Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 26 October 2017

Present:-

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

COUNCILLORS

Robert C Aldridge
Scott Arthur
Gavin Barrie
Eleanor Bird
Chas Booth
Claire Bridgman
Mark A Brown
Graeme Bruce
Steve Burgess
Lezley Marion Cameron
Ian Campbell
Jim Campbell
Kate Campbell
Mary Campbell
Maureen M Child
Nick Cook
Gavin Corbett
Cammy Day
Alison Dickie
Denis C Dixon
Phil Doggart
Marion Donaldson
Karen Doran
Scott Douglas
Catherine Fullerton
Neil Gardiner
Gillian Gloyer
George Gordon
Ashley Graczyk
Joan Griffiths
Ricky Henderson
Derek Howie
Graham J Hutchison
Andrew Johnston
David Key
Callum Laidlaw
Kevin Lang
Lesley Macinnes
Melanie Main
John McLellan
Amy McNeese-Mechan
Adam McVey
Claire Miller
Max Mitchell
Joanna Mowat
Gordon J Munro
Hal Osler
Ian Perry
Susan Rae
Alasdair Rankin
Lewis Ritchie
Cameron Rose
Neil Ross
Jason Rust
Stephanie Smith
Alex Staniforth
Mandy Watt
Susan Webber
Iain Whyte
Donald Wilson
Norman J Work
Louise Young

1 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 21 September 2017 as a correct record.

2. Questions

The questions put by members to this meeting, written answers and supplementary questions and answers are contained in Appendix 1 to this minute.

3 Leader's Report

The Leader presented his report to the Council. The Leader commented on:

- Launch of Budget options – Budget consultation
- Edinburgh's Progression Towards a Low Emissions Zone – Edinburgh delivery mechanism
- Health and Social Care – Management/structure of the service
- Congratulations on marriage of Councillor Dixon

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Whyte	-	Budget Consultation – increase in Council Tax and Charges
Councillor Main	-	Adult Health and Social Care – Assessments, Care Homes, Doctor's surgeries – worsening services
Councillor Aldridge	-	Cap of 3% on Council Tax increases – pledge for new compost tax
Councillor Day	-	Bethany Trust – Annual Shelter Project
	-	Central Government funding for local authorities
Councillor Key	-	Congratulations to Councillor Ritchie for nomination for Glasgow Herald Local Politician of the year award
Councillor Smith	-	Self Directed Support
Councillor Lang	-	Anas Sarwar – non support of Coalitions

Councillor Neil Ross	-	Commend the diligence of the Council's internal audit team for identifying high risks to the Council
Councillor Bridgman	-	Commend the Council's Treasury Management Team
Councillor Cook	-	New Primary School Campus in South Edinburgh
Councillor Munro	-	Budget Consultation – seek meetings to make robust representations for Edinburgh to be fully and properly funded
Councillor Cameron	-	Economic Strategy for Economic Growth – contributions by co-operatives
Councillor Douglas	-	Self Directed Support Options
Councillor Mitchell	-	Carers involvement in designing flexibility and choice into the self directed support and care systems
Councillor Johnston	-	Self Directed Support – understanding of information available for applicants
Councillor Brown	-	Council Leader – on-line commentary on first 100 days in the role
Councillor Gardner	-	Heriot Watt University – International University of the Year
Councillor Osler	-	Bield Care Homes closures
Councillor Work	-	Banning of fracking by the Scottish Government
Councillor Webber	-	Audit Scotland questions – Care Services

4 Edinburgh Integration Joint Board – Appointment of Chief Officer and Heads of Service

Details were provided on arrangements which had been agreed by the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board (IJB) for the permanent appointment of a Chief Officer and proposals for two Heads of Service Posts, a Head of Operations and a Head of Strategic Planning.

Decision

1) To note the arrangements for the appointment of the Chief Officer, Edinburgh Integration Joint Board.

2) To agree the arrangements for the recruitment and appointment of two Heads of Service posts, including the establishment of an IJB recruitment panel to make the appointments.

3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to authorise the appointment (if necessary) of the Chief Officer and two Heads of Service posts following the selection of appropriate candidates by the IJB.

(References – Edinburgh Integration joint Board, 13 October 2017 (item 1); report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

5. Governance for the Edinburgh and South East of Scotland City Region Deal

The Council had approved the formation of a Joint Committee for the City Region Deal programme. Shadow delivery governance had been established with the Leaders from the six partner local authorities providing strategic direction for the negotiations with the UK and Scttish Governments to secure agreement of the Heads of Terms in July 2017.

Although a Joint Committee had been meeting on a shadow basis since June 2016, approval was now sought to formally establish a Joint Committee for the purpose of progressing and implementing the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal. Details of the proposed remit and membership were provided.

Motion

1) To agree to establish a Joint Committee under Section 57 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 with East Lothian, Fife, Midlothian, West Lothian and Scottish Borders Councils, representatives from the higher education and further education sector, and business to oversee the governance arrangements for the Edinburgh and South East of Scotland City Region Deal.

2) To approve the arrangements that would inform the proposed Minute of Agreement establishing the Joint Committee as detailed in the appendix to the report by the Chief Executive.

3) To agree that the Leader of the Council be appointed to represent the Council on the Joint Committee.

4) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to negotiate and agree the Minute of Agreement establishing the Joint Committee, in line with the principles stated in the appendix to the report, and any financial and resource contributions, if they were required.

5) To note that the Chief Executive would report to Council upon the signing of the Minute of Agreement establishing the Joint Committee.

6) To note that the Project Management Office was being enhanced as partners entered the Implementation Phase and that contributions would be sought from Councils to fund this.

7) To note that an update would be provided to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee in December 2017 on progress with the implementation of the Edinburgh and South East of Scotland City Region Deal.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

1) To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

2) To add the following new 2) and renumber accordingly:

In recognition of the £2.5 billion contribution to GDP in Edinburgh alone contributed by the third sector, agrees that a further report should be submitted to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee in December 2017, setting out how the third sector, and specifically social enterprises, should be included as core partners in delivering the City Region Deal.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Miller

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion:

1) To agree to establish a Joint Committee under Section 57 of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973 with East Lothian, Fife, Midlothian, West Lothian and Scottish Borders Councils, representatives from the higher education and further education sector, and business to oversee the governance arrangements for the Edinburgh and South East of Scotland City Region Deal.

2) In recognition of the £2.5 billion contribution to GDP in Edinburgh alone contributed by the third sector, agrees that a further report should be submitted to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee in December 2017, setting out how the third sector, and specifically social enterprises, should be included as core partners in delivering the City Region Deal. The report would also provide an update on progress with the implementation of the City Region Deal.

3) To approve the arrangements that would inform the proposed Minute of Agreement establishing the Joint Committee as detailed in the appendix to the report by the Chief Executive.

4) To agree that the Leader of the Council be appointed to represent the Council on the Joint Committee.

5) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to negotiate and agree the Minute of Agreement establishing the Joint Committee, in line with the principles stated in the appendix to the report, and any financial and resource contributions, if they were required.

6) To note that the Chief Executive would report to Council upon the signing of the Minute of Agreement establishing the Joint Committee.

7) To note that the Project Management Office was being enhanced as partners entered the Implementation Phase and that contributions would be sought from Councils to fund this.

(References – Act of Council No 10 of 30 June 2017; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

6 Locality Committees 2017

The Council had agreed to explore creating Locality Committees and established four working groups to have initial discussions.

Details were provided on the work of the groups, together with proposals for establishing Locality Committees.

Motion

1) To agree to Locality Committees being established based on the principles in paragraph 3.4 of the report by the Executive Director of Place and detailed proposals being set out in a report to Council in November 2017 for final approval.

2) To carry out a review and consultation of community planning structures and working arrangements at neighbourhood and locality levels, to inform the Edinburgh Partnership governance review.

3) To seek formal agreement to the review and consultation proposals from the Edinburgh Partnership at its meeting on 7 December 2017.

4) To continue with the Neighbourhood Partnerships pending the outcome of the proposed review and consultation of community planning arrangements.

5) To refer the report to the Culture and Communities Committee on 14 November 2017 for noting and discussion of the review and consultation process.

6) To agree that strategic oversight of the review and consultation process would be the responsibility of the Culture and Communities Committee.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Wilson

Amendment

1) To delete paragraph 1), add the following new paragraphs 1) and 2) and renumber from original paragraph 2):

    1) To agree to add the following principle to the locality principles in Paragraph 3.4.

        3.4.11 Locality Committees will appoint their Conveners and Vice-Conveners from their number on an annual basis.

    2) To agree Locality Committees should be established based on the principles in paragraph 3.4 of the report as amended above in 1) and detailed proposals should be set out in a report to Council in November 2017 for final approval.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	31 votes
For the amendment	-	32 votes

(For the motion – The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson,

Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Ritchie, Watt, Wilson and Work.

For the amendment - Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Jim Campbell, Mary Campbell, Cook, Corbett, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Main, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rae, Rose, Neil Ross,Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

Decision

To approve the amendment as follows:

1) To agree to add the following principle to the locality principles in Paragraph 3.4 of the report by the Executive Director of Place:

   3.4.11 Locality Committees will appoint their Conveners and Vice-Conveners from their number on an annual basis

2) To agree Locality Committees should be established based on the principles in paragraph 3.4 of the report as amended above in 1) and detailed proposals should be set out in a report to Council in November 2017 for final approval.

3) To carry out a review and consultation of community planning structures and working arrangements at neighbourhood and locality levels, to inform the Edinburgh Partnership governance review.

4) To seek formal agreement to the review and consultation proposals from the Edinburgh Partnership at its meeting on 7 December 2017.

5) To continue with the Neighbourhood Partnerships pending the outcome of the proposed review and consultation of community planning arrangements.

6) To refer the report to the Culture and Communities Committee on 14 November 2017 for noting and discussion of the review and consultation process.

7) To agree that strategic oversight of the review and consultation process would be the responsibility of the Culture and Communities Committee

(References – Act of Council No 2 of 22 June 2017; report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

7. Audited Annual Report 2017 of the Lothian Pension Fund, Lothian Buses Pension Fund and Scottish Homes Pension Fund including Annual Report by External Auditor -

The Pensions Committee had referred a report on the Audited Annual Report for the year ended 31 March 2017 for the Lothian Pension Fund, the Lothian Buses Pension Fund and the Scottish Homes Pension Fund to the Council for information.

The unaudited Annual Report had been considered by the external auditor Scott-Moncrieff and their annual report to Members and the Controller of Audit was presented. The audited financial statement for the wholly-owned companies LPFE Limited and LPFI Limited were also provided.

Decision

To note the report by the Pensions Committee.

(References – Pensions Committee 27 September 2017 (item 11); referral report by the Pensions Commmittee, submitted.)

8 City of Edinburgh Council – 2016/17 Annual Audit Report to the Council and the Controller of Audit – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report detailing the principal findings of the external auditor's statutory review of the Council's Annual Accounts to the Council for noting.

Decision

To note the report by the Finance and Resources Committee

(References – Finance and Resources Committee of 28 September 2017 (item 6); referral report by the Finance and Resource Committee, submitted.)

9. Dalmeny Station – Motion by Councillor Lang

The following motion by Councillor Lang was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council notes;

1. the importance of Dalmeny Station as part of the City's public transport system, with over 100 train services between Fife and Edinburgh city centre each day,

2. how the station provides an important alternative to private car journeys into the city, particularly for those residents who work in the centre of Edinburgh,

3. the growth in the populations of Dalmeny, Queensferry and Kirkliston following major programmes of house building which has led to a substantial increase in the numbers using Dalmeny Station, from 361,000 in 2005/6 to 500,000 in 2015/16,

4. the Local Develpment Plan which designates significant land in rural west Edinburgh for new housing and which is likely to lead to a further increase the number of passengers using the station.

Council recognises;

(a) the problems being faced by those living close to Dalmeny Station because of the current levels of car parking, with significant commuter parking on nearby roads and in spaces created for residents in new developments,

(b) the difficulty created by the limited parking arrangements, which risks creating a disincentive towards using the station, forcing more commuters to choose to use their car to travel into Edinburgh via the busy and congested Barnton junction and Queensferry Road.

Council welcomes the recent improvements at the station, such as an increase in bike storage facilities, but believes this is insufficient in addressing the wider access issues around the station and that further significant action is needed.

Council therefore instructs officials to engage with Scotrail and Transport Scotland and seeks a report to the Transport & Environment Committee within two cycles. This report should set out an action plan for addressing these issues, including proposals to further maximise sustainable transport options to and from the station along with improved parking arrangements which benefit passengers and local residents."

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

Council notes;

1. the importance of Dalmeny Station as part of the City's public transport system, with over 100 train services between Fife and Edinburgh city centre each day,

2. how the station provides an important alternative to private car journeys into the city, particularly for those residents who work in the centre of Edinburgh,

3. the growth in the populations of Dalmeny, Queensferry and Kirkliston following major programmes of house building which has led to a substantial increase in the numbers using Dalmeny Station, from 361,000 in 2005/6 to 500,000 in 2015/16,

4. the Local Develpment Plan which designates significant land in rural west Edinburgh for new housing and which is likely to lead to a further increase the number of passengers using the station.

Council recognises;

(a) the problems being faced by those living close to Dalmeny Station because of the current levels of car parking, with significant commuter parking on nearby roads and in spaces created for residents in new developments,

(b) the difficulty created by the limited parking arrangements, which risks creating a disincentive towards using the station, forcing more commuters to choose to use their car to travel into Edinburgh via the busy and congested Barnton junction and Queensferry Road.

Council welcomes the recent improvements at the station, such as an increase in bike storage facilities, but believes this is insufficient in addressing the wider access issues around the station and that further significant action is needed.

Council therefore instructs officials to engage with Scotrail and Transport Scotland and seeks a report to the Transport & Environment Committee within three cycles. This report should set out an action plan for addressing these issues, including proposals to further maximise sustainable transport options to and from the station along with improved parking arrangements which benefit passengers and local residents.

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Young declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a frequent user of Dalmeny Station.

10 Daw Aung San Suu Kyi - Motion by the Lord Provost

The following motion by the Lord Provost was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"The City of Edinburgh Council awarded the Freedom of the City of Edinburgh to Daw Aung San Suu Kyi on 18 June 2005. She remained under house arrest in Burma (now Myanmar) at that time and the award was presented 'in absentia' in the presence of her son and the Director of Amnesty International. The award was in recognition of her personal courage and relentless pursuit of democratic justice in Burma, and reflected the award of the Nobel Peace prize to her in 1991. In conferring the award, the Council also recognised the commitment made by all those seeking to secure democracy and human rights in Burma by non-violent means.

Aung San Suu Kyi was elected to the position of State Counsellor on 5 April 2016.

The current crisis of the Rohingya minority in Myanmar's Northern Rakhine State is of wide and grave international concern. This Council notes the ongoing calls from the United Nations, Amnesty International and many governments to the Burmese government to stop the violence and allow UN scrutiny and safe return of those fleeing Rakhine.

This Council condemns the violence and calls on Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, as a recipient of the Freedom of the City of Edinburgh and all that this award stands for, to use her influence and moral courage to intervene to stop the violence, to allow UN and international scrutiny and mediation to commence immediately, and to ensure a safe, democratic and peaceful solution for the people of the region."

Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

11 Robert Owen Award for an Inspirational Educator - Motion by Councillor Child

The following motion by Councillor Child was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council congratulates Lindsey Watt, Headteacher, Castleview Primary School on receiving the Robert Owen Award from the Scottish Government. The Award was

established to recognise the contribution of renowned educationalists across the world whose work has had significant impact and informed substantial education improvement activities in Scotland. The Award recognises Lindsey's hugely positive influence on Scottish education over many years, where she has provided outstanding and inspirational leadership for learning and has continuously improved children's experiences, attainment and life-chances.

Council requests that the Lord Provost writes to Lindsey expressing the Council's appreciation for her work and congratulating her for receiving this award."

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Child.

12 Spokes 40th Anniversary - Motion by Councillor Key

The following motion by Councillor Key was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council:

Notes that Spokes, the Lothian Cycle Campaign, was formed in 1977.

Further notes that Spokes has been a key player in ensuring the promotion of safe cycling within the City and throughout the Lothians.

Congratulates Spokes on its 40th anniversary and looks forward to continuing to work in partnership to ensure that Edinburgh remains the most cycle friendly city in Scotland."

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Key.

Declarations of Interest

Councillors Arthur, Booth, Corbett, Key, Main and Miller declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of Spokes.

13 Communal Bins - Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

The following motion by Councillor Jim Campbell was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council:

1. Recognises the dangers of obstacles on the pavement as highlighted at last Council by Councillor Howie.

2. Instructs Council waste operatives to be mindful of all members of our community, and to always re-position empty bins to maintain a clear pathway along pavements.

3. Instructs Director of Waste, following the successful implementation of Clause 2, to write to all private waste collection services to request in the strongest terms that their employees always re-position empty bins to maintain a clear pathway along pavements.

4. Recognises that many Continental European cities have adopted different communal waste collection solutions, involving a suite of waste receptacles that feature a central lift point, controlled waste entry hatch at a lower height, offer greater capacity with a more efficient use of roadside space in a more acceptable aesthetic package, integral internal mechanisms protected from damage, and the possibility of ground location plates than ensure repeated precise placement.

5. Request a report to the Transport and Environment Committee within 2 cycles to cover;

    a) The costs and benefits of replacing circa 1,800 wheeled communal bins in use in Edinburgh with Continental style receptacles described in Clause 4;

    b) Where additional costs have been identified under clause 5a, investigate if these costs could be offset by identifying areas where individual bins could be replaced with new Continental style receptacles described in Clause 4;

    c) Determine costs estimates to install semi-submerged central lift point communal waste disposal suites in Central Edinburgh to enhance the public realm that would be compatible with the description in Clause 4."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Brown

Amendment

To note paragraphs 1-4 of the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell and note that a report on these issues had already been agreed and would be considered at the December meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee. If any further work was required it would be requested through that Committee.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	24 votes
For the amendment	-	39 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Aldridge, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Young.

For the amendment: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Ritchie, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor Macinnes.

14 Statues - Motion by Councillor Mowat

The following motion by Councillor Mowat was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

Council notes that parts of a number of statues including Greyfriars Bobby's nose, David Hume's toe and Wojcek the bear's nose are being regularly rubbed by passers by which is removing the patina and exposing the bronze below creating patches of

shiny bronze and causing concern to residents and visitors who believe that the statues are being harmed by this inadvertent polishing and calls for a report in 2 cycles detailing:

1. Whether the rubbing and exposure of the bronze does damage the statue and what is the nature of this damage and whether it affects the structure of the statue or is cosmetic.

2. Recognising that it is very difficult to change human nature and prevent people from interacting with these statues what measures are available to protect these statues and the costs of these if indeed it is deemed necessary to take such measures; and

3. If evidence concludes that the discolouration is damaging in a material way to the statues what factors should be taken into consideration when commissioning or advising on new statues to prevent this happening to any such new commissions."

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat subject to the information requested being included in a Members' Briefing, which was publicly available, rather than a report.

- moved by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Ian Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mowat:

Council notes that parts of a number of statues including Greyfriar's Bobby's nose, David Hume's toe and Wojcek the bear's nose are being regularly rubbed by passers by which is removing the patina and exposing the bronze below creating patches of shiny bronze and causing concern to residents and visitors who believe that the statues are being harmed by this inadvertent polishing and calls for a Members' Briefing, which was publicly available, detailing:

1. Whether the rubbing and exposure of the bronze does damage the statue and what is the nature of this damage and whether it affects the structure of the statue or is cosmetic.

2. Recognising that it is very difficult to change human nature and prevent people from interacting with these statues what measures are available to protect these statues and the costs of these if indeed it is deemed necessary to take such measures; and

3. If evidence concludes that the discolouration is damaging in a material way to the statues what factors should be taken into consideration when commissioning or advising on new statues to prevent this happening to any such new commissions.

15 A Placemaking Exercise for North West Portobello - Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

The following motion by Councillor Laidlaw was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council calls for Planning Officers to conduct a Placemaking Exercise for North West Portobello in full consultation with local residents and their representative organisations using the Place Standard developed by Architecture and Design Scotland, the Scottish Government and NHS Scotland.

Council notes the following drivers for conducting this exercise:

- Significant change of use in area from industrial and leisure to residential and retail

- Several new developments constructed, under construction or at planning stage which have and will affect services and infrastructure

- Significant pressure on road networks and parking due to historic street design

- Presence of Portobello Conservation Area

- Lack of open space per the requirements of the Local Development Plan

- Pressure on key public services including schooling and medical provision

Council notes that a Participation Request was made to the City of Edinburgh Council under the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 to be involved in the decision-making process on the sale of land at Westbank Street, and that a Community Engagement Exercise has taken place.

Council instructs Planning Officers to use the results of the Community Engagement Exercise to inform the scope of the Placemaking exercise.

Council notes that Action Porty has submitted an application for a Making Places co-design process.

If successful, Council instructs planning officers to ensure these processes are complementary to the Placemaking Exercise

Council agrees this Placemaking Exercise must be completed before any final decision is taken by Council on the sale of the Westbank site."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

Amendment

To approve the motion subject to replacing the final paragraph with the following:

"Council instructs officers to ensure that the preferred bidder for the Westbank site fully reflects the outcomes of any wider Place Making Exercise in their future planning submission."

- moved by Councillor Ritchie, seconded by Councillor Child

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Laidlaw:

Council calls for Planning Officers to conduct a Placemaking Exercise for North West Portobello in full consultation with local residents and their representative organisations using the Place Standard developed by Architecture and Design Scotland, the Scottish Government and NHS Scotland.

Council notes the following drivers for conducting this exercise:

- Significant change of use in area from industrial and leisure to residential and retail

- Several new developments constructed, under construction or at planning stage which have and will affect services and infrastructure

- Significant pressure on road networks and parking due to historic street design

- Presence of Portobello Conservation Area

- Lack of open space per the requirements of the Local Development Plan

- Pressure on key public services including schooling and medical provision

Council notes that a Participation Request was made to the City of Edinburgh Council under the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 to be involved in the decision-making process on the sale of land at Westbank Street, and that a Community Engagement Exercise has taken place.

Council instructs Planning Officers to use the results of the Community Engagement Exercise to inform the scope of the Placemaking exercise.

Council notes that Action Porty has submitted an application for a Making Places co-design process.

If successful, Council instructs planning officers to ensure these processes are complementary to the Placemaking Exercise

Council instructs officers to ensure that the preferred bidder for the Westbank site fully reflects the outcomes of any wider Place Making Exercise in their future planning submission.

16 Welcomes Webcast Subtitles - Motion by Councillor Graczyk

The following motion by Councillor Graczyk was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

1. Notes, the City of Edinburgh Council webcast will be provided with subtitles to improve accessibility for deaf and hard of hearing people.

2. Welcomes the recognition that subtitles are likely to be an important format for receiving information for deaf and hard of hearing. Welcomes the immense input by the City of Edinburgh Council and our webcast providers who are busy working on a base version of a transcription service that they hope will be rolled out by December 2017.

3. Thanks the Governance Officer Stuart McLean and members for their assistance in my request for webcast subtitles and for their work in partnership with our webcast providers to enable deaf and hard of hearing people to engage in Local Government business via webcast, making a positive difference in the lives of Deaf and hard of hearing people.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Graczyk.

17 EV and Parking Infrastructure - Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

The following motion by Councillor Jim Campbell was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council:

1. Welcomes the initiatives of the UK and Scottish Governments to boost the use of low emissions vehicles.

2. Recognises that this represents a paradigm shift and opportunity for our City.

3. Awaits the forthcoming Business Case for Electric Vehicle (EV) in Edinburgh being prepared for the Transport & Environment Committee and understood to include

    a. Estimates of adoption rates, including temporal and spatial demand models

    b. Discussion on the maturity of charging technology

    c. Capital cost estimates and the possibilities of offsetting these costs to avoid any burden on the Council budget

    d. Requirements that new developments include public charging infrastructure that the Council can adopt

    e. Exploration of EV charging payment mechanisms

    f. Consideration of the impact the adoption of electric taxis will have in Edinburgh

    g. Understanding of the impact of a Low Emissions zone on the Council's own vehicular fleet

4. Notes the wide variance in the number of Controlled Parking Permits issues per Permit & shared use space, ranging from a low of 1.41 in Zone 2 to a high, next door, of 2.54 in Zone 3. Council anticipates that the roll out of EV charging points could exacerbate issues with parking.

5. Instructs the Chief Executive to prepare a strategy paper within 4 cycles to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee including

   a. An analysis of the possibility of adopting the same payment mechanism for EV charging and parking, including residential parking schemes

   b. An analysis of whether such a payment mechanism would allow a more dynamic model of residential controlled and priority parking both in spatial and temporal terms

   c. An analysis if such an approach could be extended to avoid the undesirable concentration of parking just outside controlled parking zones, and on residential streets near major traffic destinations

   d. A discussion of what conditions would need to be in place to attract private capital to finance and run a city wide EV charging and parking infrastructure."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Laidlaw

Amendment

To note paragraphs 1-4 of the motion and note that a report on these issues had already been agreed and will be considered at the December meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee. If any further work was required it would be requested through that Committee.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted in place of the terms of the motion.

Decision

To approve the following amended motion by Councillor Jim Campbell:

1) To note the initiatives of the UK and Scottish Governments to boost the use of low emissions vehicles.

2) To note that this represented a paradigm shift and opportunity for our City.

3) To note the forthcoming Business Case for Electric Vehicle (EV) in Edinburgh being prepared for the Transport & Environment Committee and understood to include

   a. Estimates of adoption rates, including temporal and spatial demand models

   b. Discussion on the maturity of charging technology

   c. Capital cost estimates and the possibilities of offsetting these costs to avoid any burden on the Council budget

   d. Requirements that new developments include public charging infrastructure that the Council can adopt

   e. Exploration of EV charging payment mechanisms

   f. Consideration of the impact the adoption of electric taxis will have in Edinburgh

   g. Understand of the impact of a Low Emissions zone on the Council's own vehicular fleet

4) To note the wide variance in the number of Controlled Parking Permits issues per Permit & shared use space, ranging from a low of 1.41 in Zone 2 to a high, next door, of 2.54 in Zone 3. Council anticipates that the roll out of EV charging points could exacerbate issues with parking.

5) To note that a report on these issues had already been agreed and would be considered at the December meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee. If any further work was required it would be requested through that Committee.

18 Heriot-Watt University - Motion by Councillor Webber

The following motion by Councillor Webber was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council

Welcomes Heriot-Watt University being named as the inaugural International University of the Year 2018. #TrulyGlobal

Notes this award is a wonderful accolade as it recognises the truly global nature of the education and influence of Heriot-Watt University. It operates as an integrated

global university across three countries and offers students, staff and partners exceptional opportunities in their education, research and employment.

Recognises the whole community receives tremendous benefits from their global outlook, whether learning on one or more of their campuses across the world, or working with world-leading academics on challenge-led research that actively supports delivery of sustainable development goals.

Therefore congratulates Heriot-Watt University's success and confirms its continued support for the work of all of the talented staff and students, across the world, in the coming months."

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

19 Housing First Model - Motion by Councillor Whyte

The following motion by Councillor Whyte was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council:

Council notes the apparent success of the "Housing First" model in resolving street homelessness and rough sleeping in both the Unites States and Scandinavia with further evidence from elsewhere.

Council further notes the intention of the UK Government to pilot the Housing First approach in England and Wales as part of a renewed attempt to end rough sleeping following successful work in the 1990s with the Rough Sleepers' Initiative.

Council recognises the publication of recent research by the Social Justice Foundation detailing the success of the approach as compared with traditional methods in amongst other areas sustainability of tenancies and recovery from addiction.

Council therefore instructs the Director of Place to report within three cycles on the implications of implementing a Housing First approach in Edinburgh as a first step to ending Rough Sleeping and reducing street begging - the report to detail the requirements for Housing, the costs involved, the potential outcomes and the changes required in other services (including those of partners)."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Whyte with the adjustment in Paragraph 3 to read "*Council recognises the publication of recent research by the Centre for Social Justice Centre detailing…….".*

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Hutchison

Amendment 1

Council notes paragraphs 1-3 of the motion. Council recognises that work on this issue is already underway and therefore agrees to amend paragraph 4 to read:

"Council also recognises that both Scottish Government and Council have separately initiated Homelessness Task Forces. If the proposed format and remit for the latter is agreed at the Housing and Economy Committee on November 2nd it will be populated by a representative from each political group.

The proposed remit for the Council's Homelessness Task Force includes 'establishing what works, reviewing cases where successful outcomes have been achieved'. Accordingly the Council's Homelessness Task Force will consider the merits of initiatives like Housing First and others, and report thereon to a future meeting of the Housing and Economy Committee".

- moved by Councillor Barrie, seconded by Councillor Cameron

Amendment 2

To add at the end of the motion:

Agrees to write to the relevant UK minister to highlight the impact that cuts to welfare safety nets are having on increased rough sleeping and destitution.

- moved by Councillor Rae, seconded by Councillor Burgess

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	18 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	45 votes

(For the motion: Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Graczyk, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Ritchie, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 (as adjusted) by Councillor Barrie as follows:

Council notes the apparent success of the "Housing First" model in resolving street homelessness and rough sleeping in both the Unites States and Scandinavia with further evidence from elsewhere.

Council further notes the intention of the UK Government to pilot the Housing First approach in England and Wales as part of a renewed attempt to end rough sleeping following successful work in the 1990s with the Rough Sleepers' Initiative.

Council recognises the publication of recent research by the Centre for Social Justice detailing the success of the approach as compared with traditional methods in amongst other areas sustainability of tenancies and recovery from addiction.

Council recognises that work on this issue is already underway, and both Scottish Government and Council have separately initiated Homelessness Task Forces. If the proposed format and remit for the latter is agreed at the Housing and Economy Committee on November 2nd it will be populated by a representative from each political group.

The proposed remit for the Council's Homelessness Task Force includes 'establishing what works, reviewing cases where successful outcomes have been achieved'. Accordingly the Council's Homelessness Task Force will consider the merits of initiatives like Housing First and others, and report thereon to a future meeting of the Housing and Economy Committee.

Council agrees to write to the relevant UK minister to highlight the impact that cuts to welfare safety nets are having on increased rough sleeping and destitution.

20 Unmet Self-Directed Care - Motion by Councillor Doggart

The following motion by Councillor Doggart was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council:

Apologises to the 800 or so City of Edinburgh residents who have been assessed as having critical or substantial support needs that the Council has not met.

Recognises our responsibility to provide the c. 7,000 hours of unmet weekly care for those individuals, in line with the Self-Directed Support Act.

Instructs the Chief Executive within one cycle to report on the feasibility of the Service Matching Unit designing bundles of aggregated unmet hours, to interest providers to take part in regular auctions, to find the lowest price at which supply meets demand of the individuals and the Act."

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment

Council:

Accepts paragraph one of the Motion, noting that the most recent figures show there are approximately 700 people currently waiting for domiciliary care.

Accepts paragraph two of the Motion, noting latest statistics show 5,824 hours of unmet weekly care.

Notes that responsibility for these services sits with the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board (EIJB), and amends paragraph three to read:

Council is interested in the feasibility of the Health and Social Care Partnership designing bundles of aggregated unmet hours, to engage service providers to take part in regular auctions to achieve best value in the delivery of care to meet individuals' needs. Council therefore refers these matters to the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board for further consideration.

- moved by Councillor Henderson, seconded by Councillor Ian Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted in place of the terms of the motion.

Decision

To approve the following amended motion by Councillor Doggart:

Council:

Apologises to the 800 or so City of Edinburgh residents who have been assessed as having critical or substantial support needs that the Council has not met, noting that the most recent figures show there are approximately 700 people currently waiting for domiciliary care.

Recognises our responsibility to provide the c. 7,000 hours of unmet weekly care for those individuals, in line with the Self-Directed Support Act, noting latest statistics show 5,824 hours of unmet weekly care.

Notes that responsibility for these services sits with the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board (EIJB), and that Council is interested in the feasibility of the Health and Social Care Partnership designing bundles of aggregated unmet hours, to engage service providers to take part in regular auctions to achieve best value in the delivery of care to meet individuals' needs. Council therefore refers these matters to the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board for further consideration.

21 Christmas Lights - Motion by Councillor Hutchison

The following motion by Councillor Hutchison was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"Council:

Welcomes the announcement of funding for Christmas lights in high streets across the city and recognises that this relatively small investment in the context of the overall cost of the city's festive celebrations is crucial in helping local communities throughout the city to celebrate Christmas.

Council regrets that a decision on provision of festive lights in communities across Edinburgh for Christmas 2017 was not made until October and acknowledges that this is much too late in the year, given the fact that community groups across the city have already made their own arrangements.

Council further acknowledges that a decision to re-instate this funding, which was withdrawn in 2016, for a single year is illogical and may be unhelpful in light of significant investments already made by community groups and multi year contracts entered into.

Council apologises to all affected community groups for the uncertainty around funding for Christmas lights and for the inconvenience caused by the lateness of this decision and the subsequent poor communication of the decision once it was made.

Council agrees that all future decisions on funding for community Christmas lights will be made for a period of not less than 3 years and will be communicated no later than March in the year in which the decision is reviewed.

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Hutchison.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Smith

Amendment

Council notes the content of the motion and welcomes the programme to provide festive lighting across the city for 2017/18.

Council acknowledges that the timing of the confirmation of this programme was directly affected by:

- the opportunity to return to the previous programme for Christmas lights/trees was presented as a result of the supplementary funding made by the Scottish Government in March for the 2017/18 budget;

- the subsequent programme of consultation with local communities allowing a plan to be developed in partnership with them.

Council notes that a tender is currently being produced for Christmas lights/tree provision for the period 2018/21 and that the outcome of this will be reported in good time to allow communities to plan for the festive period.

- moved by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor Ian Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the amendment was accepted in place of the terms of the motion.

Decision

To approve the following amended motion by Councillor Hutchison:

1) To welcome the programme to provide festive lighting across the city for 2017/18.

2) Council acknowledge that the timing of the confirmation of this programme was directly affected by:

- the opportunity to return to the previous programme for Christmas lights/trees was presented as a result of the supplementary funding made by the Scottish Government in March for the 2017/18 budget;

- the subsequent programme of consultation with local communities allowing a plan to be developed in partnership with them.

3) To note that a tender was currently being produced for Christmas lights/tree provision for the period 2018/21 and that the outcome of this would be reported in good time to allow communities to plan for the festive period.

22 Developer Contributions – Emergency Motion by Councillor Ritchie

The Lord Provost ruled that the following item, notice of which had been given at the start of the meeting, be considered as a matter of urgency to allow the Council to give early consideration to this matter.

The following motion by Councillor Ritchie was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

"The Council:

1. Notes the recent decision by the Supreme Court sitting in Edinburgh on the case involving the Elsick Development Company Ltd and the Aberdeen City and Shire Strategic Development Authority.

2 Notes that the court found that the Authority's supplementary guidance on developer contributions to be unlawful.

3. Notes that the Scottish Government is reviewing the process of funding development infrastructure and that new proposals are likely to be contained in draft legislation published by the end of the year.

4. Notes that the Scottish Government has not yet confirmed that the Council may adopt its Supplementary Guidance on Developer Contributions.

5. In the meantime requests the Head of Legal Services in consultation with the Chief Planning Officer to review the implications of the Elsick ruling for the Council's procedures for collecting developer contributions and to report the outcome to Planning Committee."

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Ritchie.

23 Settlement Agreement with Viridor Waste Management Limited – referral from the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee

The Council, in terms of Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, excluded the public from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business for the reason that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 8 and 10 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on a settlement agreement with Viridor Waste Management Limited ("Viridor") to cover various issues arising out of a long-standing waste contract to the Council for approval of the use of reserves to meet the settlement agreement.

Decision

To approve the use of reserves to meet the settlement agreement costs.

(References: Finance and Resources Committee 28 September 2017 (item 20); referral report from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted)

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 2 of 26 October 2017)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question	**(1)**	When will the much anticipated East Fettes Avenue Crossing Point from Inverleith Park to Broughton High School finally be constructed?
Answer	**(1)**	Consultation on the proposed design for the crossing improvement is due to commence shortly. Following this, it will be necessary to undertake the statutory process for a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to alter the existing parking facilities to accommodate the new crossing point. The TRO process usually takes six to nine months to complete. It is therefore currently expected that, subject to the successful completion of the TRO process, the crossing will be constructed during the 2018 school summer holidays.
Question	**(2)**	Why has it taken so long?
Answer	**(2)**	Unfortunately the demands on our roads services have meant that this project has not been able to be progressed to date. I have asked officers to ensure that the proposed delivery date of summer 2018 is achieved.
Supplementary Question		Thank you very much indeed Convener for your answers and I would be extremely grateful if you could keep me informed to the progress. Thank you. No further question.
Supplementary Answer		Happy to do so.

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** Why does the Council's Active Travel Plan, as refreshed in 2016, make no mention of Kirkliston or, other than a reference to the completed cycle route NCN 1 cycle route, Queensferry?

Answer **(1)** Many areas of Edinburgh are not specifically named in the Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP).

Question **(2)** Why do the seven maps contained within the Active Travel Plan specifically exclude Kirkliston and Queensferry?

Answer **(2)** Six of the maps referred to are extracts from census data, principally included for illustrative purposes. To make them more readable, these exclude some areas towards the edge of the Council area. However, a link to the source website will be added to the electronic version of the ATAP on the Council website enabling the reader to access maps covering the full Council area.

The seventh map shows the proposed QuietRoutes network. This network extends to the entire Council area, including Kirkliston and Queensferry but unfortunately the westernmost part of the city was omitted from the published 2016 map in error. The electronic version of the ATAP will now be amended to show the full network.

Question **(3)** When will be Active Travel Plan next be refreshed?

Answer **(3)** The ATAP will be refreshed in 2018.

Question **(4)** What Active Travel projects are anticipated to be taken forward in Queensferry and Kirkliston, particularly in light of the Local Development Plan?

Answer **(4)** The Local Development Plan Action Programme includes a number of active travel projects associated with planned developments in the Queensferry/Kirkliston area including:

- **Builyeon Road (HSG 32)**
- **South Scotstoun (HSG 33)**
- **Dalmeny (HSG 34)**
- **Dalmeny Station**
- **West Edinburgh Transport Contribution Zone Pedestrian/Cycle Actions**

Information on each of these projects can be found on the Council website: http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20013/planning_and_building/66/edinburgh_local_development_plan

Projects in the ATAP are dependent on developments proceeding and on securing the necessary planning conditions and/or funding/implementation agreements with the relevant developers.

Supplementary Question

Thank you very much. I thank the Convener for the answers she has provided. Does she recognise that if this document had been published, dare I say, with so many maps excluded, say Liberton and Gilmerton, then perhaps her and her constituents would probably be as frustrated as mine.

Does she accept that practices such as this only fuel the perception which does exist in many parts of Queensferry and Kirkliston that they are not a priority and can I at least just ask her for her help to try and ensure that documents like this more accurately reflect the fact that this is a Council which serves all of the communities in the City and not just those within the City Bypass?

Supplementary Answer

Councillor Lang I'm happy to agree that all areas are important to this Edinburgh Council and that indeed they should be reflected in terms of the electronic presence in the publication of our, in this case, Travel Plan. I think the written answer that was given gives you a full commitment that it's now going to be amended to show the full network of maps and I think that's something that we can all welcome, particularly the residents of your particular Ward. I can go no further than that other than to commit to the fact that I've been talking to officials about the need to reflect all of these areas. We are conscious of changes that are occurring in your area and we need to be cogniscant of that in all of our work. Thank you.

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** How many free to use car parks are owned and maintained by the Council and will she publish a list of such car parks?

Answer **(1)** There are three Park and Ride car parks owned and maintained by the Council:

- Hermiston Park and Ride
- Ingliston Park and Ride
- Straiton Park and Ride

There are a number of locations through the city which may be used as parking by the public and/or residents. We will work to provide a comprehensive list of these locations over the next couple of weeks.

Question **(2)** Which of these car parks are open and accessible to caravans and motorhome vehicles?

Answer **(2)** Only Ingliston Park and Ride is open and accessible to caravans and motorhome vehicles for day parking.

Question **(3)** Which of these car parks have restrictions on overnight parking?

Answer **(3)** Ingliston Park and Ride has restrictions on overnight parking.

Question **(4)** What statutory powers exist for the Council to introduce restrictions on overnight parking at its car parks?

Answer **(4)** Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are the only powers available in respect of restricting overnight parking in car parks. Ingliston Park and Ride is the only Council facility which has an enforceable TRO in place to restrict overnight parking.

Supplementary Comment	Thank you again for the answers. My question really related less to park and ride and more to other car parks so given the Convener has promised some more data for me in the next couple of weeks I will hold off my supplementary until I get that information.

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** When was the £1m funding agreed for the redevelopment of the High Street in Queensferry?

Answer **(1)** This scheme budget was first approved at the Transport and Environment Committee on 12 January 2016.

Question **(2)** What progress has been made in the delivery of the project since this date?

Answer **(2)** Procurement is progressing for the appointment of a consultant to carry out consultation and design for the project. This appointment should be made by early 2018 and it is expected that the scheme will commence on site in late summer 2018.

Question **(3)** What specific improvements are expected to be delivered through this project?

Answer **(3)** The scheme is for sett renewal however it is recognised that this is an opportunity to improve the local infrastructure, parking control, traffic management and pedestrian areas.

A local project board will be appointed to oversee the consultation and design phases to ensure that the scheme takes account of all feedback provided.

Supplementary Question Thank you. A very simple question, given the funding for this was agreed in January 2016, for what reason is it going to take almost two years to even appoint a contractor let alone start work?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank Councillor Lang for his question. I agree the delay is very regrettable but now and again we do come across practical problems in terms of the tendering process or recruiting a consultant and I'm afraid that's what happened in this case. We got a long way down the road with the appointment of a consultant only for that individual to be barred in the end due to performance issues. So the Council then went through a traditional competitive tendering process but the delay in appointment has been partly due to a function of resource and competing priorities. We have lost some staff as a result of transformation in the North West Locality Team and that hasn't helped the process but in Spring/Summer of this year we undertook a pre-selection process with the support of the Procurement Team who also have noted that they have resource pressures too. But I would like to assure Councillor Lang that the Administration does remain wholly committed to the delivery of a successful town centre in consultation with the local community.

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Gloyer for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question

The Convener will be aware that Murrayfield Community Council hosted a site visit to Ellersly Road for council officers and Living Streets on the 15th of August. What progress has been made since that site visit on improving safety and access for pedestrians on Ellersly Road?

Answer

The site visit highlighted a number of improvements for safety and access and these are currently being reviewed to identify what engineering solutions can be implemented to improve safety.

Some of these can be delivered in the short term and will be delivered in the next six months.

Work is continuing to develop solutions to the more complex issues and I will ensure local members are kept updated on progress.

Supplementary Question

I'd like to thank the Convener for her answer. Of course we all appreciate that the more complex issues will take time to develop and implement and I look forward to further updates in due course. However, as you point out, on that site visit there were a number of things that were identified as "quick wins" and I'm a bit puzzled as to why they are going to take six months to implement. They were things like removing redundant road signs and moving a grit bin. They are small things but cumulatively they would make it very much easier for pedestrians to negotiate the narrowest sections of those pavements.

Could the Convener give me an assurance that these small minor improvements will be implemented before the end of this year?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Gloyer. I hesitate to commit departments to specific deadlines like that but I can assure you that when we refer to them being delivered within the next six months it does not mean we are going to be waiting until five and a half months from now to deliver all of them.

You will have seen, no doubt, that there is a wide range, and you are correct they are relatively small pieces of work but there are a number of them including such things as removing redundant and ineffective signage, road layout warning, etc. So, some of these require processes to be gone through. I will be asking officials to expedite them as quickly as possible.

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Gloyer for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question

A signalised pedestrian crossing across the A8 at Kaimes Rd was first assessed as having high priority in October 2009. At what stage is the design of this crossing at present?

Answer

The majority of the funding for this crossing was secured through the Planning process, via a Section 75 Agreement with a developer. This funding became available for use by the Council in late November 2016.

It is intended to implement the crossing as part of a wider scheme of improvements to the Council's QuietRoute 9 and preliminary design work for this is currently underway. Consultation on the proposals is planned to take place shortly and it is currently expected that these will be implemented during financial year 2018/19.

Supplementary Question

Again, thank you for your answer. It's very good to have it confirmed that the Section 75 funding is in place and I'm pleased to read there will be consultation on the proposals. It seems to me that this is an opportunity to improve access around the crossing as well as just between the two pavements. For example, there are a couple of steps down to the footpath to Traquair Park which mean that anyone in a wheelchair or with a pram has to detour through the Forestry Commission's grounds.

Could the Convener ensure that the consultation that's envisaged includes people who would actually use the crossing and that they are able to influence the final design?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Gloyer. Yes, I can confirm that and I hope we will also have your input to that consultation too. Thank you.

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question

When will the council publish technical drawings for their proposals for carriageway changes to:

a) Picardy Place

b) Leith Street

Answer

Picardy Place

Transport and Environment Committee on 5 October agreed to carry out further engagement on the transport layout for Picardy Place. The proposed designs will shortly be published online and at stakeholder and public events. The schedule of publication is currently being developed.

Leith Street

The redetermination order promoted for Leith Street went live on 3 October:

http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/downloads/download/2349/rso1713_leith_street_calton_road_greenside_row_waterloo_place

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her response. I'm sure she will agree with me that it's very difficult for a key stakeholder such as Living Streets or Spokes to respond to Council consultations on carriageway changes if the technical drawings have not been published. In her response she said that the redetermination order promoted for Leith Street has been published. That is correct but unfortunately it doesn't include technical drawings.

Will she give me, or will she give the Council, a date on which the technical drawings for these two streets will be published please?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Booth. I will not give you a precise date at this particular meeting because I've not had a chance to discuss it officials and it also requires them to augment what is already there on the online presence but I will undertake to get that done as quickly as I possibly can.

I'd like to speak also to the Picardy Place element in the question that you asked. I'd like to take this opportunity to remind people that we are actually delaying our processes on Picardy Place in order to expand our degree of consultation on that. I hope that that will be welcomed by all those who have been considering this question.

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** If he will produce a table showing

(a) which community centres will see a reduction in the number of hours of janitorial cover arising from the current review of facilities management and

(b) the number of hours reduction being proposed at each centre.

Answer **(1)** The Facilities Management service is subject to a formal organisational review across the City. This involves a formal consultation process with the janitorial staff covered by the review and with the relevant trade unions. This process is due to conclude in December.

Following the closure of the consultation, the service will be in a position to produce a clear breakdown of the “as is” and “to be” arrangements which will be introduced.

Question **(2)** Which community centre management committees have received formal notification of the proposed new levels of janitorial cover?

Answer **(2)** Running alongside the formal consultation with janitorial staff, there has been a programme of community centre engagement visits, which remains ongoing, with management committees to discuss with them the proposals for cover and how that best can fit in with the activities they provide. There are 38 community centres in Edinburgh and to date 26 have taken up the opportunity to discuss the Facilities Management service review.

Question **(3)** What hourly rate will be charged to community centres for the mobile janitor(s) to attend outwith the hours covered by their assigned janitor?

Answer **(3)** The charging for janitorial support is an integral part of the review of the Facilities Management service. A fundamental principle of this is that the service cannot offer services which operate at a loss. As such, work is underway to prepare a suite of charges which will be applied when janitorial support is required out of hours. This is due for completion in December and these charges will form part of the Facilities Management Business Plan from the next financial year.

Question **(4)** What assessment has been made of the expected cuts to community organisations, clubs and other activities which may arise from the reduction in core hours and charges for mobile janitors?

Answer **(4)** Community centres across the City receive services from three different Council areas: Lifelong Learning, Business Support and Facilities Management. All of these areas have had or are undertaking organisational reviews, aligned to approved Council budget decisions, which affect the levels of support that the Council as a whole is able to provide to each individual Centre.

This does throw up a range of issues and to consider these, the Council has established an internal officer working group from the three services to consider the impact and interdependencies that the changes to each function will have. Part of this group's remit is to consider what activities take place during the week in each centre and how best the Council can support them.

Question **(5)** Why have elected members received no formal briefings from officials on the specific changes being proposed at each community centre and the likely impact of such changes?

Answer **(5)** Formal briefings have previously taken place with elected members on the wider Facilities Management review. Meetings will be arranged with political groups once the final model for Janitorial services has been agreed with staff, unions and Communities and Families.

In addition, some management committees have invited their local Councillors along to the meetings they are holding

with the Facilities Management review team and I would encourage members to engage with this approach.

Supplementary Question **(1)** Thank you. I have to say I was quite puzzled by the answers which the Convener provided in the questions that I asked here. It's recognised that specific revised levels of cover have already been provided to a number of community centres and to management committees. So, why was that information not able to have been provided to this Council today in response to the question that I asked? Are we really at a point where we have to start asking freedom of information requests to get this kind of basic information? And, secondly, will a final set of proposals be subject to a decision of any Committee of this Council?

Supplementary Answer **(1)** I thank Councillor Lang for his question. To answer the second question first, the answer is yes these decisions will ultimately be made by a Council Committee. On the first point, I do understand that there are a number of things going on with the consultation process at the moment with the janitorial staff themselves. There's also a programme of community centre engagement visits going on. Most of the community centres have engaged. Some of those that have not, I think the majority of those that haven't has been because they are going to be unaffected by what's proposed, but I'd be happy to provide Councillor Lang with any additional information that he feels is lacking at the moment.

Supplementary Question **(2)** Sorry Lord Provost, I still don't understand why is it that the information that is already in the public domain that has been provided directly to community centres, why has that information not been provided to me in response to the first question that I asked. I do not understand why that information cannot be provided to this Council.

Supplementary Answer **(2)** Well, I can't answer that question definitively Lord Provost. It very much depends on precisely what information has been provided to each of the community centres involved. But I'm happy to look at that question in more detail to see if there are any issues which could be resolved.

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Staniforth for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

On Friday 13th October the Bank of Scotland announced its intention to close the Museum on the Mound permanently on 29th December 2017.

Question **(1)** Did the Bank of Scotland discuss its intentions with the Council before announcing the closure?

Answer **(1)** No contact was made with the Culture service prior to the closure being announced.

Question **(2)** What action can being taken by Council to ensure that valuable educational services continue uninterrupted and that safeguards public access to the museum artefacts?

Answer **(2)** A meeting will be requested with the Museum Curator to explore what aspects of the Collection may fit with the Council's Museums Collecting Policy should the Bank of Scotland decide to dispose of any part of their Collection.

Question **(3)** What action is being taken to safeguard other privately owned educational and cultural venues?

Answer **(3)** While the Council maintains regular contact with cultural providers in the city, we are not actively involved in safeguarding privately operated educational or cultural venues.

Supplementary Question I thank the Convener for his answers. They were very illuminating. Would the Convener be willing to write to the Lloyds Banking Group to express dismay at the closure of the Museum of the Mound and ask them to reverse their decision?

Supplementary Answer	Thank you Councillor Staniforth. Yes, I'm very happy to do that and, as it says in the answer, we have set up a meeting to discuss this. I share the sentiments. The problem with obviously private collections is that they are private so we don't have any comprehensive list of these collections across the City so it very much is on a case by case basis. You have flagged up this case and I thank you for that. I'm more than happy to say yes to that.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

School Recruitment

Question

For all recruitment into school based rolls from June 2017 to date, what is the average:

a) Number of days between job advertisement and interview?

b) Number of days between interview and first written offer being made?

c) Number of days from requesting PVG checks from candidates and gaining PVG certification?

d) The proportion of first offers that are accepted.

Answer

a) The closing date for the post should be one week after the advert goes live. Information is usually included when interviews will take place to allow candidates to plan ahead. On average 7-14 days after closing date.

b) Successful candidates' paperwork is processed by the school Business Manager and passed to the recruitment team – the length of time before written confirmation is received is variable.

c) The average time from us sending a PVG application to Disclosure Scotland and getting a certificate back is 8.5 days.

d) Schools and Lifelong Learning don't hold this information centrally, but would estimate that almost all are accepted.

Supplementary Question

Thank you. I'd like to thank the Convener for his answer and also just register my slight shock at the lack of precision with some of the data. This information is pretty standard I would say in the private sector so I am surprised that we don't have a good feel for the length of time it's taking to make offers, the length of time it's taking for them to be accepted and the acceptance rate. Certainly, at a parent council I was recently at, the Head Teacher was very disappointed that several of the offers she had made to candidates were turned down because they had already accepted alternative employment.

So, would the Convener consider gathering this information?

Supplementary Answer

I was going to ask you, I presume you were talking about a specific appointment here, and obviously you've just clarified that. I'm quite happy to look at that. The information you got is very generalised but if you have a specific issue then I'm willing to take that up and give you an answer.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Regulatory Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** How many licences have been issued by the Council to commercial dog walkers since their inception in 2014?

Answer **(1)** The Council has no power to licence commercial dog walkers under existing licensing legislation.

The Council introduced a Commercial Dog Walkers scheme in 2014 to city parks where the parks management rules apply. This requires commercial dog walkers to register prior to any of these parks and to abide by a code of conduct.

382 dog walkers have registered since the introduction of the Commercial Dog Walkers scheme in 2014.

Question **(2)** How many complaints have been received in that time about the operation of licensed commercial dog-walkers?

Answer **(2)** Since 2014 four complaints have been received.

Question **(3)** How many of those complaints were upheld?

Answer **(3)** All four complaints were upheld and have been resolved.

Question **(4)** How many licenses have been revoked in that time?

Answer **(4)** No permits have been revoked as part of the Commercial Dog Walkers scheme.

Question **(5)** To ask what measures are taken to ensure dog walkers continue to meet the conditions of their licenses?

Answer **(5)** The code of conduct is published and available to all commercial dog walkers registered with the Council scheme. If we become aware that the code has been breached, we would arrange for the matter to be investigated and would contact the dog walker concerned.

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Johnston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** What steps does the Council take to ensure that third parties, such as power or telephone providers, reinstate road markings after works have completed?

Answer **(1)** A reinstatement carried out by a Utility company is considered not complete until the permanent replacement of any road markings have taken place.

The Council inspects 100% of all reinstatements carried out by Utilities during the 2 year guarantee period to make sure compliance with the Specification for Reinstatements on Roads.

If a reinstatement fails an inspection the Utility is charged an inspection fee and it is re-inspected every 17 days until it is completed correctly. Last year the Council carried out over 34,000 inspections.

Question **(2)** Does the council measure how many repairs have been effected within the twelve month post-works deadline?

Answer **(2)** Reinstatements are guaranteed for two years, or three years in the case of deep openings.

The council carries out monthly performance checks on all Utilities including the numbers of outstanding reinstatements. These are recorded and reported as part of a Performance Framework.

Supplementary Comment Thank you for that answer. I asked the question because there was some confusion about the extent of the guarantee paid but I'm pleased that's been clarified and it is indeed two years as opposed to one year. Thank you.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Smith for answer by the Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** When a council owned residential property becomes available when someone finishes their tenancy/leaves the property, how is the property evaluated and on what basis, to confirm any maintenance/repairs that are required?

Answer **(1)** Where a termination has been notified in advance and where access is provided, a pre-termination inspection is carried out to identify if there are any issues that will result in a chargeable repair so that these can be advised to the tenant. This inspection is carried out during while the tenancy is 'live'.

For all tenancy terminations a comprehensive property condition inspection is carried out by a Quality Control Officer (QCO). This will identify if there are any repairs required to bring the property back up to the agreed 'Standard of Let'. This is due to be reviewed in 2018.

Question **(2)** How is this evaluation reviewed and by whom?

Answer **(2)** There is no evaluation of the QCO inspection as the 'Standard of Let' states the conditions which apply. Any works undertaken are inspected by the QCO or Housing Property Team Leader. The local Housing Officer will also inspect the property following completion of the works in advance of arranging a viewing for prospective tenants.

Question **(3)** Please confirm the total costs of repairs/maintenance per year on council owned residential properties between tenancies for the last 3 years.

Answer	**(3)**	2014/15 - £6,893,666 (2,878 properties) 2015/16 – £5,307,994 (2,280 properties) 2016/17 - £7,528,229 (2,467 properties) April to Sept 2017 - £3,305,042 (1,832 properties)
Question	**(4)**	Of those repairs, does the council monitor or review the percentage of those relating to normal wear and tear, and those caused by damage? If so, please also provide details of this for each of the last 3 years.
Answer	**(4)**	The Council records details of the tenant where repairs are identified as either deliberate or careless. It does not record the number of repairs carried out in these circumstances.
Supplementary Question		Thank you very much and I thank the Convener for his thorough answers. May I ask if the Convener would be happy to meet with me to discuss the specific case in my Ward which led to me asking the questions in advance of the review which he mentions in his answer to Question 1?
Supplementary Answer		Thank you to Councillor Smith for her question. Absolutely, my door is open to any Councillor who wants to discuss Ward issues at any time.

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Doggart for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** Will the Convener please confirm that the Administration still anticipates the opening of the new primary school in Caanan Lane in 2020?

If completion is not anticipated for that date, could the Convener set out a new target for the opening of the much needed school in the south of the city?

Answer **(1)** Yes, the current estimate is that construction of the new school building will be complete by August 2020.

Question **(2)** Will the Convener explain what financial impact the new building will have on existing school budgets, particularly for South Morningside Primary?

Answer **(2)** There is no change proposed to the methods which are used to calculate the budget for South Morningside Primary School.

Question **(3)** Will the Convener meet with the South Morningside Primary Parent Council to explain how the administration will meet its target, provide the finance to maintain the high standards of South Morningside Primary and avoid the problems that have affected the opening of the new Boroughmuir school building?

Answer **(3)** Before the end of the year, Council Officers are due to set up meetings with all the families from existing schools who will be affected by the creation of the new school. As Convener I would also be delighted to meet with the Parent Council of South Morningside Primary School.

Supplementary Question	**(1)**	Lord Provost, thank you to the Convener for his answers. In August, Councillor Neil Ross asked around the issues affecting Oaklands Care Home and the concerns that parents had that the unresolved issues around that Care Home would delay the completion of the school at Canaan Lane. So, is the Convener able to confirm that the issues affecting Oaklands Care Home have indeed been resolved and they will have no subsequent impact on the completion date of the new school?
Supplementary Answer	**(1)**	Sorry, I'm a bit confused as the question was about South Morningside Primary School here, not Oaklands. If you could clarify what the link between the two are.
Supplementary comment	**(2)**	Absolutely, South Morningside Primary School is connected to the new school that will be built in Canaan Lane and the parents are concerned, as you can see from the question, that there would be funding issues.
Supplementary Answer	**(2)**	Right, okay. Well, I think in the answer to your last question, I'm quite happy to meet the parents. Obviously, this is a fairly complicated issue which would take a long time to explain in this Chamber and it would be better to meet the parents to hear from them directly what the issues are. So, I'll give you a commitment that I'll meet them with yourself.

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** Do we maintain a central register of all Section 75 contributions agreed with developers?

Answer **(1)** Whilst there is no register of all Section 75 contributions, officers monitor contributions expected and collected from developers as part of the overall monitoring of planning obligations.

Question **(2)** What date was this register started?

Answer **(2)** Systematic monitoring of Section 75 contributions has been undertaken for approximately ten years.

Question **(3)** What is the total value of all section 75 contributions agreed since the register was started?

Answer **(3)** Since 2014 £25m of Section 75 contributions have been received.

Question **(4)** What is the value of unchallenged section 75 payments made that were included on the register?

Answer **(4)** The Council does not record the value of unchallenged Section 75 payments made.

Question **(5)** Is the collection rate since the date of the register higher or lower than the collection rate prior to the register?

Answer **(5)** We do not hold a record of collection rates prior to the recording of Section 75 contributions. In monitoring contributions it is recognised that the levels of Section 75 contributions have fluctuated in recent years depending on the nature of individual developments and general construction rates of developers in the city.

Supplementary Question

I thank the Convener for his answer. I actually asked for this in response to something a constituent had raised with me. She had told me, and I was surprised to hear it, that the Council didn't keep a record of all the Section 75s that have been agreed by Planning. And, I'm rather surprised to find the Convener confirming that. That had come about after an incident in my Ward where the best part of £1m that had been agreed with the developer wasn't, in fact, paid due to a lack of management shall we say.

So, what confidence can the Convener give me and my constituent that we now have a process in place so that once Section 75s have been agreed with developers we are managing that through to the money coming to this City?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you very much for the question. Although there is no formal register for recording planning obligation contributions, all planning determinations and all planning obligations whether achieved through statutory means through Section 75 or any other planning legislation are recorded on the Council's Uniform Database that is publicly available and all the information is there to see. In anticipation of your question and your supplementary question, I've got further information here on the scale of charges that we've had on various different subject areas over various different years and I'm more than happy to share it with you.

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** Can the Convener confirm if and when a school catchment area review will take place (in particular in Pentland Hills given all the new FAMILY 4/5 bed homes being built! – this also covers Kirkliston and Ratho as these children go to Balerno HS)?

Answer **(1)** A report to the Education, Children and Families Committee on 10 October 2017 provided an update on the proposals for informal consultation to take place with school communities in the west and south west of the city. Workshop sessions looking at options for potential catchment changes will be held with school communities during November and Officers are currently finalising the detail of the options which will be presented. Local members will be informed about the options in advance of them being discussed with the school communities. Only once the views of the school communities have been heard and considered will final proposals for any statutory consultations be brought forward to the Committee for consideration.

Question **(2)** Can the Convener confirm what consultation had taken place regarding the catchment area review with:

a) The Schools – High Schools and Primary

b) The Community Councils

Answer **(2)** The detail for consultation with the schools is provided in the answer above. As part of the informal consultation period Council Officers will also engage with appropriate Community Councils.

Question **(3)** Can the Convener confirm when the outcomes will be presented?

Answer **(3)** A further update on the informal consultation process will be provided to Committee in December 2017.

Supplementary Question	Thank you very much and thank you Convener for your answers to my question. A couple of supplementaries. Can I just get an assurance from you that, in fact, all the local schools will be involved in these consultations that are scheduled to take place in November. And, again, as these workshops are scheduled to take place in November as I've just said, and November starts next week, that perhaps the Convener might provide the dates for these consultations as soon as possible? Thank you.
Supplementary Answer	I'm quite happy to confirm that all primary schools will be involved and I'm also happy, as soon as we have had the meetings with the local councillors involved, because that's not happened yet, and it's going to happen as soon as possible hopefully. And once that's happened and the local councillors understand what the proposals are it will then go out to consultation in November some time.

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** What factors are considered in the siting of general waste litter bins in public areas and when was there last a review of such bin provision?

Answer **(1)** Currently sites are assessed and a decision is made on the suitability of the site based on the intensity of use (i.e. how well used it is), complaints and history of littering in the area. There is an ongoing review of this with a draft policy document being developed.

Question **(2)** How many general waste litter bins have been removed per ward over the past 5 years?

Answer **(2)** We do not record the number of waste litter bins removed.

Question **(3)** How many of these bins have been replaced per ward?

Answer **(3)** As above.

Question **(4)** How many outstanding requests are there for litter bins and at what locations?

Answer **(4)** There are currently three outstanding litter bin requests. Two in Meadows Morningside and one in Southside Newington.

Question **(5)** As at 11th September Council staff e-mailed: "We are unable to supply a new litter bin at the moment due to none being available". When were litter bins last available?

Answer **(5)** We are currently using a number of second hand bins to replace damaged bins or be placed where there is an identified need. Additional bins are currently being ordered.

Supplementary Question **(1)** Thank you Lord Provost and for that build up although the question is not really that exciting. I thank the Convener for the answers to her questions. I've got a couple of points to make and it's simply in relation to the ongoing review and draft policy, whether there's a timescale for that reporting as I wasn't aware of it at all and in particular in terms of the new bins being ordered if there was a timescale for that.

The second issue was in relation to Answer (4), I find it very hard to believe that there are only three outstanding requests. I know personally of quite a number in my Ward so I'd quite like to understand how these figures have been collated because I think that answer is erroneous. A very final point, it has been raised with me by a community group as to whether, and this may be able to form part of the review of the policy, if a community group was to purchase or put funds towards buying general waste litter bins and agreeing a location with the Council whether the Council would be willing to empty those bins? Thank you.

Supplementary Answer **(1)** Thank you very much for the supplementary question. Clearly if you are stating that there are outstanding bin requests, we will have to look into that and I will come back to you specifically on that particular point. I'm surprised to hear if they haven't been recorded. It depends I suppose on the nature of the request that's gone in.

In terms of the last point you made about communities being able to provide their own bins, that's something I'd like to discuss with the Head of Service and I'll come back to you again on that. Thank you.

Supplementary Question **(2)** On the question of the general timescale for review of the policy, is there a timescale?

Supplementary Answer **(2)** Again, that's something I'd like to come back to you with after discussing it with the officials. Thank you.

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** Why did it take over 3 months to get the street lights back on for the section of Lanark Road West between Bridge Road & Ravelrig Road in Balerno?

Answer **(1)** The Council and Scottish Power Energy Networks (SPEN) have been working to resolve this issue since July this year. Following investigations on site, SPEN were able to provide power to the street lights on Bridge Road on 25 September 2017, but Lanark Road West remained dark.

The latest information from SPEN is that they are having difficulty pinpointing the location of the fault that affected the street lights on Lanark Road West and continue with their investigations.

Question **(2)** Since work has been done on Q1, why are the lights on 24 hours a day (apart from one which doesn't come on at all) on this stretch of road?

Answer **(2)** SPEN are having difficulty locating the point of the fault, so they are currently on 24 hours in the hope that the fault becomes "open circuit" and they will have the fault location and can carry out a permanent repair.

Question **(3)** Lampposts appear to have codes associated with them – why do these not appear on the Council Website or on lampposts themselves? (responses from the street light team note codes which if made available would assist in the identification of those reported as being faulty).

Answer **(3)** Each of the Council's Street Lighting Assets have a unique asset number. In the case of column mounted lights, the asset number is normally displayed on the column, through the use of sticky labels. Depending on the age of the column, these can become faded or dislodged. The Council's Street Lighting function is currently looking at ways

	of replacing the asset numbers as part of an ongoing maintenance regime. The Council's Street Lighting function is currently engaging with the Council's ICT function to discuss improvements to the Council's website to include the display of Asset Numbers, which would help users reporting faults.
Supplementary Question	Thank you Lord Provost and can I thank Councillor Macinnes for the answers to my questions. Just referring to Question (1), I would be grateful if you could use your influence to set a timescale for Scottish Power to fix these street lights on this stretch of Lanark Road West. Thank you.
Supplementary Answer	I am certainly happy to exert some degree of pressure on that but clearly there are probably technical considerations that I suspect neither you nor I are qualified to discuss. I will certainly, through our officials, try to exert some pressure on that. Thank you.

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Mary Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question Under the current Facilities Management Review proposals, what is the staffing proposal for Head of Establishments?

Answer The impact of having reduced numbers of CLD staff combined with a review of the roles and responsibilities of newly created posts within a new service ie Lifelong Learning Service has resulted in there being the need for a new approach to supporting the Voluntary Organisations who are managing Community Centres in partnership with the Council.

At present, community centres across the City receive support from three different Council services: Lifelong Learning, Business Support and Facilities Management.

The Council has established an officer working group from the three services to consider the impact and interdependencies that the changes to each function will have. Part of this group's remit is to consider what activities take place during the week in each centre and how best the Council can support them

Question **(2)** What is the proposed level of janitorial cover for each community centre?

Answer **(2)** The Facilities Management service is subject to a formal organisational review across the City. This involves a formal consultation process with the janitorial staff covered by the review and with the relevant trade unions. This process is due to conclude in December.

Following the closure of the consultation, the service will be in a position to produce a clear breakdown of the "as is" and "to be" arrangements which will be introduced.

Question	**(3)**	Will community centres have janitorial cover for weekend use?
Answer	**(3)**	Individual community centres will have allocated hours of janitorial support. It is not anticipated that the service will provide support routinely over the weekend but will work with other council service areas and management committees to help provide the support they need.
Supplementary Question		Thank you Lord Provost and thanks to the Convener for his answers. I was just wondering, I noticed in Question (1) there isn't exactly an answer about Head of Establishment and I would be grateful if more clarity could be provided if a Head of Establishment post is being considered for community centres now community learning development workers have been withdrawn.
Supplementary Answer		You'll notice from the report we're in consultation at the moment and that consultation will finish in December. Not only have the staff been consulted but community centres have been consulted. Once the results of that consultation have been, once we know that, then we can make a judgement about how it's going to affect community centres and it's obviously up to this Council if it wants to respond. What we're trying to do is get the community centres to reflect on the position the Council's in in relation to budget and see if there's some way they can support their own centres voluntarily. So that discussion is ongoing but there shouldn't be any changes to anything until after the New Year.

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 October 2017

Question **(1)** Please list by month the number of requests received since 1 November 2016 to clear leaves from footpaths and cycle paths and in each month listing the requests received by phone; email; web; twitter; in person, and by letter.

Answer **(1)** Table 1 below shows the number of requests received since November 2016.

Question **(2)** Please list the dates since 1 November 2016 when large mechanical sweepers have swept the off-road cycle paths, including but not limited to the Roseburn, Warriston, Water of Leith and Ferry Road paths.

Answer **(2)** There is currently no recording of Mechanical Sweeping of Cycleways. There were 50 recorded cleaning actions recorded from 1 November 2016 to 17 October 2017. This does not include reactive work from the enquiries in Question 1.

Question **(3)** Please provide the URL on the council's website where concerns with

a) footpaths

b) off-road cyclepaths

can be reported

Answer **(3)** https://my.edinburgh.gov.uk/app/report_it_forms/litter

Question **(4)** What action has been taken since 1 November 2016 to implement a proactive approach to the sweeping of leaves from footpaths and cyclepaths?

Answer **(4)** Areas such as those with high footfall, on cycle paths, near sheltered accommodation are being prioritised. As part of the ongoing work to implement Routesmart for the mechanical sweeper routes, seasonal leaf fall routes are being developed to allow the service to track actual work carried out in the future. Unfortunately these routes will not be available this autumn/winter however intelligence gathered over this period will be built into their design.

Seasonal variations make it difficult to proactively route resources for leaf collection. At present areas are targeted through local knowledge, site inspections by street cleansing staff and from enquiries made by the public.

Table 1

Leaves Location	Yearmo	Phone	Email	Web	Twitter	In Person	Letter	Internal Memo	Grand Total
⊟Cycleway	2016 12		1						1
Cycleway Total			**1**						**1**
⊟Not Cycleway	2016 11	140	26	5	7	3			181
	2016 12	84	20	6	3		2		115
	2017 01	43	17	1	2	3		1	67
	2017 02	16	9	1	4	3	1		34
	2017 03	7	3						10
	2017 04	3		1			1		5
	2017 05		4						4
	2017 06		2						2
	2017 07		2	1					3
	2017 08	2							2
	2017 09	1	3			1			5
	2017 10	10	11	2					23
Not Cycleway Total		**306**	**97**	**17**	**16**	**10**	**4**	**1**	**451**
Grand Total		**306**	**98**	**17**	**16**	**10**	**4**	**1**	**452**

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her response. I must admit to being somewhat surprised by the response, in particular to the first part of my question. The answer says that only one complaint about leaves has been received on cycleways in the last year. I know that I've submitted a handful myself so it would appear that not all of the complaints are being logged. I would be grateful if she could confirm that she will investigate why that is apparently not happening.

In response to my question about how members of the public can report, in particular online, problems with leaves on foot and cycle paths, she, in her response, has provided a form to reporting litter. I wasn't aware that litter included leaf litter but perhaps that could also be made clear on the website. And also there is no way of reporting problems crucially in our off-road cycle network. I'd be grateful if she could address that point.

I suppose the general point is that, if we expect members of the public to use foot and cycle to get around, then surely we as a Council have a responsibility to ensure that our facilities for pedestrians and cyclists are well maintained.

Can she give a commitment to ensuring that this improves in future?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Booth. Yes, I will be very happy to investigate the first point as to why we only have one recorded and you're indicating that more have been made. Clearly there may be some issues with the system in that case.

In terms of reporting specifically on leaf litter, I will be happy to talk to officials about how we can improve that particular interaction with the public to allow that to be more effective.

In terms of how we improve this level of service, I mean clearly it's a regular winter occurrence, we can see that from the statistics, it's those vital four months across the winter months. You'll notice in Answer (4) that's been given a reference to Routesmart. This is obviously something that has been implemented for waste collections but, in this particular case, will also be used to inform mechanical leaf sweeping routes. Clearly we have to take time to feed information in to that system to get up fully and running but I think it promises to deliver more effectively than the current system. I hope you'll give us some time to see the benefits of that. Thank you.