

Integrated Impact Assessment – Summary Report

1. Title of proposal

‘Delivering Actions for Public Transport – Supporting Information’ paper.

This paper was formally titled ‘Draft Public Transport Action Plan’ (PTAP). Following the [Actions to Deliver Edinburgh’s City Mobility Plan \(CMP\) consultation](#) in 2023, the draft PTAP was streamlined, along with draft Active Travel, Parking and Road Safety Action Plans, to respond to feedback on the challengingly large volume of information presented and resolve duplication.

This led to a more integrated ‘CMP-led approach’, which places greater reliance on the City Mobility Plan (CMP) ‘[Strategy to 2030](#)’ and the associated ‘[Implementation Plan](#)’ in setting out the strategic vision, objectives, policy measures, targets, and actions and associated delivery information. Further explanation on the CMP-led approach is set out in the ‘City Mobility Plan – 1st Review’ committee report, [presented to the Council’s Transport and Environment Committee on 1 February 2024](#)

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

The CMP underwent a detailed Integrated Impact Assessment process as part of its creation and was approved in February 2021. The CMP Integrated Impact Assessment (IIA) is presented [here](#).

This ‘Delivering Actions for Public Transport – Supporting Information’ paper focusses on providing further detail on the actions required to deliver the objectives, policies measures and targets in the CMP in relation to public transport and builds on commitments already approved in CMP. This IIA should therefore be read in conjunction with the overarching CMP IIA, which already assesses many of the key impacts of public transport actions required to deliver CMP.

At the core of this supporting paper and CMP is a commitment to develop and enhance Edinburgh’s public transport system which includes expansion of tram, Bus Rapid Transit, bus priority measures and reform of the Council-owned public transport companies. This paper augments the CMP Implementation Plan, which has been updated to include key actions, including for public transport, as part of the CMP’s biennial review cycle. The updated CMP Implementation Plan was presented to the Transport and Environment Committee on 1 February 2024.

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

CMP was extensively consulted upon before its finalisation in 2021. Between April-July 2023, consultation was undertaken to gain views across the suite of draft action plans mentioned above, alongside an emerging Future Streets Framework (Circulation Plan) designed to further support the delivery of CMP. [Findings were presented](#) to the Transport and Environment Committee in October 2023.

A key focus of this consultation was engaging with groups with protected characteristics, including groups that have been flagged as potentially being affected by the public transport actions in this IIA. The consultation programme received a total of 3,827 representations, received via a range of activities including stakeholder workshops, focus groups, market research, an online survey, and public drop-in events.

Views were captured across the following key themes:

- Improving local travel for walking and wheeling
- Delivering a joined-up cycle network
- Delivering improvements to our public transport network
- Delivering a people-friendly city centre
- Achieving city-wide road safety targets
- Improving our public transport and active travel corridors
- Delivering vibrant shopping streets
- Delivering liveable neighbourhoods
- Supporting the journey to net zero and cleaner air

The findings from the consultation have been used to inform this IIA.

4. Is the proposal considered strategic under the Fairer Scotland Duty?

Yes. This paper, when read in conjunction with CMP, will play a key role in the city's bid to tackle inequalities and will deliver a green, sustainable and more accessible form of transport to residents, commuters, businesses and visitors.

5. Date of IIA

The IIA was finalised on 6 December 2023.

6. Who was present at the IIA? Identify facilitator, lead officer, report writer and any employee representative present and main stakeholder (e.g. Council, NHS)

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
	<p data-bbox="555 566 762 667">Appendix A. Evidence data Census 2022</p> <p data-bbox="555 1025 743 1059">Census 2011</p> <p data-bbox="555 1765 767 1984">National Records of Scotland Mid-year estimates 2019, 2020, & 2021</p>	<p data-bbox="825 380 1334 450">Scotland saw large increases in the older population.</p> <p data-bbox="825 472 1206 542">Edinburgh population by demographic</p> <p data-bbox="825 564 1377 994">Based on data gathered from the 2022 Census, Edinburgh has a higher proportion of people who would likely be participating in the workforce, aged 20-64 (64.5%) than Scotland average (59.1%). There is a lower proportion of people above the working age, in the 65+ age bracket, in Edinburgh (16%) compared to Scotland (20.1%). There are similar proportions of people under 19 in both Edinburgh and Scotland, 19.4% and 20.8% respectively.</p> <p data-bbox="825 1016 1382 1193">Edinburgh has a slightly lower proportion of people who are living with a disability than the Scotland average, at around 16% (compared to 20% in Scotland).</p> <p data-bbox="825 1216 1353 1357">The proportion of single people in Edinburgh is higher than the Scottish average at 45.3% (compared with 35.4% for Scotland).</p> <p data-bbox="825 1379 1353 1520">There is a slightly lower proportion of people with White ethnicity in Edinburgh (91.8%) than Scotland (96.1%).</p> <p data-bbox="825 1543 1382 1756">In terms of religious affiliation, the percentage of people with no religion is 44.8%, which is higher than the Scottish average of 36.7%. The main religion is the Church of Scotland with a 24.3% of people.</p> <p data-bbox="825 1778 1372 2024">Comparing the mid-2011 data to mid-2021 data, by 2043, the proportion of age groups generally not participating in the workforce – those in age groups 0-15 and 65+ - will represent almost half of the population in Edinburgh (47.6%). The population of those age</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
	NTS Delivery Plan - Social and Equality Impact Assessment (SEQIA) (Transport Scotland 2022) Edinburgh School Catchment zones	<p>groups most vulnerable to the effects of air pollution: children (0-15) and older people (65+) - grew by 8.7% and 18.1% respectively.</p> <p>The school catchment zones for Edinburgh give an indication of travel to school areas. Benefits can be realised by reducing severance and barriers to travel.</p>
Data on service uptake/access	Appendix A. Evidence data	<p>Travel patterns by demographic in Scotland</p> <p>Based on Transport and Travel in Scotland (Social Survey 2020) the methods of travel to work in Scotland include walking, driving, using the bus or the rail.</p> <p>Regarding the driver and passenger %:</p> <p>Males are shown to drive to work 3% more than women, with percentages at 70% and 67% respectively. Females are slightly more likely to be a passenger.</p> <p>The age group that is most likely to drive to work is the 50-59 age bracket (75%), followed by 30-39 (74%) and 60+ (72%). Only 55% of people aged 20-29 drive to work. A much higher proportion of people aged 60+ are likely to be a passenger (7%).</p> <p>People living with a disability are 13% less likely to drive to work, with only 57% driving to work, compared to 70% of people without a disability. However, they are more likely to be a passenger (9% compared to 4% for people without a disability).</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>Regarding employment status, part-time employees are 1% more likely to drive compared to full time employees.</p> <p>Generally, as household income increases, driving increases, with the anomaly of the £40,000-50,000 bracket being slightly lower.</p> <p>In regard to SIMD rank, the more deprived ranks (1st to 3rd) are less likely to drive to work with percentages between 59% and 67%. The 4th and 5th ranks are more likely to drive to work (between 74% and 79%). Thus, as level of deprivation decreased the percentage of drivers increase.</p> <p>Regarding the bus %:</p> <p>The gender split of bus use across Scotland is fairly balanced, with males shown to catch the bus to work 1% more than women.</p> <p>In terms of age, 29–39-year-olds are most likely to use the bus at 11% compared to the lowest % age group of 50-59 and 60+ at 5%.</p> <p>In terms of the disabled category, disabled individuals are 6% more likely to use the bus at 13% of the population.</p> <p>Regarding employment status, part-time employees are 4% more likely to use the bus compared to full time employees.</p> <p>Generally, as household income increases, bus use decreases, however, there is an anomaly of 4% in the household income between £20,000- £30,000.</p> <p>In regard to SIMD rank, the most deprived ranks (1st- 3rd) were more likely to use the bus (13%) than the least deprived 4th and 5th ranks (1%</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
	<p>NTS Delivery Plan - Social and Equality Impact Assessment (SEQIA) (Transport Scotland 2022)</p> <p>Equality Outcomes and Mainstreaming Report 2023</p> <p>Women's and girls' views and experiences of personal safety when using public transport</p>	<p>and 4%, respectively). Thus, as level of deprivation decreased bus use decreased dramatically.</p> <p>Access to public transport by demographic in Scotland</p> <p>Access to public transport – Age groups</p> <p>Young people are more dependent on public transport, particularly for accessing education and training.</p> <p>Availability of public transport in rural areas and island communities is a significant challenge for young people.</p> <p>Socio-economically disadvantaged groups and children could benefit from reduced child poverty via free bus travel</p> <p>For older people, the lack of access to public transport services can act as a barrier to accessing key services including healthcare. Accessibility issues are likely to affect older people more than other groups.</p> <p>Access to public transport – Disabilities</p> <p>Members of communities with disabilities are much more likely to be dependent upon public transport than car use. This dependency means that any changes to local transport infrastructure could have a direct impact on their lifestyle and wellbeing (International Transport Forum, 2017).</p> <p>Issues facing disabled people or those with long-term limiting illness are often exacerbated by low levels of employment, low income and living in areas of relative deprivation.</p> <p>Affordability and accessibility barriers to public facilities, including lack of suitable transport in the care pathway, hostile pedestrian environments,</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>inaccessible infrastructure and online information and aspirations to reduce private car use.</p> <p>Safety and security concerns when using public transport, especially at night.</p> <p>Access to public transport – Ethnicity Since ethnic minority groups are less likely to have access to a car and more likely to rely on public transport than other groups, issues of cost and safety may disproportionately impact these groups and affect the outcomes and opportunities available.</p> <p>Access to public transport – Religion or belief There is a clear link between religion and economic inequality. Discrimination, assault or harassment of the basis of religious identity may affect people of certain religious groups more than others, and this may affect their choice to use public transport and public transport facilities.</p> <p>Access to public transport – Gender Transgender people are likely to have lower incomes and therefore, are at a higher risk of transport poverty. Transgender or gender non-conforming people may have concerns about using public transport or public transport facilities, such as toilets, for fear of being harassed or discriminated against.</p> <p>Women are more likely to walk, be a passenger in a car or take a bus than men and make multi-stop and multi-purpose trips, combining travel to work with trips for other purposes such as</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
	<p>Edinburgh by Numbers 2022</p>	<p>taking children to school, looking after family members or shopping.</p> <p>Women are more likely to be victim of sexual assault and have concerns about safety and security issues with regards to the use of public transport at night out of fear of being harassed or sexual assault.</p> <p>Access to public transport – Pregnancy</p> <p>Pregnant women or parents travelling with pushchairs and young children may find journeys are uncomfortable or difficult, especially without rest stops. People with pushchairs may find certain types of public transport options inaccessible.</p> <p>Access to public transport – Sexual Orientation</p> <p>People in the LGBTQIA+ group may be concerned about being able to access public transport and public transport facilities, especially at night when these may be poorly lit, for fear of harassment or discrimination.</p> <p>Travel patterns by demographic in Edinburgh</p> <p>In 2021, Edinburgh’s population density was 1,999 residents per square kilometre. The number of rail passengers travelling to and from Edinburgh fell in 2020/21 to less than 4 million passengers from almost 29 million the previous year. Passenger numbers recovered in 2021/22 to over 16 million, just over half the pre-pandemic number. Due to the pandemic, the number of passengers arriving in Edinburgh fell to a low of 3 million in 2021. However, figures for 2022 have shown a strong recovery</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
	<p data-bbox="555 748 775 891">Population distribution and density - 2011 Census</p> <p data-bbox="555 1644 788 1787">Edinburgh Tram York Place to Newhaven Project</p> <p data-bbox="555 1868 767 1899">City Plan 2030</p> <p data-bbox="555 1980 746 2011">Census 2011</p>	<p data-bbox="825 380 1382 448">with passenger numbers reaching 11.3 million.</p> <p data-bbox="825 470 1361 721">According to the Population Density Maps (The City of Edinburgh Council, 2013), in common with many other cities, population densities in Edinburgh are highest in inner suburban areas surrounding the commercial core of the city centre.</p> <p data-bbox="825 743 1374 1321">Local changes in the concentration of population have important implications for service planning in the public, private and voluntary sectors. Large numbers of people living in close proximity may help to sustain both public and commercial services and provide a conducive setting for enterprise and growth. Although high densities may exert pressure on urban infrastructure, the potential economies of scale may also justify investment in innovative, sustainable solutions such as high capacity public transport systems which would not be viable elsewhere.</p> <p data-bbox="825 1344 1361 1594">The development of transport infrastructure plays a key role in shaping the pattern of future growth and development, and hence in delivering the spatial strategy and the long-term economic growth that this will support.</p> <p data-bbox="825 1617 1382 1939">Edinburgh’s City Plan 2030 aims to deliver a “place-based approach” improving sustainable public transport and promoting active travel. The City Plan also supports the reduction in car kilometres by 30% by 2030 through introducing maximum parking limits for new developments minimising their car use associated.</p> <p data-bbox="825 1962 1382 2029">Car use in Edinburgh is the joint lowest of all Scottish cities. In 2010 of the</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>190,000 people living and working in Edinburgh, 60,000 commuted to work by car and a further 61,300 commuted by car from other local authority areas. 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.</p>
<p>Data on socio-economic disadvantage e.g. low income, low wealth, material deprivation, area deprivation.</p>	<p>Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD)</p> <p>Transport and Travel in Scotland 2019</p> <p>City Mobility Plan 2021 - 2030</p> <p>The Poverty in Edinburgh commission Data and Evidence</p>	<p>Socio-economic disadvantage and travel in Scotland</p> <p>The most deprived communities are mainly in the peripheral areas of the city (e.g., Craigmillar, Gilmerton, Granton, Lochend, Muirhouse, Niddrie, Pilton, Saughton and Wester Hailes).</p> <p>Some of the areas ranked by the SIMD as of high deprivation such as Wester Hailes, Muirhouse and Granton have a low level of access to public transport and/or no access to a private car.</p> <p>Some 74% of all unemployed people in Scotland are in poverty, compared to only 5% of people in households where all adults are in full time work.</p> <p>Socio-economic disadvantage and travel in Edinburgh</p> <p>Based on the City Mobility Plan, 45% of households in Edinburgh are without access to a car (Progressive Survey, 2019). The most disadvantaged communities are mainly located in the periphery of the city (e.g., Granton, Pilton, Niddrie, Saughton and Wester Hailes).</p> <p>The risk of poverty can be seen to depend highly on factors such as age, gender, the number of children in a family, marital status, disability, tenure of housing, as well as employment</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
	<p data-bbox="555 1039 788 1182">Edinburgh Travel Behaviour study 2019</p> <p data-bbox="555 1518 769 1662">Edinburgh Walking and Cycling Index - Sustrans 2022</p>	<p data-bbox="823 380 1382 450">status. In particular, groups with higher rates of poverty are:</p> <ul data-bbox="823 465 1369 651" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="823 465 1241 535">▪ People from certain BAME Backgrounds <li data-bbox="823 539 1187 573">▪ People with disabilities <li data-bbox="823 577 1369 611">▪ Households with 3 or more children <li data-bbox="823 616 1369 651">▪ People that live in rented properties <p data-bbox="823 656 1353 837">Approximately 29% of households which rely on part time employment are in poverty, as well as 26% of multiple adult households where only one adult is in full time employment.</p> <p data-bbox="823 853 1342 999">Estimates suggest that 29% of all people in poverty in Edinburgh are living in these conditions because of the cost of housing.</p> <p data-bbox="823 1014 1382 1272">Those living in SIMD deprived areas are less likely to hold a driving licence (39%) or to have driven recently (26%) than those in less deprived areas (61% and 44% respectively). Car and bike access is lower in areas of multiple deprivation.</p> <p data-bbox="823 1288 1382 1469">Wealthier people are more likely to drive or take the train to work, less likely to walk or catch the bus. Users of public transport tend to be younger (16-29) and older age groups (60+).</p> <p data-bbox="823 1485 1382 1854">White Scottish and White British residents are a lot more likely to have a driving licence than ethnic minority groups. Furthermore, men are more likely to hold a licence than women along with the income of households showing a clear trend where lower income households are less likely to drive and less likely to own multiple cars.</p> <p data-bbox="823 1870 1358 2018">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.</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
Data on equality outcomes	<p>Census 2011</p> <p>Air quality in Europe - 2020 report — European Environment Agency</p> <p>Women Safety in Public Places: Interim Analysis of public consultation July - September 2022</p>	<p>Health conditions in Edinburgh</p> <p>Based on 2011 Census Data, the wards with the highest number of long-term health conditions (including deafness, blindness, physical, mental health, learning disabilities etc.) are Portobello/Craigmillar (31.17%), Liberton / Gilmerton (30.79%) and Craigentiny / Duddingston (30.5%). The City Centre ward has the lowest number (21.65%). Almost a third of the City of Edinburgh population have more than one health condition.</p> <p>Impact of air pollution in Europe</p> <p>Children, some disabled people, pregnant women and older people are more vulnerable to the impact of air pollution and they could benefit from cleaner air in city centre locations.</p> <p>Children and young people spend a higher proportion of their time outdoors and breathe in air closer to the ground, where some pollutants reach peak concentrations, putting them at greater risk of exposure to ambient pollutants. During their early years, children’s lungs, organs and brains are still developing making them increasingly vulnerable to air pollution (Royal College of Physicians, 2016).</p> <p>Women’s Safety</p> <p>Feelings of safety are largely attributed to good lighting (84.4%), the busyness and footfall in the neighbourhood (62.6%) and the area is well-looked after (53.6%)</p> <p>Feelings of unsafety are linked to lighting levels, these were highlighted as playing a critical factor in feelings of safety, as well as people’s behaviour in the area (particularly the behaviour of</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>men and the behaviour of young people).</p> <p>Almost all women reported that they ‘very often’ or ‘always’ felt unsafe when using public transport, although feeling unsafe was not limited only to being on transport, but was more something that was experienced by women more generally when out socially, especially if alone or out after dark.</p>
Research/literature evidence	<p>Future of mobility: inequalities in mobility and access in the UK Transport System</p>	<p>Transport as a barrier to employment</p> <p>A Transport to Employment (T2E) scheme, which offers subsidised on-demand community-based transport and shared taxi services in rural Scotland, was found to move people into employment, with social and economic benefits that outweighed the investment by 3:1 (Wright et al., 2009).</p> <p>The British National Travel Survey shows that there is a significant number of carless people who depend on cars to reach jobs and services, and therefore often rely on car lifts and taxis for their travel needs. Older non-drivers, the majority of whom do not have a driving licence, can be very dependent on the car for their daily activities, in which case they are often dependent on others to gain access to services (Mattioli, 2014).</p> <p>Mobility as a Service</p> <p>The lowest income groups across the UK are becoming increasingly reliant on taxis. It is unclear whether this is due to the advent of on-demand taxi services, or due to the decline of bus services in many peripheral urban areas.</p> <p>The current system of shared mobility is based on the assumption that</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>everyone has access to a bank account and a credit card. However, many low-income and older people do not have credit or debit cards and can only use their bank card to withdraw money from the bank or ATM up to their financial limit. This excludes them from using some of these shared mobility services that require a bank card to sign up. In addition, some people may not be able to access car insurance, either because it is high-priced (e.g. for low-income households and young drivers) or because they have a poor driving record, e.g. previous endorsements on their licence. This means that these people may also find it difficult to rent a car or join a car-sharing scheme.</p> <p>The current system of Mobility as a Service (MaaS) may exclude some sectors of the population due to digital divides, lack of appropriate skills and literacy, and other cognitive and cultural barriers. The likely social distributional impacts of MaaS include:</p> <p>Rising population of older people no longer able to drive may benefit.</p> <p>Younger people increasingly excluded from car ownership and use might benefit.</p> <p>Barriers exist for less technically able around reselling tickets, and the openness of Application Programming Interfaces (API) undergirds services.</p> <p>Potential benefits for high functioning disabled people from MaaS</p> <p>Shared transport is not popular with some BMEs due to fear of racism</p>

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		<p>Rising transport costs could be a core driver in pushing shared mobility options</p> <p>Low population density settings make MaaS difficult to deliver, so private car remains important</p>
Public/patient/client experience information	<p>Edinburgh Walking and Cycling Index - Sustrans 2022</p> <p>Low Emission Zone: monitoring and evaluation - The City of Edinburgh Council 2022</p> <p>Low Emission Zone: monitoring and evaluation - The City of Edinburgh Council 2023</p>	<p>Low traffic neighbourhoods in Edinburgh</p> <p>Residents want more funding for walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport. Among Edinburgh residents 78% support the creation of more 20-minute neighbourhoods and 61% support the creation of more Low-Traffic Neighbourhoods. 53% of the Edinburgh’s population agree that restricting through-traffic on local residential streets would make their area a better place.</p> <p>Low Emission Zones in Edinburgh</p> <p>Based on research done in 2022 where more than 600 people were interviewed, the majority of the population from Edinburgh, two thirds said they were in favour with a third strongly in favour of a Low Emission Zone (LEZ). Only one in seven were opposed to the scheme and just under one in five were undecided. Most people(75-81%) consider it important to protect public health and to reduce both air pollution and carbon emissions from vehicles.</p> <p>In the repeat 2022 survey, there was an additional representative sample of Edinburgh van drivers. Overall, most drivers were supportive of LEZ restrictions and consider it important to protect public health from harmful vehicular emissions.</p>
Evidence of inclusive engagement of people	CMP Consultation	Public consultation related to public transport in the Edinburgh City Mobility

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
who use the service and involvement findings	Findings Public Transport October 2023 (summary of engagement provided in Appendix B)	<p>Plan was undertaken in October 2023. Those experiencing poverty, rural communities, women, older people, people with disabilities, younger people and parents of young children were consulted. Some feedback on the PTAP includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Women, those experiencing poverty, older people, rural communities, people with disabilities and parents of young children were all supportive of measures to improve safety and comfort of users, particularly lighting. ▪ All groups highlighted the need for better bus tracking/real-time information systems. Women, older people and people with disabilities would also like better information on space for prams/wheelchairs. ▪ Women, older people and people with disabilities found there to be a lack of space for prams and wheelchairs ▪ Rural communities noted that public transport into the city centre is 'inadequate' in terms of frequency, time taken, lack of late-night options and cost. <p>All groups were broadly in favour of bus priority and extension of bus lanes, however groups that relied upon cars were unsupportive of extending bus lane operating times.</p> <p>Older people and people with disabilities had concerns regarding the distance between stops and identified changing the layout as a priority.</p> <p>All groups identified congestion as a problem.</p>
Evidence of unmet need	City Mobility Plan 2021 - 2030	Fewer than a quarter of resident workers have public transport journey times of less than 20 minutes to work. Public transport journey times to jobs

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
		in the peripheral areas of the city are almost double those of jobs in the city centre. If public transport infrastructure and accessibility is configured correctly across the city region, the city’s job market becomes more accessible, opening up opportunities for people from relatively job scarce communities.
Good practice guidelines	Get home safe National Standards for Community Engagement	<p>Focusing on women’s safety, the toolkit and guidance informs the process of assessing where and how safety can be improved, supported by walking site audits and current best practice.</p> <p>The National Standards for Community Engagement are good-practice principles designed to support and inform the process of community engagement.</p>
Carbon emissions generated/reduced data	Climate Emissions Analysis and 2030 City Sustainability Approach	<p>In 2020, the city’s carbon emissions were predominantly made up of transport (31 %), housing/domestic (29 %), public and commercial buildings (23 %), industry (17 %).</p> <p>The most effective way to reduce CO2 emissions from transport is via modal shift and electrification/decarbonisation as evidenced in the City Mobility Plan.</p>
Environmental data	City Mobility Plan Environmental Assessment, 2021	Detail provided as part of a separate Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) as published alongside the City Mobility Plan.
Risk from cumulative impacts		Cumulative impacts, both positive and negative, may occur relating to the Low Emission Zone, City Mobility Plan 2030, City Centre Transformation and City Plan 2030. Focus on equalities and inclusion will remain strong as policies are further developed and implemented.

Evidence	Available – detail source	Comments: what does the evidence tell you with regard to different groups who may be affected and to the environmental impacts of your proposal
Additional evidence required	No	<p>There are potential gaps in the information and data collected:</p> <p>More up to date statistics than 2011 Census on ethnicity, religion and disabilities of the population within the study area;</p> <p>Travel modes of different protected characteristic groups.</p>

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

Equality, Health and Wellbeing and Human Rights	Affected populations
Positive	
<p>The proposed action to improve perceived safety for all users through improved lighting and walking routes to public transport stops and stations (PT1) will encourage more people to travel using public transport, especially vulnerable groups. This action will also likely positively impact the experience of public transport users, and could lead to greater overall wellbeing. Moreover, an increased number of people using public transport (through actions addressing public transport safety, reliability, affordability and accessibility), can also have a positive impact on vulnerable people's safety perception.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed actions that aim to improve affordability (PT3, PT4) will provide better value-for-money for people using public transport. It will allow low-income groups who previously couldn't afford this travel option better access to essential services and jobs. Action PT4 specifically targets concessionary and under-22 users which will have positive impacts for these vulnerable groups who are known to experience affordability issues.</p> <p>A reduction in car travel within the City of Edinburgh may result in less respiratory illnesses from transport emissions. Further, the improvements in air quality and reduction in inner-city background noise from less vehicles, may lead to an increase in the quality of public space and therefore the health and wellbeing of people.</p> <p>A reduction in car travel will also reduce the risk of road traffic accidents and improve overall safety on the street of Edinburgh.</p> <p>Providing more information on space availability (PT2) aims to improve the travel experience and positively impacting people with a disability. This information will also assist other groups such as parents with young children in prams, pregnant women and older people. It will make using public transport easier for these groups and help them plan their journeys.</p> <p>Improved infrastructure increases accessibility to essential services for all populations, including protected populations such as single parents and deprived communities/low-income groups. Actions related to improving regional</p>	<p>People with disabilities, ethnic minorities, women, pregnant women and girls, older people, parents of young children, children and younger people</p> <p>Low income earners, young people, older people, people with disabilities, single parents</p> <p>Older people, children, younger people, pregnant women, and people with pre-existing health conditions.</p> <p>All population groups</p> <p>People with a disability, older people, parents with young children and pregnant women.</p> <p>Rural and deprived communities, single parents, and low-income groups.</p>

Equality, Health and Wellbeing and Human Rights	Affected populations
<p>connectivity (PR1 to PR11) will specifically target remote and deprived communities and better connect them to essential services and employment.</p> <p>Better shared mobility through DRT, MaaS and DDI solutions (PT9, to PT13) will improve flexibility and provide more travel choices for public transport users. It will allow people with limited mobility such as people with a disability, older people, pregnant women and parents with young children to use public transport. The demand will be able to shape the capacity and the service of the public transport improving the access to employment, services and businesses for these groups.</p>	<p>People with a disability, older people, parents with young children and pregnant women.</p>
<p>Negative</p>	
<p>The modal shift from private vehicles to public transport could potentially increase disease transmission. This could have negative impacts for people vulnerable to illnesses such as older people and people with pre-existing health conditions.</p> <p>During construction vulnerable groups, such as people with disabilities, ethnic minorities, women, pregnant women and girls, older people, parents of young children, children and younger people, may feel unsafe walking past or near construction sites. Temporary diversions for footways pose disproportionate challenge for these population groups due to mobility challenges. People with sensory impairments are also differentially affected due to the fact that temporary arrangements mean new information may be conveyed visually or through audio that they will miss. This could be encountered at temporary works and when buses are diverted.</p> <p>Increased bus priority (PG4) and operating times (PG3), and therefore slower travel times for other vehicles, may affect people who are reliant on cars to access services or employment. Similarly, restrictions to traffic (PV1) in the city centre, may have the same negative impact. This is a differential impact for individuals who rely on private vehicle transport such as those with mobility issues and those from rural communities that are not served by public transport.</p> <p>Increased distance between stops in bus stop realignment (PG5) may negatively affect people with disabilities or older people. These same groups may be negatively impacted by PV2 where reducing dwell times for buses may cause anxiety or stress for users who have restricted mobility.</p> <p>Interventions encourage public transport utilisation across the general population will increase competition for space on public transport. Given certain population groups (older people and people with disabilities) require additional time and space to utilise public transport, they may be intimidated and in turn discouraged/excluded from using public transport if it is prohibitively busy. For example, no space for a mobility aid or wheelchair on train or bus. Additional capacity will need to be added to public transport system to meet induced demand to avoid this negative impact.</p> <p>Mixed mode travel may be too expensive for low income earners, meaning they are not able to utilise public transport if it does not offer end-to-end trips.</p> <p>Depending on the cost of new services intended to service rural communities, there may be negative impacts for people who are priced out of using public transport, and therefore still cannot access services.</p>	<p>Older people and people with pre-existing health conditions</p> <p>People with disabilities, ethnic minorities, women, pregnant women and girls, older people, parents of young children, children and younger people</p> <p>Older people, people with disabilities, rural communities</p> <p>Older people and people with disabilities</p> <p>Older people and people with disabilities</p> <p>Low income earners, single parents, older people</p> <p>Rural and deprived communities, and low-income groups.</p>

Environment and Sustainability including climate change emissions and impacts	Affected populations
Positive	
<p>The proposed actions that aim to address the climate emergency (PC1, PC2, PC3, PC4) will likely lead to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution. This will occur as a result of behaviour change interventions and the switch to cleaner energy public transport fleets. The reduction in air pollution caused by public transport will positively impact the health of all population groups but especially those who are most sensitive to poor air quality such as children.</p> <p>Implementation of the proposed actions related to convenience, reliability, affordability and accessibility of public transport will incentivise a modal shift from private to public transport by making it more attractive. This will have positive impacts on the environment by reducing car reliance, and therefore greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	<p>All population groups, but especially older people, people with pre-existing health conditions, children and younger people and people with disabilities.</p> <p>All population groups</p>
Negative	
<p>Construction works that will be required for a number of actions could result in temporary environmental impacts a result of land clearing and emissions from the operation of machinery. These environmental impacts may include land contamination, air pollution and noise pollution.</p> <p>A shift to more sustainable forms of public transport (e.g. electric or hydrogen fleets through actions PC3 and PC4) could cause environmental damage if redundant, non-compliant vehicles are not disposed of properly.</p> <p>Additional public transport vehicles (e.g. electric or hydrogen) being purchased generates additional carbon and uses other materials such as lithium for batteries. This is compared to utilising the incumbent public transport fleet for as long as possible.</p>	<p>Population groups in close proximity to construction works.</p> <p>All population groups</p> <p>All population groups</p>

Economic	Affected populations
Positive	
<p>Implementation of the proposed actions that aim to improve accessibility, reliability and useability of public transport will allow more people to access job locations and therefore employment. Better access will also have positive impacts for younger people, helping them into positive destinations to set them up for financial success in the future.</p> <p>Decreased traffic and cleaner atmosphere in the city may lead to higher quality of public spaces in the city. There will also likely be greater foot traffic in the city centre due to the mode shift from cars to public transport. This could lead to opportunities for businesses in the long term.</p>	<p>All population groups, but especially for low-income groups, singles parents, families, young people and people with disabilities</p> <p>Local businesses</p>

Economic	Affected populations
Actions addressing affordability will encourage greater uptake of a more cost effective form of travel for low income earners. This will help to reduce income inequality, particularly for young people, older people and people with a disability.	Low income earners, young people, people with a disability, older people
Negative	
<p>Decreased access to non-sustainable transport may reduce opportunities to apply for a job in these areas for people relying on a non-sustainable vehicle.</p> <p>Bus priority and the reduction in traffic volumes on some streets could have negative impacts for some business operations that rely on vehicles for deliveries. It could also mean people who rely on vehicles such as some people with disabilities and older people, have restricted access to city centre businesses.</p> <p>Construction works that will be required for a number of actions could result in temporary negative impacts on businesses if there are access restrictions or disturbance.</p>	<p>Low income earners, people with a disability, older people</p> <p>Local businesses, people with a disability, older people</p> <p>Local businesses</p>

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?

Yes, it is possible that some or part of the actions in the paper and the associated updated CMP Implementation Plan would be undertaken by contractors. Equality, human rights and environmental and sustainability issues would be addressed though the general terms and conditions of the Council’s contract requirements.

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 range of communication methods will be used to reach out to different types of people at different stages of the delivery of actions, ensuring a broad audience reach and opportunities for interaction. Community involvement (listening and acting on stakeholders views) will remain a key element and communication formats will be designed to be understood by a range of population groups.

Residents are encouraged to use Council’s translation service if they have language/visual requirements.

- 11. Is the plan, programme, strategy or 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. See section 2.10 in the Guidance for further information.**

A SEA was completed for the CMP. This papers role is to support the overarching CMP.

12. Additional Information and Evidence Required

Additional evidence will be added to the IIA, if required, as it becomes available.

- 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
Continual engagement and communication with potentially affected protected groups as actions are further developed in detail, implemented and evaluated.	CEC	During detailed design stage	A review of progress against actions committed will be undertaken as part of the CMP biennial review cycle. The next review is scheduled for 2026.
Construction management to ensure safety for vulnerable groups.	CEC	During detailed design stage	As above
Potential cumulative effects, positive and negative, with other aspects of CMP should be noted and monitored.	CEC	During detailed design stage	As above

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

No. At this stage, mitigation in the form of engagement with potentially affected protected characteristic groups has been recommended as the PTAP's interventions are developed in further detail.

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

Performance against CMP's Key Performance Indicators is measured every 2 years as part of its biennial review cycle.

16. Sign off by Head of Service

Name Peter Watton

Date 8 January 2024

17. Publication

Completed and signed IIAs should be sent to:
integratedimpactassessments@edinburgh.gov.uk to be published on the Council website www.edinburgh.gov.uk/impactassessments
Edinburgh Integration Joint Board/Health and Social Care
sarah.bryson@edinburgh.gov.uk to be published at
www.edinburghhsc.scot/the-ijb/integrated-impact-assessments/