on disabled street users. Most of these negative impacts are associated with parking restrictions and layout.

It is recommended that the protected cycle lanes are retained using ETROs. However, it is proposed to carefully review schemes during the development of the ETRO to minimise the impacts on disabled street users, in particular by seeking to achieve on street parking within a reasonable distance of properties that do not have such parking and do not have a driveway. This will be considered on a scheme by scheme basis.

It is proposed to retain the protected cycle lanes at Drum Brae North, Comiston Road and Lanark Road, noting in particular that the measures on Comiston Road and Lanark Road have reduced the effective road width and facilitated the introduction of a 30mph speed limit.

On Comiston Road it is also proposed to consider extending the existing bus lane southwards, in liaison with Lothian buses and other bus operators. This is to address the recently reported queuing on the approach to the Greenbank crossroads (there is a northbound bus lane which allows buses to bypass the congestion and therefore the impact on public transport northbound is minimal).

Two additional projects, originally envisaged for implementation under SfP but not implemented, are proposed to be taken forward integrated into the programme for retaining SfP measures, as follows:

- Portobello to Musselburgh link which was discussed at Transport and Environment Committee in April 2021; and
- An uphill segregated cycle lane on Orchard Brae, providing a safe connection between the A90 and Crewe Road South.

Connecting routes for walking and cycling for pleasure

Measures introduced under the Spaces for Exercise programme and now proposed for retention include:

- Closure of Cammo Walk to motor vehicles, forming a connection from East Craigs, via a crossing of Maybury Road, to the Cammo Estate;
- Retaining the connection from Silverknowes Promenade to the North Edinburgh Path Network/ National Cycle Network via Silverknowes Road North, Silverknowes Parkway and Silverknowes Road South. It is proposed to review the designs for the scheme as part of the ETRO process (if approved) to improve access, particularly on Silverknowes Parkway while retaining a marked cycleway; and

- Closure of West Shore Road to motor vehicles, removing through traffic from West Shore Road and West Harbour Road and forming a much better cycling connection from Silverknowes Promenade to McKelvie Parade.

It is recommended to introduce the above measures via ETROs, and to retain other measures introduced under Spaces for Exercise with the exception of the closure of Links Gardens to motor vehicles.

It is proposed to remove the closure of Links Gardens during tram construction in the area, but to consider reinstatement, subject to consultation with local people as part of proposals for a Leith Low Traffic Neighbourhood.

Braid Road attracted the highest net level of demand for removal versus retention during the consultation (it is worth noting however that it was the subject of the 8th highest demand for retention as well as the 2nd highest demand for removal). However, the road has subsequently been reopened to motorised traffic southbound, with new protected cycle lanes provided. This reopening should reduce southbound congestion on Morningside Road, which had increased in association with the closure.

The continued southbound closure of Braid Road facilitates the Meadows to Greenbank cycling Quiet Connection, particularly at the junction of Braid Road and Braidburn Terrace. It also provides much safer and more comfortable conditions for pedestrians and cyclists on Braid Road south of Braidburn Terrace and reduces traffic on Braid Road itself.

With the above in mind it is proposed to retain Braid Road closed to northbound traffic.

Retained measures would be subject to the normal legal processes for either Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETRO) or Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO). As this is an interim IIA, it is proposed that this IIA evolves and is updated subject to Committee approval into the next phase.

3. Briefly describe public involvement in this proposal to date and planned

We have followed the engagement process approved by councillors at the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 14 May 2020 and have notified local councillors, emergency services, access groups, community councils and other stakeholders of the new measures put in place. . A public consultation platform, Commonplace, was utilised at the beginning to gather suggestions from the public and this attracted 4,000+ responses.

An extensive consultation and engagement exercise ran from 22 February to 5 April 2021. There were three surveys, one for individuals; for businesses; and for stakeholders. In addition, there were four stakeholder presentation sessions in advance of the consultation opening: heritage; emergency services; accessibility and business.

A range of approaches were employed to ensure as wide-ranging and inclusive consultation exercise as possible, given that this took place during a period of lockdown. To ensure accessibility for a wide range of people, the consultation was made available in a range of formats such as regular print, large print, braille and translation into other

languages. A British Sign Language video was also displayed on the project website to further widen access to people with hearing loss.

In addition to the Consultation Hub survey, market research was carried out by independent Market Research consultants on behalf of the Council. The aim was to complement the consultation responses, which are intrinsically self-selecting, by securing a statistically representative sample of opinion.

The survey included a mix of closed and open-answer questions and stakeholders were able to respond by email or by completing the online survey.

The Access Panel were consulted in the production of a criteria to look at each scheme on balance going forwards. The following elements were part of the criteria:

- Does the project encourage walking and/or cycling?
- Does the project have beneficial impacts on the street environment?
- What are the project's likely impacts on public transport?
- What are the project's likely impacts on traffic disturbance of communities?
- What are the project's likely impacts on residents of streets that are the subject of measures?
- What are the project's likely impacts on businesses?
- What are the project's likely impacts on disabled street users?

4. Is the proposal considered strategic under the [Fairer Scotland Duty](#)?

No

5. Date of IIA

20 May 2021

6. Who was present at the IIA? Identify facilitator, Lead Officer, report writer and any partnership representative present and main stakeholder (e.g. NHS, Council) [names removed for data protection]

7. Evidence available at the time of the IIA

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
Data on populations in need	Census 2011 National Records for Scotland 2017 Mid year estimates Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (CEC, 2015)	<p>The City of Edinburgh has one of the fastest growing populations of any city in the UK. Although the city has a lower share of its population over 65 years of age (12%), the wider city region has a significantly higher share (22%) than Edinburgh and Scotland (19%).</p> <p>Based on 2011 Census Data the wards with the highest number of health conditions (including Deafness, Blindness, Physical, mental health, learning disabilities etc.) are Portobello/Craigmillar and Liberton/Gilmerton. Both had 31% of their total reporting health conditions. The City Centre had the lowest proportion (22%).</p> <p>The most deprived communities are in the peripheral areas of the city (e.g. Granton, Pilton, Niddrie, Saughton and Wester Hailes) furthest from the City Centre.</p>
Data on service uptake/access	Census 2011	<p>Car use in Edinburgh is the joint lowest of all Scottish cities. In 2010 of the 191,000 people living and working in Edinburgh, 63,500 commuted to work by car and a further 63,300 commuted by car from other local authority areas.</p> <p>Transport Scotland is monitoring transport trends during the COVID-19 outbreak. This information provides a snapshot of travel across main modes.</p> <p>For the period 19 - 25 April 2021, compared with the same period in 2019, we saw:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Walking journeys up by 15% •Cycling journeys up by 10% •Concessionary bus journeys down by 55% •Rail journeys down by 80% •Ferry journeys down by 75% •Air journeys down by 80% •Car journeys down by 20%.
Data on socio-economic disadvantage e.g. low income,	Scottish Index of Multiple	Transport accessibility is lowest around the periphery of the city, for example, Niddrie, Baberton, Clermiston and Granton. Many of these are areas of high deprivation as ranked by the SIMD.

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
low wealth, material deprivation, area deprivation.	Deprivation (SIMD)	<p>The temporary measures have brought in increased space for walking and cycling in the following areas which are ranked in the highest 10% SIMD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Muirhouse/Pilton • Murrayburn • Gilmerton <p>Providing such space has the potential to bring increased opportunities for community members to travel actively, and to experience the benefits to physical and mental health of walking, cycling, wheeling and scooting for everyday journeys.</p>
Data on equality outcomes	Bike Life (Sustrans, 2017)	<p>In a 2017 survey, 24.5% of school pupils, stated they normally travelled to school using only private motorised mode of travel compared with 48.8% who normally use active modes.</p> <p>2017 data from Transport Scotland indicates that women were more likely than men to walk or catch the bus to work and men were more likely to cycle to work or travel by rail. In Scotland twice as many men as women cycle once or twice a week for transport.</p> <p>In addition, people in lower income households were more likely to walk or take the bus whereas people in higher income households were more likely to drive. 7.5% of commuters living in Edinburgh cycle to work with over 15.3 million trips made by bike in 2017.</p> <p>In the city black and minority ethnic (BAME) communities, women and over 65s are underrepresented when it comes to cycling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Female – 37% • Over 65 – 6% • BAME – 3% (8% of City population)
Research/literature evidence	UK and International Evidence showing beneficial economic impacts to businesses where space for walking	<p>Beyond the pandemic, it is important that towns and cities adapt to the challenges associated with the climate emergency and the need to decarbonise transport and the ways people move around urban areas</p> <p>https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/documents/s25363/Item%206.10%20-%20Spaces%20for%20People%20Initiative%20-%20Response%20to%20Motion-%20FINAL.pdf</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
	and cycling is priorities	
Public/patient/client experience information	Consultation & Engagement SfP Market Research	<p>Market research shows majority support for each of the scheme types: schools; protected cycle lanes on main roads; shopping streets; city centre; space for exercise/leisure; quiet connections. Levels of overall support are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools 65% • City centre 61% • Protected cycle lanes on main roads 59% • Shopping streets 59% • Spaces for exercise/leisure 51% • Quiet connections for day to day cycling with reduced traffic 45% <p>In the consultation, there were concerns were raised over the way the temporary measures have been implemented, particularly with minimal consultation ahead of changes being made. The Council has followed standard TTRO procedures in its implementation of the measures in its response to the pandemic and would follow the necessary procedures if schemes were retained under ETRO.</p> <p>Stakeholders raised negative impacts of the measures on people with reduced mobility and sight loss, particularly those who depend on travelling by car for these reasons.</p> <p>In particular they have raised concerns over:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in on-street parking opportunities for people with disabilities • ‘floating’ car parking, where a cycle lane is located between parking and the kerb <p>It has been noted that signage could be clearer at the locations of new measures.</p> <p>Businesses reported that the measures have brought difficulties in receiving deliveries, due to a reduction in available road space for parking and loading. By using ETROs going forwards for measures which may be retained, there is a greater ability to dedicate road space for location-specific requirements.</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
		<p>Sample size for market research = 583. Delivers a dataset with a 95% confidence interval of no more than $\pm 4.06\%$ for questions answered by the full sample. This means there is a 95% probability that if the questions were asked to the whole Edinburgh adult population, answers would be within this range.</p> <p>Responses to individual consultation = 17,600</p> <p>Responses to business consultation = 179</p> <p>Responses to stakeholder consultation & email responses = 22</p>
Evidence of inclusive engagement of people who use the service and involvement findings	Consultation & Engagement	<p>Local feedback received as measures are implemented will be used to refine schemes. Feedback from the Commonplace website has been used to help to highlight areas where interventions should be targeted.</p> <p>Presentation/briefings were carried out with stakeholder groups in advance of the public citywide consultation opening. There were four themed briefing sessions: accessibility; heritage; business and emergency services. Main issues discussed in each of these sessions is as follows:</p> <p>Accessibility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-installation design risk process, and ongoing modification through the stakeholder notification system • Independent road safety audits carried out on larger schemes • Street clutter removal is taking place in parallel with SfP installations, involving contributions from Living Streets Edinburgh • Any moves from TTRO into ETRO would involve statutory consultation • Acknowledging that people, particularly those who may have mobility issues, made fewer journeys in lockdown, and so may not be aware of the SfP measures on-street and may not have been able to comment in the consultation from lived experience • Suggestions to use Connect Radio, talking newspapers to engage more effectively with people with sight loss

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has taken care not to introduce obstructions around crossings, using reflective materials, providing Blue Badge parking adjacent to cycle routes • Voluntary organisations have limited time/capacity to engage in a meaningful way for the large number of schemes which is important to note going forwards, for the Council to be able to engage within this context <p>Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council has not had the opportunity to see how the measures work in normal traffic • Heritage groups acknowledge another trial period would allow a fuller picture of how the schemes work towards their function in busier operation • Concerns with visual appearance of measures, which were due to the TTRO and emergency nature of installation • Co-design welcomed going forwards, looking at best practice and design standards • Concern over bollards in conservation and World Heritage site and time is needed to look at solutions which are affordable and acceptable in the sense of a longer-term appearance <p>Business</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A great deal more consultation is felt to be needed, and it was felt the Consultation Hub survey was not flexible enough • Temporary measures have been installed in unprecedented conditions, where during lockdown, businesses had to close due to the pandemic, which will not be the case going forwards • ETRO process allows for more flexibility compared with the TTRO to adapt to specific changes e.g. loading bay locations <p>Emergency services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designs must ensure that incidents can be responded to rapidly – e.g. width of roads to allow for passing through traffic • Scheme-specific discussions with Road Safety colleagues who have fully engaged with

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
		<p>emergency services. This has offered reassurances and led to some scheme amendments for example on Old Dalkeith Road and Meadowplace Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keen to continue to work together going forwards with early and ongoing dialogue <p>The Access Panel were consulted in the production of the criteria used for recommendations around retention and changes were made which sought to address their comments.</p>
Evidence of unmet need	<p>SfP Market research</p> <p>Consultation & Engagement for SfP and for previous related policies such as the City Mobility Plan and City Centre Transformation</p>	<p>From SfP market research:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost three-quarters of those who had used a street/road with Spaces for People measures, did so on foot • Just under 6 in 10 had used a car - significantly more common for over 65year olds (80%) and those living in West Edinburgh (73%) • Half had used buses on Spaces for People streets/roads • Males were more likely than females to have used buses (58% vs 43%) • 22% had cycled - more common in under 65yr age groups, and amongst those living in Central Edinburgh • When asked about the benefits of the measures, 54% felt the measures have made it easier for children and parents to walk/cycle to school; 47% reported the measures gave improvements for people walking; 37% for people cycling • When asked about the disadvantages of the measures, 43% of people mentioned traffic increases due to diversions; 40% mentioned increased traffic congestion; 38% said it was harder for residents to park or receive deliveries • Respondents were also asked of their views on each measure, and views have been taken into account to consider the impact of retention of each measure <p>The consultation revealed the following levels of support amongst individuals and businesses, respectively, with the market research % support in brackets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schools measures 47%; 28% (65%)

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected cycle lanes on main roads 38%; 22% (59%) • Shopping streets 36%; 19% (60%) • City centre 41%; 25% (61%) • Spaces for exercise/leisure 34%; 18% (51%) • Quiet connections for cycling 31%; 15% (44%)
Good practice guidelines	Designing Streets (2010) Edinburgh Street Design Guidance (2015) National Standards of Community Engagement Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland (MACS)	<p>The strategy has sought to follow best practice guidance such as Designing Streets and Edinburgh Street Design Guidance.</p> <p>In addition, an extensive international benchmarking exercise was undertaken to learn from cities similar in scale to Edinburgh, with broadly recognised good practice in city planning, and recent and most significant interventions in terms of quality of life.</p> <p>Despite the inability to hold normal consultation, the teams have been noting observations and respond by modifying measures. A design risk assessment process had been completed before schemes are installed. Once on the ground, larger schemes have been subjected to a full road safety audit by independent auditors. Stakeholder views have been captured through the notification system. Each measure is reviewed every two months and takes account of ongoing feedback.</p> <p>The National Standards for Community Engagement are good-practice principles designed to support and inform the process of community engagement.</p> <p>Guidance utilised for the IIA specifically created for the temporary measures installed on A1 are below and these are typically used for the development of each scheme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Edinburgh Street Design Guidance; • Sustrans SfP Guidance; and • Roads for All – a good practice guide. • Traffic Signs Manual • Traffic Signs Regulations • General Directions 2016 • London Cycling Design Standards • Roads for All – a good practice guide

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected?
Carbon emissions generated/reduced data	Air Quality Monitoring Stations Scottish Government Monitoring	Government has been monitoring the impact of COVID-19 social distancing and lockdown actions, which includes air quality. Evidence will continue to be collected on carbon emissions/air quality by the Council and Scottish Government as lock down measures are being relaxed. At time of writing, a protection level system is still in place, based on local authority wide regulation.
Environmental data	As above	As above
Risk from cumulative impacts	Low Emission Zone, City Mobility Plan, City Plan 2030, Edinburgh City Centre Transformation	Cumulative impacts may come about as a result of Low Emission Zone, City Mobility Plan, City Plan 2030 and Edinburgh City Centre Transformation. Cumulative impacts from this work will be included in due course once impact assessments of these policies/proposals have been undertaken.
Other (please specify) Feedback on projects since installation, including during consultation on retaining Spaces for People	Consultation Results Web page	This feedback varies between projects, although there are common themes, notably in relation to car parking for people with disabilities. Should projects be approved to retention under ETROs or TROs, opportunities to amend designs and relevant restrictions in response to feedback will be considered.
Additional evidence required		The Council will continue to build its capacity to deliver in line with best practice and experience gained from elsewhere.

8. In summary, what impacts were identified and which groups will they affect?

Equality, Health and Wellbeing and Human Rights	Affected populations
Positive	
1. Improved mental and physical health due to increased uptake in active travel. The measures can help people to access to amenities and social connections, and increased choices over	All

how they travel from A to B, improving their sense of inclusion and support.	
2. Street closures and segregated cycle ways enable and encourage people to go out and use public spaces safely without fear of traffic conditions and vehicle conflict.	All
3. There are also personal safety benefits to providing additional route options so people can make informed decisions taking into account their feelings of safety & the extent of natural surveillance in terms of number of people around when travelling at day or night, particularly important for women and people travelling alone	All; particularly women and people travelling alone
4. Improved access to schools by creating safer streets and allowing pupils who are able to walk and cycle	Young people and children and parents/carers
5. Creating more favourable crossing facilities can be helpful to those who aren't able to walk too far to find a safe crossing point	All; particularly young people and children and parents/carers; disabled people
6. Introduction of slower speeds restrictions will help improve road safety, encourage people to walk, cycle and make streets more people friendly	All; particularly young people and children and parents/carers; disabled people
7. Retention of measures recommended in the following areas of multiple deprivation: Muirhouse/Pilton; Murrayburn; Gilmerton. Access to amenities and the means to travel where public transport accessibility is poor, important to look at the whole transport system/network to continue to offer options. Measures will seek to join up areas of deprivation with areas of employment and/or services.	All; particularly people living in areas of deprivation
8. Design solutions to provide best access for servicing for businesses and blue badge, where there is a greater opportunity for ETROs to be able to service particular requests compared with TTRO	Disabled people; business community
9. Cycling is opened up as a mode of transport for people who have certain conditions who may not be able to drive. 1.5metre	Disabled people

standard widths are providing space for people using adaptive bicycles and trikes. Outwith this proposal, as part of the active travel investment programme, steps are being taken to introduce on-street cycle parking for non-standard bicycles	
10. Infrastructure can be used by everyone, helps with community cohesion and social interactions, potential to bring new people into active travel	All
11. Removal of street clutter, beneficial for parents and carers of young children and people who have particular accessibility requirements. Access to services when travelling with children, particularly with a young child or multiple children, providing further space in footways and removing vehicles from space next to footways	Disabled people; people travelling with children under 1; people travelling with multiple children
Negative	
1. Some of the cycle segregation schemes include floating bus stops which means people having to cross the cyclepath to access buses. RNIB and Guide Dogs Scotland expressed that this feature makes alighting buses challenging for disabled people.	Disabled people; people travelling with children under 1 and young children; pregnant women; older people
2. Some cycle segregation schemes also incorporate floating car parking. This is seen by the Access Panel as creating additional difficulties for disabled people. E.g. Handicabs mentioned that installation of bollards has impeded access making it more difficult to gain kerbside access for entry and exit for people with disabilities, and as such increased safety risk to staff and passengers and considerable disruption to traffic caused by need to stop in running lanes.	Disabled people; people travelling with children under 1 and young children; pregnant women; older people
3. Increased parking pressures particularly for blue badge holders, blue badge holders may not be aware that parking on double yellows is allowed	Disabled people, particularly people who have mobility issues and their carers including

	family members
<p>4. Conflict between road users at present, potential hazards of temporary infrastructure suited to the short term.</p> <p>For example, installing floating parking can provide a far safer environment for less confident cyclists, including children. But it can lead to interactions between cyclists and people entering and exiting vehicles by their nearside doors. The issue is likely to be more of a concern when cyclists can travel at higher speeds or where visibility is lower and/or more likely to be obstructed.</p> <p>There have been issues reported with traffic management equipment such as bollards and cycle lane defenders, with concerns that they can potentially be trip hazards for older people, partially sighted and disabled people</p>	All; older people; disabled people, particularly people with visual impairments
<p>5. Access to amenities and the means to travel where public transport accessibility is poor, having potential to negatively impact people travelling into the city from rural areas and the choices available to them</p>	Rural/semi-rural communities
<p>6. Impact on families who may rely on private car to travel as a group. Measures are designed to help families to feel more safe to travel in ways other than private car</p>	People travelling with children; pregnant women; older people
<p>7. Potential negative impacts associated with the displacement of traffic, congestion and pollution on people's health.</p>	All
Suggested Mitigation	
<p>In response to 1, 2, 3, 4 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attention should be given to making sure enforcement (for example of traffic speed, cycling on pavements) is effective. • All temporary measures were subject to a detailed design and risk assessment process being followed, and this will carry forward if schemes are retained under ETRO. Design solutions will continue to be appropriate to the surroundings. • Ensure designs follow relevant design guidelines to maximise access. • Ensure designs consider impact on the wider road network. • Regarding adapting to requirements, unlike TTROs, ETROs provide the opportunity to demarcate accessible blue badge parking as part of schemes. The designs will be based on the layouts in the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance, which have been through detailed risk assessment. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A fundamental principle of the floating bus stops is that the street markings clearly indicate to people cycling that they should give way to people embarking/alighting buses • Careful consideration will be given to ameliorating these issues as designs are taken forward under ETRO. Possible amendments include relaxing loading (and therefore blue-badge parking) restrictions where possible and measures to encourage/ensure cyclists proceed at modest speed 	
<p>In response to 4 - Consideration will be given to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing, or increasing the width of, the 'buffer' area between parked cars and the cycle lane; and • Measures to encourage/ensure cyclists proceed at modest speed; and • In some circumstances, replace floating parking with a layout with the cycle lane between parked cars and the running carriageway. 	
<p>In response to 3 - This impact can in some cases be mitigated by the provision of dedicated disabled parking in close proximity.</p>	
<p>A general point that in terms of accessible communications, that visual maps can help to communicate, noting the GIS Atlas mapping does meet accessibility requirements and can be used going forwards. Representatives of appropriate organisations should be contacted to dispense information to members. Going forward, it is planned to continue open engagement with representative groups and members of the public.</p>	
<p>In response to 5, 6 – The communications plan will include the promotion of routes/journeys to seek to encourage people to make trips which could be made by active/sustainable transport by these means, with links with the Council's Smarter Choices, Smarter Places programme where appropriate, and by promoting the city's cycle hire scheme.</p>	
<p>In response to 7 – it is acknowledged that measures may cause air quality impacts of congestion caused by displacement at a local level, and air quality will continue to be monitored in line with the Council's Air Quality Action Plan</p>	

Environment and Sustainability including climate change emissions and impacts	Affected populations
Positive	
1. The proposals may reduce greenhouse gas emissions and pollution as a result of reduced traffic and increased active travel.	All
2. The proposals may help plan for the future climate change/achieving carbon neutrality by Edinburgh's target of 2030	All

and promote sustainable forms of transport as modal shift may be achieved to more sustainable modes	
3. Fewer vehicular trips into urban areas and increases in the use of sustainable modes should provide opportunities to improve the quality of public spaces/public realm for non-car users	All
4. Improved opportunities to access greenspace and improved sense of place & community	All
5. Supporting active leisure trips to coastal areas, improving quality of life for citizens, and encouraging economic activity at coastal locations e.g. Portobello, Cramond, Granton, Silverknowes	All and coastal communities
6. Spaces for exercise measures may be retained, opening up new choice of destinations for people on foot and by bike, which has potential to reduce short car trips made for leisure reasons.	All
Negative	
1. Potential negative impacts associated with the displacement of traffic, congestion and pollution on the environment.	All
2. The visual appearance of the temporary measures has been reported as a concern in the consultation and engagement exercise. Cockburn Association put forward the point of view that interventions should be “place-led” rather than “transport-led”, and this was echoed by Better Edinburgh for Sustainable Transport (BEST)	Urban communities
Suggested Mitigation	
In response to 1, ensure designs consider impact on the wider road network.	
In response to 2, co-design with stakeholders is a positive way forward.	

Economic including socio-economic disadvantage	Affected populations
Positive	
1. The proposals may help people into positive destinations (including workplaces). Shift workers increased active travel options for travelling there/home	Shift workers
2. We have listened to feedback and recognise the need to support the local economy during this specific context of coming out of the pandemic and the infrastructure not being suited to longer-term	Business community

use here, and so it is proposed to remove measures on shopping streets.	
3. ETRO allows us to mark out loading arrangements where it is not possible through TTRO, leading to the potential for more beneficial outcomes for a greater majority	Business community
4. ongoing monitoring	All
Negative	
1. May negatively impact the viability of businesses who currently carry out loading on bus lanes.	Business community
2. Businesses and customers (including to services such as dental practices and nurseries) reported issues with the loss of parking in reducing the ability of customers to readily access their premises.	Business community
3. Measures are not on each street in the city, and so there will not be universal benefits	All
4. There has not been a great deal of scheme-specific correspondence received from businesses, and so the responses to the consultation are being considered as the main way we can assess the impact of the proposals on businesses. This may or may not accurately present the impacts experienced by business community members	Business community
Suggested Mitigation	
In response to 1, 2 – ETROs enable location-specific requirements to be catered to more readily than when utilising TTROs. The Council seeks to be in dialogue to arrive at the best outcomes which bring a favourable balance between positive contributions and risks/potentially negative outcomes.	
In response to 3 – in preparation of the recommendations, each scheme has been scored, where impact on business is one of the key scoring points. It is imperative that retained measures do not adversely disadvantage businesses as they recover from the pandemic, and the Council seeks dialogue with members of the business community where possible.	
In response to 4 – it is expected that a level of stakeholder engagement would take place subject to Committee decisions around retention of measures under ETRO	

9. Is any part of this policy/ service to be carried out wholly or partly by contractors and if so how will equality, human rights including children's rights, environmental and sustainability issues be addressed?

As part of the Council's procurement process due regard is required to be given to all equalities and rights, environmental and sustainability impacts when undertaking work on behalf of the Council.

10. Consider how you will communicate information about this policy/ service change to children and young people and those affected by sensory impairment, speech impairment, low level literacy or numeracy, learning difficulties or English as a second language? Please provide a summary of the communications plan.

A communications plan is in place, and will use a range of communication methods to reach out to different types of people. Communication will be in plain English and designed to be understood by a range of population groups. The Council's ITS translation service is available for materials to be available in alternative languages including Braille.

Communication channels include media promotion, press releases, outdoor advertising and lamp post banners. General updates are added to Council Twitter and Facebook with links to a dedicated page on the Council website. This provides a cost-effective way of empowering residents in Edinburgh to share with friends and enable wide distribution of information.

The Council intends to take appropriate next steps in a partnership/co-design approach with key stakeholders, such as RNIB, Living Streets, Spokes and Edinburgh Access Panel, to ensure different target audiences are reached and that key messages are appropriately tailored, and provided in a readily-accessible format for a range of groups of people.

11. Is the policy likely to result in significant environmental effects, either positive or negative? If yes, it is likely that a [Strategic Environmental Assessment](#) (SEA) will be required and the impacts identified in the IIA should be included in this.

An SEA has been undertaken for the Edinburgh City Centre Transformation Project and CMP which would be used as a reference document for any measures which may be retained.

12. Additional Information and Evidence Required

If further evidence is required, please note how it will be gathered. If appropriate, mark this report as interim and submit updated final report once further evidence has been gathered.

Additional consideration should be given to the impacts of each measure retained/adapted to ensure scheme-specific feedback has been taken on board, and that any potential negative impacts have a planned mitigation approach.

13. Specific to this IIA only, what recommended actions have been, or will be, undertaken and by when? (these should be drawn from 7 – 11 above) Please complete:

Specific actions (as a result of the IIA which may include financial implications, mitigating actions and risks of cumulative impacts)	Who will take them forward (name and job title)	Deadline for progressing	Review date
Report to Transport and Environment Committee in June with this IIA	The Council's project team	17/06/21	17/06/21
Develop the communications plan	The Council's project team	15/07/21	17/06/21
Develop the stakeholder engagement plan and approach	The Council's project team	15/07/21	17/06/21
Develop the monitoring plan to measure the effectiveness of individual schemes if taken forward on an experimental basis under ETRO	The Council's project team	15/09/21	17/06/21
Update this IIA into the next stage	The Council's project team	15/09/21	17/06/21

14. Are there any negative impacts in section 8 for which there are no identified mitigating actions?

n/a

15. How will you monitor how this proposal affects different groups, including people with protected characteristics?

The consultation and engagement exercise outputs will be shared within the Council's project team, to ensure the exercise continues to deliver with consideration given to the valuable feedback and suggestions.

16. Sign off by Head of Service/ NHS Project Lead

Name  Head of Place Management

Date 11 June 2021

17. Publication

Completed and signed IIAs should be sent to strategyandbusinessplanning@edinburgh.gov.uk to be published on the IIA directory on the Council website www.edinburgh.gov.uk/impactassessments