

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 1 February 2018

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 Duggart
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
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
Cameron Rose
Neil Ross
Jason Rust
Stephanie Smith
Alex Staniforth
Mandy Watt
Susan Webber
Iain Whyte
Donald Wilson
Norman J Work
Louise Young

1 South West Schools Review – Motion by Councillor Webber – referral from the Pentlands Neighbourhood Partnership

a) Deputations

i) Currie Community High School Parent Council and Juniper Green Primary School Parent Group Council

The deputation expressed concern that the proposals in the South West Schools Review were a threat which they felt was damaging to the community and urged the Council to listen to the responses being submitted to them. They indicated that the proposals impacted and unsettled the community and felt that they had been treated unfairly, causing stress and damaging those affected.

They urged the Council to communicate effectively with the community and look particularly at the effects on:

- the rising rolls review
- loss of green belt space
- peak time traffic
- loss of community facilities
- loss of partnership working
- dividing of communities with changes to catchment areas.

ii) Juniper Green Primary School Parent Group Council

The deputation stressed that evidence showed that the majority of parents and the wider community wanted to keep Currie Community High School on its existing site with its current catchment area. They expressed concern that the proposal to abolish the community high school would have an effect on educational attainment levels as there was no evidence that a merged school would have an attainment benefit.

The deputation indicated that the proposals would have an effect on:

- the relationship with Woodlands Special School
- traffic congestion and safer routes to school

- negative impact on the community in general
- accessible facilities for user groups

The deputation asked the Council to consider rebuilding or refurbishing Currie Community High School on its existing site with the existing catchment area supporting the feeder primaries and Woodlands Special School. They expressed a willingness to fully engage with the Council in this process.

iii) Trinity Academy Parent Council

The deputation expressed concern at the condition of Trinity Academy which formed part of the Wave 4 Schools and had been deemed in the poorest condition of all of the schools involved, with major defects identified. They recognised that the fabric of the building was in need of replacement or refurbishment, were aware of the redevelopment of other schools in other areas of the City and felt that the delays to improvements at Trinity Academy were unfair.

The deputation were concerned that with the activity around new projects in the south west of the city, Trinity Academy would once again be forgotten about. They urged the Council to keep the long standing needs of Trinity Academy to the forefront when considering the emerging needs of schools elsewhere.

b) Motion by Councillor Webber – referral from the Pentlands Neighbourhood Partnership

The Pentlands Neighbourhood Partnership had referred the following adjusted motion by Councillor Webber, in terms of Standing Order 16.1, on proposals for the Edinburgh South West Schools Review to the City of Edinburgh Council for information:

“To recognise the significant public reaction in opposition to the Edinburgh South West Schools Review and agree that the proposals demonstrate:

- a lack of understanding of the extraordinary characteristics of this area compared to other parts of the city
- no thought or consideration to the significant importance that the High Schools have within their respective communities (Balerno, Currie and Wester Hailes/Sighthill) and fails to recognise the mutually beneficial link that CCHS has with Woodlands School

- a lack of awareness that all 3 options presented to the communities face significant issues in terms of the impact on the transport and environmental issues that are already stretched beyond capacity

To acknowledge the valuable place Balerno High, Currie Community High School and WHEC hold within the local community and the value of the education they provide.

To note there have been serious shortcomings and concerns with the process of the informal consultation currently underway.

To acknowledge that significant concerns have been raised by local residents, the most prominent of which include:

- The need to undertake a full educational impact assessment of the proposals.
- The need to work with the wider community not just those with children at the schools.

Agrees to refer this motion to the next full meeting of City of Edinburgh Council for information as to the local community's concerns."

Motion

The Council acknowledges the comments made by the Pentlands Neighbourhood Partnership regarding the Edinburgh South West Schools Review and agrees to forward them to the Additional Meeting of the Education, Children & Families Committee on 29 March 2018. This additional meeting of the Committee has been called to consider the evidence and views of all interested parties who have agreed to participate in the informal consultation process. The Neighbourhood Partnership are welcome to attend and present their views.

In relation to the consultation process, meetings and events have been arranged to gather the views of all the parent councils, head teachers, schools and community councils involved.

The following workshops have been organised in conjunction with parent councils and attended/will be attended by the appropriate Education Officers and either/both the Convener/Vice Convener:

Workshop	Date	Time
Currie Primary School	Wednesday, 17 January	19:00 – 21:00
Clovenstone Primary School	Thursday, 18 January	18:30 – 20:30
Balerno High School	Monday, 22 January	18:30 – 20:30
Ratho Primary School	Tuesday, 23 January	18:30 – 20:30
Nether Currie Primary School	Wednesday, 24 January	19:00 – 21:00
Juniper Green Primary School	Thursday, 25 January	18:30 – 20:30
Dean Park Primary School	Monday, 29 January	19:00 – 21:00
Currie High School	Tuesday, 30 January	18:30 – 20:30
Woodlands School	Thursday, 1 February	18:45 – 20:15
Currie High School	Wednesday, 7 February	19:00 – 21:00
WHEC	Thursday, 8 February	18:30 – 20:30
Kirknewton Primary School	Monday, 19 February	18:30 – 20:30
Sighthill Primary School	Thursday, 22 February	18:30 – 20:30
Craigmount HS	TBC	TBC

The following are individual meetings with the Convener and Vice Convener, Parent Council Representatives and the Head Teacher:

School	Date	Time
WHEC	Thursday, 7 December	15.30 – 16.30
Balerno HS	Wednesday, 13 December	14.30 – 15.30
Currie HS	Wednesday, 13 December	16.30 – 17.30
Woodlands	Tuesday, 19 December	15.00 – 16.00
Forrester HS	Thursday, 11 January	16.00 – 17.00
Juniper Green PS	Wednesday, 24 January	14.30 – 15.30
Dean Park PS	Tuesday, 30 January	12.30 – 13.30
Clovenstone PS	Tuesday, 30 January	14.30 – 15.30
Nether Currie	Thursday, 8 February	14.00 – 15.00
Kirkliston PS	Wednesday, 28 February (TBC)	13.00 – 14.00
Ratho PS	Wednesday, 28 February	14.30 – 15.30
Hillwood PS	Wednesday, 28 February	16.00 – 17.00
Currie PS	Wednesday, 28 February	19.00 – 20.00
Sighthill PS	Thursday, 1 March	12.30 – 13.30
Canal View PS	Thursday, 1 March (TBC)	14.00 – 15.00

Communities and Families are arranging meetings with the affected Community Councils listed below. These are aiming to take place in the

period 19 February to 8 March and will be attended by either/both the Convener and Vice Convener with appropriate Education Officers:

- Balerno Community Council
- Currie Community Council
- Juniper Green & Baberton Community Council
- Colinton Community Council
- Ratho & District Community Council
- Wester Hailes Community Council

Separately, Currie Community Council have invited the Convener and Vice Convener to attend a Public Meeting on 6 February which Councillor Perry will attend with the appropriate Education Officer.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dickie

Amendment

To refer the matter to the next meeting of the Education, Children and Families Committee on 6 March 2018, and request an initial response from officials to that meeting on the concerns raised by Parent Councils and others.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Laidlaw

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	43 votes
For the amendment	-	18 votes

(For the motion: Lord Provost and 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, Macinnes, Lang, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Perry

(Reference – referral report from the Pentlands Neighbourhood Partnership, submitted)

Delaration of Interest

Councillor Bruce declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the parent of a young person at Balerno High School.

2 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 14 December 2018 as a correct record.

3 Questions

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

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Lang declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of the Edinburgh Airport Consultative Committee.

4 Leader's Report

The Deputy Leader presented the Leader's report to the Council. The Deputy Leader commented on:

- Council Budget – Coalition Pledges
- Achievements of Young People in the City – 2018 Year of Young People
- Homelessness in the City - Socialbite
- Picardy Place – revised plans
- Welcome the first Virgin Hotel to Edinburgh
- National Time to Talk day

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Councillor Whyte | - | Maintenance backlog in Council buildings |
| | - | Nature of Council business |
| Councillor Main | - | Scottish Budget Stage 1 Debate – Edinburgh's Allocation |
| Councillor Aldridge | - | Budget settlement |
| Councillor Howie | - | Reducing street furniture in the streets of Edinburgh |

Councillor Bruce	- South West Schools Review – consultation events
Councillor Arthur	- Walkabout in Fairmilehead Ward on 16 February 2018 – abandoned properties
Councillor Munro	- Meetings with Scottish Government ministers in regard to Council funding allocation
Councillor Fullerton	- Broomhouse Primary School – Sports Award - Redhall Special School – Rights Respecting Schools Award
Councillor Hutchison	- Open, transparent Coalition – consultation process
Councillor Brown	- Parkgrove area - potholes
Councillor Young	- Rainfall – severe flooding at Cramond Brig – traffic problems
Councillor Neil Ross	- HR Report – increased level of stress and tiredness
Councillor Lang	- Barnton Junction – congestion – meeting with Community Council
Councillor Doggart	- South West Localities Committee meeting - postponement
Councillor Osler	- School estate capacity and impact on communities

5 Appointments to Committees etc

The Council had agreed its political management arrangements and made appointments to a range of Committees, Boards, Joint Boards and outside organisations. Councillor Ritchie had resigned from the Education, Children and Families Committee and as Gaelic Champion, and the Council was required to appoint members in his place.

Decision

- 1) To note the resignation of Councillor Ritchie from the Education, Children and Families Committee, and appoint Councillor Howie in his place.

- 2) To note the resignation of Councillor Ritchie as Gaelic Champion and appoint Councillor Dickie in his place.

(References – Act of Council No 3 of 22 June 2017; Acts of Council Nos 8 and 9 of 29 June 2017)

6 Scheme of Delegation – Shared Repairs

Details were provided on changes that were required to the Scheme of Delegation following a decision of the Finance and Resources Committee in September 2017 regarding the payment of missing share payments and recovering missing share payments under the Housing Act 2006.

Decision

- 1) To repeal the existing Scheme of Delegation and approve in its place appendix one of the report by the Chief Executive, such repeal and approval to take effect from 2 February 2018.
- 2) To delegate to the Chief Executive to take such actions and make such minor adjustments to appendix one of the report as might be necessary to implement the decision of the Council in relation to this report and to produce a finalised version of the document.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee 5 September 2017 (item 28); report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

7 Rolling Actions Log

Details were provided on the outstanding actions arising from decisions taken by the Council from May 2015 to January 2018.

Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:

Action 1	Edinburgh Tram Extension – Next Steps
Action 2	St James Quarter – Update on Progress
Action 3	Appointments to Outside Organisations
Action 4	EU Referendum – Emergency Motion by Councillor Corbett
Action 5	Designation of Chief Education Officer

- Action 6 Appointment of Members to Committees, Board and Joint Boards
- Action 7 Council Diary 2016-17 and 2017-18
- Action 10 Appointments to Outside Organisations 2017-22
- Action 11 Grenfell Tower – Council Response to Fire Safety and Contingency Planning and motion by Councillor Mowat
- Action 13 Rent Pressure Zone – motion by Councillor Rae
- Action 15 Programme or the Capital – The City of Edinburgh Council Business Plan 2017-22
- Action 16 Edinburgh Festivals 70 Anniversary Legacy
- Action 17 Fair Fringe and Fair Hospitality Charter – motion by Councillor Cameron
- Action 19 Locality Committees 2017

- 2) To otherwise note the Rolling Actions Log.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, submitted.)

8 Edinburgh St James Growth Accelerator Model (GAM) – Update on Progress and Approval of New Financial Limit

An update was provided on the working arrangements between the City of Edinburgh Council, the Scottish Government and St James Edinburgh in the delivery of the St James Quarter Edinburgh project. In particular, information was provided on the Growth Accelerator Model Agreement, the Council project monitoring and member oversight arrangements and the requirement for additional expenditure in order to deliver an enhanced public realm package.

Motion

- 1) To note that Council had entered into the Growth Accelerator Model Agreement (“GAM”) with St James Edinburgh Limited, Certza Trustees 3 Limited and Certza Trustees 4 Limited (the Developer) under the delegated authority to the Chief Executive, which was approved by Council on 19 November 2015 and 10 March 2016 and signed on 21 June 2016.
- 2) To note that the Council had entered into the funding agreement with the Scottish Government as part of the Scottish Government annual contributions to the GAM, as approved by Council on 1 May 2014 and 19 November 2015.

This funding agreement related to works to be carried out by the Developer as prescribed in the GAM: the CEC Growth Assets.

- 3) To note that the funding cap (City of Edinburgh Council GAM Funding Gap) of new potential borrowing for the Works which would be maintained and repaid over a period of up to 25 years through a combination of public and private sector investment, all as approved by Council on 1 May 2014 was £61,400,000.
- 4) To note that all necessary property interests had now been acquired either through voluntary agreement or through the Compulsory Purchase Order process (CPO). The CPO was now complete.
- 5) To note the revised governance of the GAM and the cross-party Members oversight of the project as detailed in the update report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 6) To approve funding the projected £1.5m cost through realignment of the existing Carriageway and Footways block capital budget in 2020/21.

- moved by Councillor Barrie, seconded by Councillor Cameron

Amendment

- 1) To note that Council had entered into the Growth Accelerator Model Agreement (“GAM”) with St James Edinburgh Limited, Certza Trustees 3 Limited and Certza Trustees 4 Limited (the Developer) under the delegated authority to the Chief Executive, which was approved by Council on 19 November 2015 and 10 March 2016 and signed on 21 June 2016.
- 2) To note that the Council had entered into the funding agreement with the Scottish Government as part of the Scottish Government annual contributions to the GAM, as approved by Council on 1 May 2014 and 19 November 2015. This funding agreement related to works to be carried out by the Developer as prescribed in the GAM: the CEC Growth Assets.
- 3) To note that the funding cap (City of Edinburgh Council GAM Funding Gap) of new potential borrowing for the Works which would be maintained and repaid over a period of up to 25 years through a combination of public and private sector investment, all as approved by Council on 1 May 2014 is £61,400,000.
- 4) To note that all necessary property interests had now been acquired either through voluntary agreement or through the Compulsory Purchase Order process (CPO). The CPO was now complete.

- 5) To note the revised governance of the GAM and the cross-party Members oversight of the project as detailed in the update report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 6) To approve funding the projected £1.5m cost through realignment of the existing Carriageway and Footways block capital budget in 2020/21.
- 7) To welcome the improvements in the current proposals for the redevelopment of Picardy Place compared to previous plans, in particular the increase in segregated space for cyclists and the decrease in shared space; acknowledge that Transport and Environment Committee on 25 January 2018 voted, by majority, to proceed with the changes outlined; but nevertheless remained of the view that the design of the Picardy Place junction was a missed opportunity on the journey to a radically different city centre which was designed around the needs of people rather than traffic.
- 8) To agree the internal audit report on the project as outlined in paragraph 6.10 of the report would be referred to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee for consideration.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Miller

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	53 votes
For the amendment	-	8 votes

(For the motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Donaldson, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rankin, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Wilson, Work and Young.)

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Barrie.

(Reference – report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

9 City Deal – New Housing Delivery Partnership Implementation – referral from the Housing and Economy Committee

The Housing and Economy Committee had referred a report on proposals to enter into agreements with the Scottish Futures Trust to establish two Limited Liability Partnerships (LLPs) to own and manage housing for market and mid-market rent into the LLPs to the Council for confirmation of the appointment of members to the LLP Corporate Body.

Decision

To appoint the Executive Director of Place and Councillors Barrie, Cameron, Doggart and Rankin as the Council's representatives on the LLP Corporate Body.

(References – Housing and Economy Committee 18 January 2018 (item 11); referral from the Housing and Economy Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Cameron declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of the Board of an LLP organisation.

Councillors Barrie, Bridgman, Kate Campbell and Dixon declared a non-financial interest in the above item as registered social landlords.

10 Award of Energy Efficient Street Lighting Programme – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the award of a contract for the Street Lighting Energy Efficient Street Lighting Programme from 6 February 2018 to 31 December 2020, to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of spend to save funding of £768,470.

Decision

To approve the spend to save funding of £768,470.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee 23 January 2018 (item 15); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

11 603 Squadron - Motion by the the Lord Provost

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

“No 603 Squadron was formed in Edinburgh as an Auxiliary Air Force Squadron in 1925. The Squadron has the unique distinction of being the highest scoring squadron during the Battle of Britain when it destroyed the first enemy aircraft to be shot down over Britain in the Second World War.

This was an outstanding achievement given that the Squadron, which trained at Turnhouse, was comprised of part time Auxiliary pilots recruited from the City and the Lothians. The first spitfire to fly from Turnhouse remains on display today.

The Auxiliary Air Force was given the prefix ‘Royal’ after WW2 to mark its sterling performance during the war. Princess Elizabeth graciously accepted the position of Honorary Air Commodore of 603 Squadron in 1951, a position she retains, as Sovereign, to the present day. This is one of the longest associations that the Sovereign has enjoyed with any military unit in the UK.

The Royal Air Force reaches its centenary as the final commemorations of World War 1 take place in Edinburgh in 2018.

To mark this auspicious occasion, and in recognition of the vital contribution of ‘the few’ who protected Edinburgh and Scotland, the Council would like to honour 603 Squadron by agreeing to award the Freedom of the City.”

Decision

To unanimously approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

12 Edinburgh’s Christmas and Hogmanay 2017/18 - Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council

Notes:

- that Christmas and Hogmanay 2017/18 was the first year of a new contract to provide entertainment and animation to the City Centre;
- that there was a change of location for some of the siting of some of the events;

- that the scale of the event has increased and,

Requests:

- that the review of the contract for Edinburgh's Christmas and Hogmanay should recognise that the implementation of this contract cuts across many council functions and services and should be considered at the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee;

further requests:

- that given that this was the first year of operation of a new contract that the review is widened to include set up and take down;
- the impact on local businesses and residents;
- the siting of rides and lighting and whether these were appropriate for their locations given the impact some of these had on protected views such as the siting of the globe of lights and ride on George Street which were highly visible in views from the North of the City;
- that the economic impact of the events are assessed to determine whether the increased footfall resulted in increased spend in businesses located in Edinburgh all year round;
- that there is an assessment of access arrangements to the sites and the City Centre and whether access and ease of getting around the City Centre was improved or diminished;

and that the views of local businesses and residents are sought to ensure that where weaknesses are identified in this year's events these can be improved for future years."

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

13 Integration Joint Board - Motion by Councillor Doggart

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

"Council

1. Welcomes the re-allocation of resources by the Integration Joint Board to address the significant delays in care assessments and patients leaving hospital.

2. Requests the Council Leader to write to the Finance Secretary and the Health Secretary to request additional funding for City of Edinburgh Council to meet its statutory care requirements.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Doggart.

14 Roads Surface Treatment - Motion by Councillor Cook

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

“Council

Recognises concerns exist in respect of the use of surface treatment dressing works on a number of carriageways across the city;

Understands that while surface treatment dressing is a widely used preventative treatment which can mitigate the need for full resurfacing for up to ten years residents, councillors and parliamentarians have raised concerns over the quality of works, effectiveness and appropriate use of said treatment in various locations.

Instances have been reported of the treatment breaking up in weeks and of contractors failing to ensure that stone chips are properly embedded in the bitumen surface, in addition to contractors resurfacing around parked cars.

Agrees, as part of the next Roads Services Improvement Plan report to Transport and Environment Committee that a review be undertaken identifying the process required to better ensure the quality of future works.

Further agrees that this review provide residents with clarity around the criteria used to ensure that surface treatment work is used only in appropriate instances and not as a ‘quick fix’ to avoid the costs of full carriageway resurfacing.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Cook.

- moved by Councillor Cook, seconded by Councillor Douglas

The motion was adjusted by acceptance of the following addendum moved by Councillor Young and seconded by Councillor Lang:

1. To add at the end of paragraph 3:

Council recognises the efforts of officials to address these matters through street sweeping and additional treatment, accepts assurances that the cost of such additional work will be borne by the contractor but notes the added inconvenience to residents from the imposition of parking and loading restrictions whilst repair work is undertaken.

2. To add at the end of paragraph 4:

by identifying (i) the underlying causes of the deterioration in carriageway surfaces so soon after the initial resurfacing and (ii) what additional steps can be taken to ensure such issues do not arise in future.

Amendment

Council notes paragraphs 1 and 2 of the motion, deletes paragraph 3 and amends paragraph 4 and 5 to read:

That the Roads Services Improvement Plan report, due to be considered at the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee on 17 May 2018, include a review of the causes of the road surface treatment issues, the measures required to better ensure work is done right first time and clarify the criteria for use of this treatment, while acknowledging that many of these issues are already being addressed by officers.

- moved by Councillor Mcinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Cook:

Council

Notes concerns exist in respect of the use of surface treatment dressing works on a number of carriageways across the city;

Notes that while surface treatment dressing is a widely used preventative treatment which can mitigate the need for full resurfacing for up to ten years residents, councillors and parliamentarians have raised concerns over the quality of works, effectiveness and appropriate use of said treatment in various locations.

That the Roads Services Improvement Plan report, due to be considered at the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee on 17 May 2018, will include a review of the causes of the road surface treatment issues, the measures required to

better ensure work is done right first time and clarify the criteria for use of this treatment, while acknowledging that many of these issues are already being addressed by officers.

15 Short Term Letting - Motion by Councillor Lang

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

“Council:

1. recognises the ongoing concerns amongst residents affected by the increase in the short term letting of properties across the City.
2. notes the recent suggestion by AirBnB to introduce a 90 day limit on individual Edinburgh properties being listed on its website but further notes that peak periods around Christmas, Hogmanay and the summer festival season would be excluded from this restriction meaning properties could still be listed for well in excess of 90 days.
3. believes such a restriction on its own would be insufficient to address the issues which have emerged from the substantial increase in short term letting in the City.
4. therefore looks forward to the opportunity to fully consider both the recommendations of the Scottish Expert Panel on the Collaborative Economy and the Scottish Government’s response so a consensus can be developed on how to best address issues around short term property letting.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Osler

Amendment 1

Deletes all after “Council:” and replaces with:

1. Notes the previous motion that was agreed at Council on 14 December 2017 and that there is cross party consensus on the need to develop a policy on short term lets.
2. Council notes the recent publication of the Scottish Expert Advisory Panel on the Collaborative Economy.

3. Council furthers notes all the recommendations, including those specific to Edinburgh.
4. Council instructs officers to facilitate discussion between elected members and the Scottish Government and other stakeholders to develop a policy on Short Term Lets in Edinburgh.

- moved by Councillor Barrie, seconded by Councillor Cameron

Amendment 2

To insert at the end of the motion:

5. Welcomes the Homes First campaign and its focus on the problems caused by the rapid rise and concentration of short term lets in particular areas; and further welcomes the campaign call to give greater and clearer enabling powers to councils to regulate the number, concentration and management of short term lets
6. Therefore agrees that the Council should make representation to Scottish ministers to press the case for Scottish Government legislation to provide these enabling powers.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Rae

In accordance with Standing Order 20(7), the Amendments 1 and 2 were adjusted and accepted as addendums to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

Council:

1. recognises the ongoing concerns amongst residents affected by the increase in the short term letting of properties across the City.
2. notes the recent suggestion by AirBnB to introduce a 90 day limit on individual Edinburgh properties being listed on its website but further notes that peak periods around Christmas, Hogmanay and the summer festival season would be excluded from this restriction meaning properties could still be listed for well in excess of 90 days.
3. believes such a restriction on its own would be insufficient to address the issues which have emerged from the substantial increase in short term letting in the City.

4. therefore looks forward to the opportunity to fully consider both the recommendations of the Scottish Expert Panel on the Collaborative Economy and the Scottish Government's response so a consensus can be developed on how to best address issues around short term property letting
5. notes the previous motion that was agreed at Council on 14 December 2017 and that there was cross party consensus on the need to develop a policy on short term lets.
6. notes the recent publication of the Scottish Expert Advisory Panel on the Collaborative Economy.
7. furthers notes all the recommendations, including those specific to Edinburgh.
8. instructs officers to facilitate discussion between elected members and the Scottish Government and other stakeholders to develop a policy on Short Term Lets in Edinburgh
9. recognises the problems caused by the rapid rise and concentration of short term lets in particular areas and the need for greater and clearer enabling powers to councils to regulate the number, concentration and management of short term lets
10. therefore agrees that the Council should make representation to Scottish ministers to press the case for Scottish Government legislation to provide these enabling powers.

16 Slurry Seal Resurfacing - Motion by Councillor Young

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

“Council

1. notes with concern the significant issues which have arisen over the winter months in relation to the unexpected breakup of roads and footways treated with slurry resurfacing during 2017.
2. recognises the efforts of officials to address these matters through street sweeping and additional treatment, accepts assurances that the cost of such additional work will be borne by the contractor but notes the added inconvenience to residents from the imposition of parking and loading restrictions whilst repair work is undertaken.
3. Seeks an urgent report to the Transport & Environment Committee on (i) the underlying causes of the deterioration in road and footway surfaces so soon

after the initial resurfacing, (ii) what steps can be taken to ensure such issues do not arise in the future and (iii) whether the use of slurry seal resurfacing remains an appropriate method for treating roads and footways in the City over the long term given the problems which have arisen.”

Decision

To note that Councillor Young had withdrawn her motion.

17 Gritting of Roads and Pavements - Motion by Councillor Cook

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

“Council

Acknowledges the good work carried out by Council staff in servicing Priority 1 routes during the recent snowy and icy weather, to keep the city moving and minimise accidents and injuries;

However, recognises that a significant number of roads and pavements outwith Priority 1 - across large swathes of Edinburgh - received no gritting treatment and that many suburban grit bins were empty or not refilled in a timely manner, creating hazard for many people such as the elderly, disabled and active travellers.

Calls for a report to the Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles reviewing the continued suitability and responsiveness of the current priority system, including, but not limited to, consideration of how the council can better service suburban and other ‘non priority’ areas; give due consideration to the divergent topography and thermal make-up of the city; make better use of technology like ‘routesmart’ to improve response times; and better advertise, service and encourage safe use of grit bins by local residents in their community.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Cook.

- moved by Councillor Cook, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment

Council further:

- recognises the importance of providing residents with accurate information via the online winter road and pavement maintenance map and notes that officials have admitted the current map does not include all grit bin locations or show all current priority gritting routes.

- acknowledges the current difficulties in obtaining information on the status of new grit bin requests and the decision making processes involved in the siting of new grit bins.

Council therefore agrees that the report to Committee should also cover:

- how the updating of the online map will be made a priority for next winter.
- the potential to develop the online map in order to provide real time information on planned and completed gritting of priority routes.
- the improvements that can be made to the processes for requesting new grit bins and the information that is available on the status of new grit bin requests.

- moved by Councillor Lang , seconded by Councillor Gloyer

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 Cook:

Council

Acknowledges the good work carried out by Council staff in servicing Priority 1 routes during the recent snowy and icy weather, to keep the city moving and minimise accidents and injuries;

However, recognises that a significant number of roads and pavements outwith Priority 1 - across large swathes of Edinburgh - received no gritting treatment and that many suburban grit bins were empty or not refilled in a timely manner, creating hazard for many people such as the elderly, disabled and active travellers.

Calls for a report to the Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles reviewing the continued suitability and responsiveness of the current priority system, including, but not limited to, consideration of how the council can better service suburban and other 'non priority' areas; give due consideration to the divergent topography and thermal make-up of the city; make better use of technology like 'routesmart' to improve response times; and better advertise, service and encourage safe use of grit bins by local residents in their community.

Council further:

- recognises the importance of providing residents with accurate information via the online winter road and pavement maintenance map and notes that officials

have admitted the current map does not include all grit bin locations or show all current priority gritting routes.

- acknowledges the current difficulties in obtaining information on the status of new grit bin requests and the decision making processes involved in the siting of new grit bins.

Council therefore agrees that the report to Committee should also cover:

- how the updating of the online map will be made a priority for next winter.
- the potential to develop the online map in order to provide real time information on planned and completed gritting of priority routes.
- the improvements that can be made to the processes for requesting new grit bins and the information that is available on the status of new grit bin requests.

18 Economy Watch - Motion by Councillor McLellan

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

“Council

Believes regular measurement and publication of key indicators of the city’s economic performance is essential for guiding the council’s economic strategy.

Regrets the discontinuation of the monthly Economy Watch report in February, which was a very useful tool in understanding the city’s performance.

Agrees that a publicly available monthly report should be published within the next two cycles at the latest.

Instructs the Director of Strategy and Insight to submit proposals for its replacement to the next Housing & Economy Committee.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor McLellan

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment

Delete all after “Economy Watch” in line one and replace with:

Council believes regular measurement and publication of key indicators of the city’s economic performance is necessary for informing, guiding and monitoring the execution of the council’s economic strategy.

Agrees that a publicly available quarterly report should commence immediately following committee approval.

Instructs the Head of Strategy and Insight to include proposals for such quarterly monitoring within the Economy Strategy report to Housing and Economy Committee on 22 March.

- moved by Councillor Barrie, seconded by Councillor Cameron

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McLellan:

Council believes regular measurement and publication of key indicators of the city’s economic performance is necessary for informing, guiding and monitoring the execution of the council’s economic strategy.

Agrees that a publicly available quarterly report should commence immediately following committee approval.

Instructs the Head of Strategy and Insight to include proposals for such quarterly monitoring within the Economy Strategy report to Housing and Economy Committee on 22 March 2018.

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 3 of 1 February 2018)

QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Planning Committee
at a meeting of the Council on 1
February 2018**

Question

What statutory powers does the Council have to impose restrictions on the night time flying operations at Edinburgh Airport?

Answer

The Council has no statutory powers which would allow it to regulate or restrict flight operations including night flights. Under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 noise from aircraft is specifically excluded from statutory nuisance provisions. Similarly, in planning terms, the Council currently has no control over the frequency and timing of flights at Edinburgh Airport. Airports benefit from certain permitted development rights granted in Part 14 Aviation Development of the 1992 GDPO, as amended by Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (Scotland) Amendment Order 2011.

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 1 February 2018**

Question **(1)** How many new grit bins were requested in

a) 1-31 December 2017 and

b) 1-23 January 2018,

broken down by ward?

Answer **(1)** There were 37 new grit bins requested in December 2017 and 57 in January 2018.

This information is not currently stored by ward but officers are working on amending the IT system to enable this in future.

Question **(2)** How many new grit bins were installed in

a) 1-31 December 2017 and

b) 1-23 January 2018,

broken down by ward and if she will list the street locations of all new grit bins over this period?

Answer **(2)** There have been 45 grit bins issued since the start of the winter period. It is not possible to confirm whether these are new or replacement bins and we do not currently record the locations by ward. Officers are working on updating the IT system to record this information in future.

Question **(3)** How many spare grit bins were held centrally in each week between 1 December 2017 and 23 January 2018?

Answer **(3)** We are not able to confirm the number of grit bins held at the beginning of each week. There were 140 bins available at the start of the winter period (October) and at 23 January there were 95 remaining.

Question (4) What follow up action was taken in response to the question asked by Cllr Aldridge at the December 2017 meeting of the Council about the prioritisation of school bus routes for road gritting?

Answer (4) I have asked officers to consider Councillor Aldridge's suggestion as part of a review of this year's winter operation.

Supplementary Question So you've had the good news, now the bad news. Lord Provost, I have to say I found these answers genuinely pretty unacceptable and I do say to Councillor Macinnes and I have said to her before, I hold her in very high regard but I have to say that if I was Convener I would have been pretty embarrassed to have answers like this being put out in my name. I asked for a simple list of locations of new grit bins and it's not there. This should not be complicated stuff. Is she honestly saying to me that officials know how many new and replacement grit bins were put out but they've got no idea where they are? Either the information that she was given for this question is wrong or it's an astonishing admission of incompetence. Now I think it's the former and I think a list does exist and I think it probably would have taken 20 minutes for someone to sit down and work out how many were in each ward and we also now know that there are many new grit bin requests which have not been met and meanwhile there are 90 grit bins sitting in a shed somewhere gathering dust. Lord Provost I think this is unacceptable, so can I ask her to please go back and to challenge officials so I and other colleagues can get more meaningful information than has been provided today.

Supplementary Answer I am somewhat surprised by your tone Councillor Lang. You asked a simple set of questions, it was responded to by officials as best as they were able to at this point. Clearly we are right in the midst of the winter weather period and I suspect that if you'd simply asked the officials directly you would have got the information that you're requiring. I will of course go back and speak to officials again and I will provide you and indeed everybody else if they wish, with that precise piece of information. I think however it is worth recognising the fact that the people who are involved in

providing grit bins, in managing the processes around them, are also the very same ones who are delivering what I consider to be a very strenuous effort to protect the citizens of Edinburgh from the effects of bad weather.

I would suggest instead that if you wish to berate officials you don't do it through this forum but instead that you and I sit down with officials.

I am more than willing to host a meeting of yourself and any other interested Councillors with officials to discuss the detail that lies behind this answer, 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 1 February 2018

Question

I wrote to the Convener on 1 December with questions relating to the administration's policy on 20mph and traffic calming measures. After receiving no reply or acknowledgement, I sent a follow up email on 17 December. Can she tell me when she expects to respond to the issues raised?

Answer

The implementation of the Citywide 20mph programme commenced soon after the Council's Transport and Environment Committee in March 2015. The final construction phase has now commenced and will be completed by 5 March 2018. This will mark the completion of the phased implementation programme.

Officers have been monitoring the impact of the 20mph introduction and will, at the end of the first full year of operation (March 2019) review the results before determining whether further actions are required to achieve the desired impacts.

The new 20mph speed limits require a significant change to take place in driver behaviour. Council officers are implementing a high profile public information and communications campaign to raise awareness and encourage compliance with the new 20mph limit.

It is anticipated that, once the full implementation is complete, driver awareness will also increase and that this will have a positive impact on behaviour.

The review outcomes will be reported to Transport and Environment Committee in 2019 and will include monitoring data on traffic speeds, road casualties, journey times, walking and cycling levels, air quality and public

perceptions. It will also highlight what further actions may be required (e.g. streets where non-compliance continues to be of concern).

On-going feedback about specific streets is being recorded and will be reported but there are currently no plans to introduce further measures in areas where feedback on non-compliance continues through the review period.

In addition, an annual collision investigation into all streets within the city is carried out and where the collision rate is giving cause for concern at specific locations, consideration is given to introducing road safety remedial works.

I appreciate the concerns raised about Lennymuir and Bo'ness Road. These have been investigated and, while currently there is insufficient justification to prioritise road safety remedial works at these locations, officers will continue to monitor them.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you, this will be a bit simpler. Just so I can absolutely clarify, is it the position, is that the policy of the Administration that no specific traffic calming measures will be considered or installed in advance of the city wide review next year?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I think the answer to that is probably yes, but as you know officials undertake very detailed approaches to these particular questions. If you've got any specific instances, please come meet with me and we'll talk it through with officials directly, thank you.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Leader of the Council
at a meeting of the Council on 1
February 2018**

Since May 2014, I understand there have been four instances of building failures in the school estate where the Council would self-fund maintenance. These involved ceilings or other building components falling to the ground, where the reasonably foreseeable worst-case injury could have been life threatening at: Boroughmuir High School, Broughton Primary School, St Catherine's RC Primary School and Tower Bank Primary School.

Can the Leader:

Question (1) List the dates he first became aware of each failures listed?/Confirm the date of each failure?

Answer (1) The relevant Conveners were made aware of the issues as and when they arose. The dates were 6 December 2017, 20 September 2017, 29 November 2017 and 10 October 2017 respectively.

Question (2) Provide details of any other similar failures in Council buildings outside the School Estate?

Answer (2) Please see below extract from SHE database.

Year	Schools and Early Years	Council Estate (excluding schools and Early Years)	Total
2014	1	0	1
2015	7	10	17
2016	5	7	12
2017	6	6	12

Question (3) Confirm if these failures should have been recorded as near misses?

Answer (3) Yes, they should have been. It is up to individual establishments to ensure they are recorded.

Question (4) Confirm that inadequate maintenance of the building estate is the primary cause of each failure?

Answer (4) A history of underinvestment in the Council's building estate over the past two decades is now manifesting itself in an increasing number of building issues, a poor condition estate and significant levels of backlog maintenance.

Question (5) Reassure this Council that the maintenance of all Council buildings is a priority and that good maintenance should remove any risk of injury due to Council Buildings failing?/Confirm that officers had raised the risk of building failures due to inadequate maintenance at the Finance and Resources Committee?

Answer (5) The maintenance of, and investment in, Council buildings is a priority and this will be reflected in the forthcoming Coalition budget.

Current mitigating actions include an ongoing programme of tactile ceiling and roof inspections instigated across the estate. This is in progress with any issues identified remediated immediately.

Updates were provided to the Finance and Resources Committee through the Asset Management Strategy but the full extent of the issues were not identified until, on the instruction of Committee, a full suite of condition surveys across the estate was completed at the end of last year.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost. I recognise that the Leader has a sore throat today so he may not be able to answer a complicated question so I'll stick to a very simple one.

As far as the Leader is aware is this the first time that the 42 failures in buildings that the Council owns and maintains, which could have threatened life or limb, is this the first time that has been reported to Council?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I'll try and answer but as you point out tonsillitis has somewhat limited my ability to speak.

I understand this is the first time it has been referred to Council. The important thing for this Administration is that even though in my answer I point out the last 20 years of this being an issue, actually, when you look at some of the buildings are far older, some of the problems of under investment and maintenance stretch back way way longer than 20 years. The important thing in terms of this Administration, is that we will prioritise the absolute maximum amount of money that is required to make sure we can carry out the maximum amount of repairs in our estate as possible in the coming year. That obviously is constrained by the capacity of the Department but we are looking to match their capacity with our resources.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Deputy Leader of the
Council at a meeting of the Council
on 1 February 2018**

Since May 2014, I understand there have been four instances of building failures in the school estate where the Council would self-fund maintenance. These involved ceilings or other building components falling to the ground, where the reasonably foreseeable worst-case injury could have been life threatening at: Boroughmuir High School, Broughton Primary School, St Catherine's RC Primary School and Tower Bank Primary School.

Can the Deputy Leader:

Question (1) List the dates he first became aware of each of the failures listed?

Answer (1) See answers to Question 4

Question (2) Provide details of any other similar failures he is aware of in the Council estate?

Answer (2) See answers to Question 4

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost. So yes first of all can I thank the Leader for being so open with Council on this very very serious matter. I wonder the Deputy Leader's obviously been in Council rather longer than I have, he may remember, as may officials that are watching this the old advice that was to make sure buildings were wind and watertight. With the benefit of hindsight does that seem to be rather an inadequate test and would he agree with the briefing that was given last week, that had the Council spent something in the order of an extra five million in today's money over the last number of Councils, we might not be now facing a £180.5m bill.

**Supplementary
Answer**

No, I don't think it's unfair to say £5 million would equate to a £130m investment. I think as the Councillor Leader clearly said, our budget proposals that come forward on the 22nd February, will address the backlog of repairs that are needed for the same.

QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Education, Children and Families
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 1 February 2018**

Since May 2014, I understand there have been four instances of building failures in the school estate where the Council would self-fund maintenance. These involved ceilings or other building components falling to the ground, where the reasonably foreseeable worst-case injury could have been life threatening at: Boroughmuir High School, Broughton Primary School, St Catherine's RC Primary School and Tower Bank Primary School.

Can the Convener of Education Children & Families:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Question | (1) Confirm the date of each failures listed above? |
| Answer | (1) See answers to Question 4 |
| Question | (2) List the dates on which he first became aware of each failure? |
| Answer | (2) See answers to Question 4 |
| Question | (3) Provide details of any other similar failures in the school estate? |
| Answer | (3) See answers to Question 4 |
| Question | (4) Detail what he did to deal with the problem? |
| Answer | (4) See answers to Question 4 |
| Question | (5) Provide details of where the Council records any near misses where the reasonably foreseeable worst-case injury is life threatening? |
| Answer | (5) See answers to Question 4 |
| Supplementary Question | Does the Convener of Education worry about the condition of our schools? |

**Supplementary
Answer**

Of course I do and that's why we need to get the Budget passed, that's why we need to get money into the budget, in order to repair the backlog that's already alluded to.

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Finance and Resources Committee at
a meeting of the Council on 1
February 2018**

Since May 2014, I understand there have been four instances of building failures in the school estate where the Council would self-fund maintenance. These involved ceilings or other building components falling to the ground, where the reasonably foreseeable worst-case injury could have been life threatening at: Boroughmuir High School, Broughton Primary School, St Catherine's RC Primary School and Tower Bank Primary School.

Can the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee

Question (1) List the dates on which he first became aware of each failure?

Answer (1) See answers to Question 4

Question (2) Confirm that inadequate maintenance of the building estate is the primary cause of each failure?

Answer (2) See answers to Question 4

Question (3) Confirm that Officers had raised the risk of building failures due to inadequate maintenance at the Finance and Resources Committee?

Answer (3) See answers to Question 4

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost. My question to the Convener of the Finance Committee is, officers have made it clear that the issue of inadequate maintenance was reported to his Committee in March 14, September and November 15, January, June and September 16, February and September 17. When officers made those reports to his Committee did they refer to the instances of failure that were recorded in the SHE database?

**Supplementary
Answer**

No, I can't say that I recollect doing that. That was something that has happened in the time of the previous administration and this administration is commissioning a full condition survey which enables us to accurately target where the investment needs to go to sort out the problems that we have in repairs and maintenance and that's entirely what we intend to do and as it's already been said we will be bringing forward proposals in the budget meeting later this month which will address those issues as far as we can given the capacity constraints.

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 1 February 2018**

Question (1) Could the Convener explain why it is possible to leave an unmotorised wheeled item on the street without it being ticketed or removed as it would be if it were in possession of both wheels and engine?

Answer (1) The Council does not currently ticket or remove unmotorised wheeled vehicles which are left on the street. Officers are currently seeking legal advice on the legislative powers which could be used to enforce such activity and a report will be presented to the Transport and Environment Committee shortly with recommendations for implementation in Edinburgh.

Question (2) What would need to be done to make it possible to leave such items on the street so that where they were causing an obstruction or had been abandoned they could be removed?

Answer (2) The report being prepared to Transport and Environment Committee (referred to above) will outline the legislative powers and procedure being proposed to remove obstructions from the road where the owner has been requested to remove it and has failed to do so.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost that excludes people of course. I thank the Convener for her answer. I notice in some of the other responses given to questions, where reports will be coming forward to your Committee, you have given the date of the report. Do you know when this report will be coming forward?

Supplementary Answer Yes, I apologise for that emission from this particular answer. We said that it would be presented to Transport Environment Committee shortly. I can promise you that it will be in not the next one but the next one, in other words in May.

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

Is the Transport Convener aware of the reports regarding the 20mph scheme that had been introduced in Bath and North East Somerset, where one year on there has been an increase the number of people killed or seriously injured in seven out of the thirteen zones where 20mph was now the standard speed limit?

Answer

The Transport and Environment Convener is aware of the report on the 20mph Scheme introduced in Bath and North East Somerset (BANES).

The report was discredited and subsequently withdrawn.

This Council is undertaking an extensive monitoring programme to assess the impacts of the 20mph network on Edinburgh's streets. Monitoring to assess traffic speeds, road casualties, journey times, walking and cycling levels, air quality and public perceptions are included in the programme, which will continue throughout implementation of the project and for one year afterwards. Findings will be reported to Transport and Environment Committee in 2019.

Supplementary Question

Thank you. I thank the Convener for her answer regardless of her views on the incident mentioned in the report. Bath and North East Somerset Council found that in real terms the overall reduction in average speed was just 1.3 miles an hour and therefore was not persuasive in terms of the money spent on these schemes. If the review of Edinburgh's 20 mile an hour scheme reveals a similar drop in speeds, will the Administration consider it good value for money?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I think I'm correct in saying that in fact the Bath Council underwent further discussions on this at their Communities Transport and Environment Policy Development and Scrutiny Panel in their particular Council and indeed agreed that the report was not that useful. It was the figures that were used in it, were so remarkably small, that it was not a particularly useful sample, it has also been widely rebutted by others outside of the Council. It seems to have had something of a political motivation that sat behind it. In terms of our own review, I think I'm quite confident what the results will be which is that the speeds have dropped quite dramatically, anecdotal evidence from the police at this point says that that's the case and I'm very pleased to say that that is so. The review will be covering a number of different issues attached to the 20 miles per hour implementation and I very much look forward to the report that will be coming forward in 2019 to answer those particular issues, thank you.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

Has the introduction of community parking zones around Murrayfield stadium ever been considered on match days where large crowds are expected, and if so, the reasons why no scheme was introduced?

Answer

The Administration raised this matter with officers in November 2017 and investigations are underway to identify the schemes operating across the UK. A report on the findings will be presented to Transport and Environment Committee on 17 May 2018.

Supplementary Question

Thank you, and I thank you again for the answer. I'm glad to hear that officials are looking into alternative parking schemes in light of recent rumours that international football might soon be held at Murrayfield. Is there any way of bringing forward this report to an earlier date, to mid May?

Supplementary Answer

Given that we are well into the processes attached to the reports coming forward for March, I don't think that is possible, so I can understand your desire to have them come forward, but we have to give officials time to prepare the reports correctly.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

Have any surveys been carried out to estimate the impact on congestion that the shutting of Leith Street has had, and if so what the results of those surveys were?

Answer

Prior to the closure of Leith Street extensive modelling was undertaken to determine the effects the additional traffic from Leith Street would have on the proposed diversion route.

As a result of the modelling, specific temporary measures were put in place to manage the additional traffic that was expected. The diversion routes are monitored regularly and reactive improvements and adjustments are made as required. This will continue until Leith Street is opened again to traffic.

A number of improvements have been made around London Road / Easter Road junction as a result of this monitoring, including improved line markings and adding a left turn filter arrow stage at London Road / Easter Road.

In addition, adjustments have been made to timings of the signals on the main diversion routes, on the London Road gyratory and also at Dundas Street and South St David St, as required and in response to any feedback received.

Traffic counting has been undertaken by the Edinburgh St James developer and at Leith Walk and Easter Road and this data has been used in development of appropriate adjustments.

Anecdotal evidence from the New Town and Broughton Community Council has indicated that there has been no

significant increase in traffic in this area over the monitoring period. They declined a repeat of the survey.

Leith Walk traffic showed a reduction in traffic following the implementation of the closure and diversion route. Easter Road showed an increase in traffic over the same period.

The results mirrored the expected results predicted by the initial modelling exercise.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you and thanks to the Convener for the answer. There can be no doubt that the closure of Leith Street is causing severe disruption for motorists, who have at times to face queues back to Dalkeith Road when approaching Abbeyhill from Holyrood especially on match days at Easter Road, but also local residents who have seen increased traffic along residential roads. Can the Convener assure them that they will not have to face disruption like this again and that Leith Street will be kept open to all traffic on completion of the works?

**Supplementary
Answer**

The future of Leith Street is something which we are currently looking at, at this point. I would like to come back at a later date perhaps, and address this more fully but, given the fact that we're looking at the developments around Picardy Place and the follow on from that, I would not wish to give you a definitive answer on that.

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

To ask what has been done to address the rising issue of graffiti vandalism across the city since the issue was raised at full Council in September and the response remitted to the Culture and Communities Committee.

Specifically:

Question (1) Have any officers been specifically tasked with addressing the issue and if so within what department?

Answer (1) The Head of Place Management has been tasked with creating a working group of relevant officers to identify potential solutions to reducing the amount of graffiti in the city. The working group will meet for the first time in February.

Question (2) Has the Council been in contact with Police Scotland and offered to share information gathered through its online reporting mechanism?

Answer (2) There has been no offer to share the information gathered by the Council with Police Scotland to date but this will be considered as part of the working group discussions.

Question (3) What is the Council's current policy on removal of non-offensive graffiti and how is this defined?

Answer (3) Graffiti is considered non offensive unless it is racially or sexually offensive, homophobic, or defamatory by nature.

Non-offensive graffiti on Council buildings is removed within 10 working days. If the graffiti is on private land then it is up to the owner to treat it. On certain types of private land the Council does have enforcement powers which can be used to require the landowner to remove graffiti. Obviously these legal powers would only be used as a last resort

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer.

They say that imitation is the greatest form of flattery and today it seems to be two fold, for not only has a very similar question been raised by Councillor Rae, who I know like myself from Portobello has similar issues with tagging in her ward, but it appears that the Convener's answer is a repetition of my earlier motion. May I just remind you all, I also asked the Director of Place Management to form a working group, I called it an Action Task Force which is a little bit more action orientated, to tackle the graffiti issue. So I'm glad that this answer confirms that this will happen in the coming month. Unfortunately this will be almost six months after I first raised this identical proposal on a balmy September afternoon

So Lord Provost I wish to ask, does the Convener think that six months is an appropriate turn around for an issue that all parties agreed was very much pressing in September, or is this another example of the current Administration moving against an utterly sensible proposition from the opposition and kicking it to Committee to languish unacted upon? Indeed a questionable choice of Committee as in those long six months the Culture and Communities Committee has not received a single report that mentions the issue of graffiti, the Culture and Communities Convener has not been quoted in any press coverage of graffiti which has been handed to the Transport and Environment Convener, and is now only picking up this political football in the face of two follow up questions that exposed the lack of action for nearly half a years.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you for the question. What we have done in fact is set up a Working Group which is officer led and the reason that we have done that is for quick action. If we were going to do an elected member working group then we would have to have a report that would then have to be agreed and then that would have to come back at a subsequent meeting. So in the interests of speed, we have set up a working group which will take all the expert advice and give us a way forward in dealing with this issue which we have had for longer than since September. It's a big issue, it requires a multi-disciplinary approach and in order to bring everybody together we have done that and that is meeting in the next few weeks. It will be meeting this month and once it does that it will be working with the police on the data. This is a complicated issue but I'm happy to give you regular updates on how we progress this. I also however, in response to what you're saying, do feel that we need to take this a bit further in terms of actually setting up although it does take a bit longer, an elected member led Working Group on this issue. So in order to make sure that it's elected member led and directed, I would suggest we do take it a step further and we will be setting that up and bringing it forward to March.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question (1) How much was the rate of pay awarded to staff working at Edinburgh's Christmas events this winter?

Answer All staff employed by Edinburgh's Christmas were paid, as a minimum, the National Living Wage.

Question (2) Can the Convener confirm the date that the report agreed by this Council on Thursday, 24 August regarding Fair Fringe and Fair Hospitality Charter will be coming to committee?

Answer (2) A full report on how the Fair Fringe and Fair Hospitality Charter can be promoted will be presented to the Housing and Economy Committee in March 2018.

An interim report went to the Housing and Economy Committee on [18 January 2018](#) and provided an update on the amended Council Motion by Councillor Cameron from [24 August 2017](#) .

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost. I don't so much have a supplementary for the second part as I harped on about it at Committee just a couple days ago, however the first part, can the Convener confirm if the national living wage was paid to those under the age of 25 as well?

Supplementary Answer Well I can't confirm that off the top of my head but I will endeavour to establish that. As you know we've taken up this issue at the last Culture and Communities Committee meeting. Also, we'll have another report in parallel coming forward on that, also reporting to March to take it into the same cycle at that, going forward to the Housing and Economy Committee.

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

- Question** (1) Can the Convener explain what involvement has CEC had in assisting sporting groups who previously trained at Meadowbank Stadium in finding new and suitable training facilities since its closure?
- Answer** (1) Edinburgh Leisure, as managers of Meadowbank Sports Centre, co-ordinated the relocation of sports clubs and groups to alternative facilities within the estate they manage on behalf of the Council. Council officers assisted two groups who had specific facility requirements.
- Question** (2) How many Clubs, Sporting Associations and local groups have been affected by the closure of Meadowbank?
- Answer** (2) Meadowbank had 86 clubs and groups with extended lets (i.e. regular weekly bookings).
- Question** (3) What clubs / sporting organisations have you helped?
- Answer** (3) Edinburgh Leisure were able to offer space at an alternative sports centre to 30 clubs. 16 out of the 30 clubs accepted the alternative venue. Edinburgh Leisure also offered a further 21 groups space at secondary school sport facilities and 14 accepted. 7 clubs informed Edinburgh Leisure that they had been able to find their own alternative accommodation.
- Question** (4) And what alternatives have been provided?
- Answer** (4) As detailed above space has been found within the Council's sport and leisure estate and secondary school estate

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 1 February 2018**

Question

What steps does the Council take to publicise the online Consultation Hub resource?

Answer

To publicise the Consultation Hub online resource, the Council provides a link to the hub on the corporate website under the Have Your Say webpage.

The consultation hub has its own mailing list function, which allows interested people to register their details for regular email updates regarding new consultation activity that they may be interested in. The news centre is also used to publicise specific consultations that are open for comment and provide updates on progress in relation to key projects. In addition, individual consultations have their own communications plans that utilise a variety of methods to publicise issues we're seeking views on and encourage response. This can include using the Council's social media channels, mail outs and appropriate advertising such as wraps, news, etc. to promote the consultation. For those who search online for information about consultations across Edinburgh, the Consultation Hub or Have Your Say webpage is also one of the first hits in Google's search engine.

Since its launch in 2014, 219 consultations have been published on the consultation hub. In total, over 31,000 online responses have been collected in relation to key issues and services delivered by the Council via the consultation hub. The hub is a central resource for frontline services to publicise their consultation activity in an accessible way.

**Supplementary
Question**

I'd like to thank Councillor Rankin for that answer and his new responsibility for consultations, which I hope he can agree with me, can play an important role in gauging public opinion about things you plan to do, or raise awareness about important issues. Just last month Councillor Corbett and I were talking to local people in Hutchison about the Consultation Hub and how we can perhaps help them save their Community Centre. I think the important thing about consultations is that they must be genuine, they should focus on things that have yet to happen, not things that are taking place already or a preordained.

Does Councillor Rankin agree with me that timing is also important? The recent budget consultation was shorter than normal, but I am sure each and every pupil at the City of Edinburgh Music School is glad that it was and something that should never have been in that consultation was able to be brought out.

Does he agree with me that sometimes it's worth asking yourself if it is worth consulting at all? An example could be perhaps that if you are consulting on a tourist tax but you're own party have already refused to give you the power to deliver it, one must question whether it would be worth consulting on that at all.

Does he agree with me that consultations must be done in good faith and be legitimate?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Well yes I've no trouble agreeing with that at all. If I could just address one of the other points you made on the shortened consultation for the budget, that was partly because it took some time to start this coalition and partly because there are some very serious issues that we need to address in order to be able to bring forward a draft budget for consultation and I can assure you that is our intention in the next financial year, to come up with another consultation and I hope it will revert to the pattern of previous years where it will begin at the beginning of September and end sometime in December.

On the music school, the fact of the matter is when it comes to a consultation, when it comes to budget decisions, there are times when difficult choices have to be considered, we

are under a statutory obligation as I'm sure Council Johnson knows, to produce a balanced budget and I explained when we had a deputation in front of my Committee why we put that in the consultation, and I think there was a fair amount of understanding from the parents concerned about why we did that. Now, of course it was difficult and of course you saw how we reacted. we responded as I think it was right to that point and as a result it will not feature in our budget this year and I doubt it will come forward substantively in any other. Nevertheless we are in difficult financial times as you must know and we do have to consider things in the round and that means that we cannot exempt across the board, this, that and the other thing can never ever be considered, I think it's only right that we look at as many options as we can and it was only fair to bring that forward in the consultation although I appreciate the strength of reaction. On the tourist tax, it's simply not true to say that the Scottish Government is opposed to it, the latest I've heard from the relevant minister Fiona Hyslop, is that any move towards that by this Administration or any other local authority is something which would have to be done in consultation with the hospitality sector and that's exactly what we are considering doing.

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

In light of the new housing development in Dalmeny Park, South Queensferry, and the Section 75 monies secured from this, what progress is being made to install traffic calming measures on Scotstoun Avenue leading into this development?

Answer

As part of the planning process, the consent granted required the developer to provide funding to help mitigate the transport impact of the development on the local road network.

The Section 75 Agreement for the old Agilent Technologies site on Scotstoun Avenue made allowance for the developer to pay a Safer Routes to School contribution of £20,000 towards the provision of drop kerbs in the vicinity of South Queensferry High School and local primary schools, where the catchment area includes the site.

The Agreement also made allowance for a Traffic Calming Measures contribution of £30,000 towards the cost of traffic calming measures in Scotstoun Avenue.

Both contributions were paid to the Council in January 2015 and the Traffic Calming Measures Contribution must be utilised within five years of receipt. There is no time limit by which the Council has to utilise the Safer Routes to School contribution.

With work on the development site nearing completion, it is now intended to commence design work for the traffic calming scheme (which will include the introduction of traffic calming cushions along the length of Scotstoun Avenue and four full width traffic calming tables to tie into the main crossing points used by residents to the south of the Avenue

to cross into the estates to the north and to access the Primary and High Schools). Consultation with the local community will be undertaken as part of the design process.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you very much and thank you to the Convener for her answer. I just wanted to ask if the expected timetable for the design and the consultation stages can be shared with the Ward Councillors please.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Yes, I'll be happy to do so, thank you.

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

- Question** **(1)** Please provide a table showing the following information:
- a) the locations of Council owned and operated automatic traffic counters
 - b) the dates on which they were installed
 - c) whether the counters are currently operational or not

- Answer** **(1)**
- a) Appendix A lists the 95 decommissioned locations.
 - b) The dates for installation were not recorded but all were installed during the mid to late 1980's.
 - c) The counters are not operational.

- Question** **(2)** For those which are currently not operational, please provide:

- a) the dates on which they stopped working
- b) what action is being taken to repair and/or replace them?

- Answer** **(2)**
- a) Maintenance ceased in August 2013. The system was stood down at this time as they had become obsolete.
 - b) A replacement counter system is planned. Proposed sites are listed in Appendix B attached. They are expected to be operational by the end of 2018. The new system will have supporting analysis software and will cover both traffic and cycle counters, with some locations covering both.

Appendix A – Decommissioned Sites

Middle Cordon Sites

Site No.	Location	Grid Ref.	Type	Loops	Telemetry
000 001	Cramond Road South	319926, 676183	Class	4	y
000 002	A90 @ Davidson's Mains	320109, 675104	Class	8	y
000 003	A8 @ Saughtonhall	321382, 672951	Class	8	y
000 004	Stenhouse Drive	321017, 671902	Class	6	y
000 005	A701 Craigmillar Park	327058, 671237	Class	8	y
000 006	A71 Calder Road @ Stenhouse	321156, 671429	Class	8	y
000 007	A70 Lanark Road E of Inglis Green Road	322135, 670738	Class	8	y
000 008	Colinton Road W of Patie's Road	322237, 669540	Class	4	y
000 009	Oxgangs Road North	323364, 668990	Class	4	y
000 010	Greenbank Crescent	323920, 669464	Class	4	y
000 011	Braid Road @ Braid burn	324442, 670260	Class	4	y
000 012	A701 Liberton Road	327131, 670373	Class	8	y
000 013	Mayfield Road	327074, 670403	Class	4	y
000 014	A772 Gilmerton Road S of Old Mill Lane	327244, 670705	Class	6	y
000 015	A7 Old Dalkeith Road	328014, 670926	Class	6	y
000 016	A6095 Peffermill Road	327942, 671623	Class	6	y
000 017	Duddingston Village(Old Church Lane)	328461, 672656	Vol	2	y
000 018	Meadowbank Terrace	327836, 674132	Vol	2	y
000 019	Royal Park	327715, 674135	Class	4	y
000 020	Restalrig Road South (Smokey Brae)	328291, 674353	Vol	2	y
000 021	Restalrig Avenue	328954, 674327	Class	4	y
000 022	Craigentenny Road	329089, 674723	Class	8	y
000 023	Seafield Road (Fillyside)	329247, 675539	Class	8	y
000 024	London Road	327811, 674261	Class	8	y
000 025	Lasswade Road	328876, 667593	Vol	2	y
000 026	A700 Melville Drive	325731, 672508	Class	6	y
000	A8 West Coates	323519,	Class	8	y

027		673226			
000 028	A8 Gyle Park	318639, 672789	Class	8	n
000 029	A902 Maybury Road	318040, 673257	Class	8	y
000 030	B701 Drum Brae	319088, 674090	Class	6	y
000 031	Whitehouse Road	318505, 675179	Class	4	y
000 032	Lauriston Farm Road	320616, 676122	Class	4	y
000 033	B8905 Main St Davidson's Mains	320685, 675448	Class	4	y
000 034	Craigcrook Road	320735, 674914	Class	4	y
000 035	Strachan Road	321482, 674765	Class	4	y
000 036	A902 Telford Road	321826, 674881	Class	8	y
000 037	Charterhall Road	325587, 670988	Class	8	y
000 038	B7030 Cliftonhall Road	311870, 670692	Class	4	y
000 039	Clermiston	320194, 673587	Class	4	n
000 040	A90 Queensferry Road @ Orchard Park	322776, 674274	Class	8	y
000 041	A902 Ferry Road (Inverleith)	324153, 675934	Class	8	y

Outer Cordon Sites

Site No.	Location	Grid Ref.	Type	Loops	Telemetry
000 002	A90 Queensferry Road (Barnton)		Profiler	8	y
000 003	A701 Straiton		Classifier	8	y
000 004	A8 Gogarmount		n/a		
000 005	A1 Jewel		n/a		
000 006	A199 Edinburgh Road		Classifier	4	y
000 007	A720 Sighthill		n/a		
000 008	A6095 Newcraighall Road		Profiler	8	y
000 009	Dreghorn Link		Profiler	6	y
000 010	The Wisp		Classifier	4	y
000 011	A7 W of Wisp		Profiler	8	y
000 012	A772 Gilmerton Road		Classifier	4	y
000	A702 Biggar Road		Profiler	8	y

013					
000 014	A70 Lanark Road		Profiler	4	y
000 015	Baberton Mains View		Profiler	4	y
000 016	Westburn Avenue		n/a		
000 017	Cultins Road		n/a		
000 018	A71 Calder Road		Profiler	8	y
000 019	A199 Seafield Road East		n/a		
000 020	A904 (Bo'ness Road)		Profiler	4	n
000 021	Colinton Road		Classifier	8	n
000 022	Comiston Road		n/a		
000 023	Braid Hill Drive		Classifier	4	n
000 101	Sir Harry Lauder Road		Profiler	4	y
000 102	A89 Edinburgh Road		Profiler	8	y
000 103	B7030 Wilkieston Road		Profiler	4	y
000 104	Glenlockhart Road		Counter	4	n
000 105	South Gyle Broadway (South)		n/a		
000 106	A8 Gogarmount		Profiler	8	y
000 107	Comiston Road		Profiler	8	n
000 108	Balgreen Road		n/a		
000 109	Gogarstone Road		Profiler	4	n
000 110	A8 Ratho Station		Profiler	8	n
000 111	B701 Frogston Road West		Profiler	4	n
000 112	Bruntsfield Place		Profiler	8	n
000 113	Portobello Road		n/a		
000 114	A1 The Jewel		Profiler	8	y
000 115	Wester Hailes Road		Profiler	8	y
000 116	Duddingston Road West		Profiler	4	n
000 117	South Gyle Broadway (North)		n/a		
000 118	B9080 W of Kirkliston		Profiler	8	y
000 119	B924 Bo'ness Road		n/a		

000 120	B800 N of Kirkliston		Profiler	4	y
000 121	Carlowrie		n/a		
000 122	A902 Maybury Road (Cammo)		Profiler	8	y
000 123	B924 Edinburgh Road (Dolphington)		n/a		
000 124	A90 Queensferry Road (Deans)		n/a		
000 125	Roddinglaw Road		Profiler	4	y
000 126	Riccarton Mains Road		Profiler	4	y
000 127	Gogar Station Road		Profiler	4	y
000 128	St. Johns Road		n/a		
000 129	West Port		Profiler	4	y
000 130	Grt. Junction St.		n/a		
000 131	A1 London Road @ Norton Place		Profiler	8	n
000 132	Easter Road (W of Albion Rd.)		Profiler	4	n

Temporary Radar Sites

000 994	Abercromby Place
001 099	Northumberland Street
002 199	Great King Street
032 993	Albany Street

Appendix B – Proposed Sites

FID	Type	Location	Status	Priority	Cordon_1
0	Traffic	A1 Jewel	Proposed	high	outer
1	Traffic	A199 Seafield Road East	Proposed	low	other
2	Traffic	A6095 Newcraighall Road	Proposed	high	outer
3	Traffic	A7 Dalkeith Road	Proposed	high	inner
4	Traffic	A7 W of Wisp	Proposed	high	outer
5	Traffic	A701 Craigmillar Park	Proposed	high	inner
6	Traffic	A71 Calder Road	Proposed	high	outer
7	Traffic	A720 Sighthill	Proposed	high	outer
8	Traffic	A772 Drum Street	Proposed	high	outer
9	Traffic	A8 @ Saughtonhall	Proposed	high	inner
10	Traffic	A8 Gogarmount	Proposed	high	outer
11	Traffic	A8 Gyle Park	Proposed	high	outer
12	Traffic	A8 Ratho Station	Proposed	high	AQMA
13	Traffic	A8 West Coates	Proposed	high	AQMA
14	Traffic	A90 Queensferry Road	Proposed	high	outer
15	Traffic	A90 Queensferry Road @ Orchard Park	Proposed	high	inner
16	Traffic	A902 Ferry Road (Inverleith)	Proposed	low	other
17	Traffic	A902 Maybury Road	Proposed	low	other
18	Traffic	A902 Telford Road	Proposed	low	other
19	Traffic	B701 Drum Brae	Proposed	low	other
20	Traffic	B8905 Ferry Road	Proposed	low	other
21	Traffic	A90 Queensferry Road	Proposed	high	outer
22	Traffic	Clovenstone Road	Proposed	high	outer
23	Traffic	Braid Hill Drive	Proposed	low	other
24	Traffic	Morningside Rd	Proposed	high	inner
25	Traffic	Charterhall Road	Proposed	low	other
26	Traffic	Clermiston	Proposed	low	other
27	Traffic	Craigentiny Road	Proposed	low	other
28	Traffic	Dreghorn Link	Proposed	high	outer
29	Traffic	Duddingston Road West	Proposed	high	inner
30	Traffic	Duddingston Village(Old Church Lane)	Proposed	high	inner
31	Traffic	Easter Road (W of Albion Rd.)	Proposed	high	inner
32	Traffic	Glenlockhart Road	Proposed	low	other
33	Traffic	Lasswade Road	Proposed	high	outer
34	Traffic	Lauriston Farm Road	Proposed	high	outer
35	Traffic	Mayfield Road	Proposed	high	inner
36	Traffic	Duke's Walk	Proposed	high	inner
37	Traffic	Portobello Road	Proposed	high	outer
38	Traffic	Seafield Road (Fillyside)	Proposed	high	AQMA
39	Traffic	St. Johns Road	Proposed	high	AQMA
40	Traffic	The Wisp	Proposed	high	outer
41	Traffic	West Port	Proposed	high	AQMA
42	Traffic	Baberton Mains Hall	Proposed	high	outer
43	Traffic	Wester Hailes Road	Proposed	high	outer
44	Traffic	Whitehouse Road	Proposed	high	outer
45	Traffic	A702 Biggar Road	Proposed	high	outer
46	Traffic	B901 Montague Terrace	Proposed	high	AQMA
47	Traffic	A199 Commercial Street	Proposed	high	AQMA

48	Traffic	A901 Great Junction Street	Proposed	high	AQMA
49	Traffic	A1 London Road	Proposed	high	inner
50	Traffic	A71 Gorgie Road	Proposed	high	inner
51	Traffic	A70 Slateford Road	Proposed	high	inner
52	Traffic	Polwarth Terrace	Proposed	high	inner
53	Traffic	A90 Dean Bridge	Proposed	high	inner
54	Traffic	B900 Raeburn Place	Proposed	high	inner
55	Traffic	Dundas Street	Proposed	high	inner
56	Traffic	Inverleith Row	Proposed	high	inner
57	Traffic	Rodney Street	Proposed	high	inner
58	Traffic	B900 Broughton Road	Proposed	high	inner
59	Traffic	Willowbrae Road	Proposed	high	inner
60	Traffic	St Leonard's Street	Proposed	high	AQMA
61	Traffic	Queen Street	Proposed	high	AQMA
62	Traffic	Burdiehouse Road	Proposed	high	outer
63	Traffic	Lower Granton Road	Proposed	high	outer
64	Traffic	Sir Harry Lauder Road	Proposed	low	other
65	Traffic	Milton Road East	Proposed	high	outer
66	Traffic	Musselburgh Road	Proposed	high	outer
67	Traffic	Greendykes Road	Proposed	high	outer
68	Traffic	A6095 Peffermill Road	Proposed	low	other
69	Traffic	Ravelston Dykes	Proposed	high	inner
70	Traffic	Hillhouse Road	Proposed	low	other
71	Traffic	Stevenson Road	Proposed	high	inner
72	Traffic	Colinton Road	Proposed	low	other
73	Traffic	Blackford Avenue	Proposed	high	inner
74	Traffic	Torphin Road	Proposed	high	outer
75	Traffic	Dundee Street	Proposed	high	AQMA
76	Traffic	West Approach Road	Proposed	low	other
77	Traffic	Lothian Road	Proposed	high	AQMA
78	Traffic	Shandwich Place	Proposed	high	AQMA

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

To ask the Convener of Housing and Economy to provide a table showing the following information for the North West Locality overall, and then broken down by community:

- Question** **(1)** How many households in each category (singles, couples, families with children under 16, families with no children under 16) are currently in temporary accommodation. Please provide numbers per category/community?
- Answer** **(1)** City of Edinburgh Council has 1,609 properties available to use as Temporary Accommodation as on 24 January 2017, across a variety of tenures.

These are broken down by tenures as follows:

- Dispersed Flats – 422
- Short Term Let (STL) flats – 213
These are purchased on a night by night basis as required.
- Managed Units – 195
- Hostels – 174
- Bed and Breakfasts – 605
These are purchased on a night by night basis as required.

Answer

(1) The breakdown across the city by ward and locality is as follows:

Ward No	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Managed Units	B&B	Hostel	Total
1	20	3		85		108
2	72	23				95
3	14	9		12		35
4	37	28	40	30		135
5		3				3
6	1	1				2
7	32	20	15			67
8	9	2	14			25
9	9	7		10	16	42
10	1	2	20	21		44
11	15	3	61	111	88	278
12	14	38		36		88
13	33	19		161	70	283
14	40	30		18		88
15	8	2		90		100
16	70	10		18		98
17	47	13	45	13		118
Total	422	213	195	605	174	1609

Locality	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Managed Units	B&Bs	Hostels	Total
North East	134	100	45	228	70	577
North West	72	44	40	127	0	283
South East	94	17	81	240	88	520
South West	122	52	29	10	16	229
Total	422	213	195	605	174	1609

Question

(2) The average length of time each household category are waiting for a permanent home?

Answer

(2) Due to all households who present as homeless being treated equally, there is no distinction given to households in regard to localities when calculating the average case length.

Between 1 January and 31 December 2017, 2,967 homeless cases were closed. Overall, 66.7% of households were housed in either permanent accommodation or long term settled accommodation (this includes PSL).

A summary breakdown of the cases outcomes by number of households is as follows:

- Housed (permanent/long term settled) - 1978
- Housed CEC - 994
- Housed RSL - 372
- Housed PRS - 126
- Refused offer of housing - 97
- Lost Contact - 497
- Other - 395

A detailed breakdown of the case outcomes by family composition can be seen in Appendix 2.

The average case length is calculated on conclusion of a homeless assessment and it is the date difference between the end date of the case and the start date.

The average case length for each of these summarised cases outcomes by family composition for cases closed between 1 January and 31 December 2017 is as follows:

	Single	Couple	Family - Children < 16	Family - No Children < 16	Total
	Time (days)	Time (days)	Time (days)	Time (days)	Time (days)
Housed - CEC	399.8	429.0	433.4	456.3	415.0
Housed - RSL	373.4	356.3	433.4	445.8	391.8
Housed - PRS	182.0	128.6	169.7	91.5	167.7
Refused	459.4	389.3	438.9	427.4	448.6
Lost Contact	240.1	315.7	246.0	251.5	244.1
Other	149.3	162.8	122.9	101.2	141.3
Total	283.5	283.6	312.5	315.8	292.8

Question

- (3)** The longest waiting time currently being experienced by each household category?

- Answer**
- (3)** The longest waiting times for homeless cases open as on 24 January 2017 are as follows:
- Single – 2976 days
 - Couple – 1036 days
 - Families with children under 16 – 1540 days
 - Families with no children under 16 – 1120 days

**Supplementary
Comments by
Councillor
Young**

Just to say thank you very much for a very detailed response on this. I do have some practical follow up questions to understand the data better but I'm happy to pick those up with officers directly, thanks.

Appendix 1 – Breakdown of households in Temporary Accommodation in North West Locality 24 January 2018

All North West

Ward No	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Managed Units	B&Bs	Hostels	Total
Singles	2	1	38	85	0	126
Couples	3	1	0	11	0	15
Families with Children Under 16	60	35	4	22	0	121
Families with no children under 16	4	4	0	6	0	14
Total	69	41	42	124	0	276

Ward 1 - Almond

Ward No	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Supported Units	B&Bs	Hostels	Total
Singles				54		54
Couples				7		7
Families with Children Under 16	18	2		16		36
Families with no children under 16	1	1		5		7
Total	19	3	0	82	0	104

Ward 3 - Drum Brae/Gyle

Ward No	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Supported Units	B&Bs	Hostels	Total
Singles				10		10
Couples	1			1		2
Families with Children Under 16	13	8		1		22
Families with no children under 16		1				1
Total	14	9	0	12	0	35

Ward 4 - Forth

Ward No	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Supported Units	B&Bs	Hostels	Total
Singles	2	1	38	21		62
Couples	2	1		3		6
Families with Children Under 16	28	24	1	5		58
Families with no children under 16	3	2		1		6
Total	35	28	39	30	0	132

Ward 5 - Inverleith

Ward No	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Supported Units	B&Bs	Hostels	Total
Singles						0
Couples						0
Families with Children Under 16			3			3
Families with no children under 16						0

Total	0	0	3	0	0	3
--------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Ward 6 - Corstorphine/Murrayfield

Ward No	Dispersed Flats	STL Flats	Supported Units	B&Bs	Hostels	Total
Singles						0
Couples						0
Families with Children Under 16	1	1				2
Families with no children under 16						0
Total	1	1	0	0	0	2

Appendix 2 – Average Case Length by Household category where homeless case closed between 1 January to 31 December 2017

Case Outcomes of Homeless Cases Closed – 1 January to 31 December 2017

	Single		Couple		Family - Children < 16		Family - No Children < 16		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	Housed LA/RSL/SH	826	43.5%	46	37.1%	428	52.4%	66	52.8%	1366
Housed PSL - Duties Not Discharged	173	9.1%	18	14.5%	129	15.8%	14	11.2%	334	11.3%
Housed Private L/L	57	3.0%	8	6.5%	53	6.5%	8	6.4%	126	4.2%
Housed - Other	77	4.1%	7	5.6%	21	2.6%	5	4.0%	110	3.7%
Housed - Long Term Supported Accom	40	2.1%	1	0.8%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	42	1.4%
Entered into Long Term Care	39	2.1%	4	3.2%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	44	1.5%
Intentionally Homeless	36	1.9%	2	1.6%	14	1.7%	5	4.0%	57	1.9%
Lost Contact - After	365	19.2%	18	14.5%	68	8.3%	12	9.6%	463	15.6%
Lost Contact - Before	12	0.6%	1	0.8%	5	0.6%	1	0.8%	19	0.6%
Lost Contact - Deceased	14	0.7%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	15	0.5%
Not Homeless	30	1.6%	1	0.8%	12	1.5%	1	0.8%	44	1.5%
Offered Interim Accom and Accepted	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Offered Interim Accom and Refused	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Offered SSST and Accepted	3	0.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	3	0.1%
Offered SSST and Refused	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Offered Temp Only and Accepted	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
Offered Temp Only and Declined	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	1	0.1%	0	0.0%	1	0.0%
Owner Occupier	4	0.2%	2	1.6%	3	0.4%	0	0.0%	9	0.3%
Referred to Another Local Authority	20	1.1%	0	0.0%	6	0.7%	0	0.0%	26	0.9%
Refused Offers	56	2.9%	3	2.4%	33	4.0%	5	4.0%	97	3.3%
Resolved Before Assessment	12	0.6%	1	0.8%	6	0.7%	0	0.0%	19	0.6%
None of the Above	137	7.2%	12	9.7%	35	4.3%	8	6.4%	192	6.5%
Total	1901	100.0%	124	100.0%	817	100.0%	125	100.0%	2967	100.0%

Summarised Version

	Single		Couple		Family - Children < 16		Family - No Children < 16		Total	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
	Housed	1173	61.7%	80	64.5%	632	77.4%	93	74.4%	1978
Refused	56	2.9%	3	2.4%	33	4.0%	5	4.0%	97	3.3%
Lost Contact	391	20.6%	19	15.3%	74	9.1%	13	10.4%	497	16.8%
Other	281	14.8%	22	17.7%	78	9.5%	14	11.2%	395	13.3%
Total	1901	100.0%	124	100.0%	817	100.0%	125	100.0%	2967	100.0%

QUESTION NO 19

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 1 February 2018**

Following the announcement that the Scottish Government accidentally increased council budgets by double counting £86 million.

Can the Convener please advise:

- Question** (1) The financial implications for the City of Edinburgh Council of this embarrassing miscalculation?
- Answer** (1) There is expected to be £2.983m less support through the “floor” mechanism than was originally advised in the Local Government Settlement figures issued on 14 December 2017.
- Question** (2) What representations have been made to the Scottish Government’s Finance Secretary to mitigate the impact of his error?
- Answer** (2) The Council Leader has spoken to the Cabinet Secretary and I have e-mailed him, as I committed to do at the Finance & Resources Committee meeting on 23rd January.
- Question** (3) What response has been received to the representations detailed above?
- Answer** (3) Revised figures were received on Tuesday 23 January and have been taken fully into account.
- Question** (4) Whether he has any confidence that further miscalculation on the part of the Scottish Government will not come to light before the Council’s budget for 2018/19 is set?
- Answer** (4) Local Government and Scottish Government officers are working together closely to ensure that all figures are accurate. I have no reason to expect further revisions to the Local Government Settlement of the kind mentioned in answer to Question (2) before the 22nd February meeting of Council.

However, as is generally known, the Cabinet Secretary for Finance and the Constitution has offered to engage constructively with all parties in the Scottish Parliament on any budget proposals they bring forward. Changes affecting local authorities arising from such discussions could occur ahead of the Council's budget meeting.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener for your answer.

I appreciate that events have somewhat overtaken us since that question was asked a week and a half ago and I'm sure you were as flabbergasted as all of us when the Greens agreed to support the SNP in Holyrood.

Can I just ask, obviously there are difficult decisions before this Council which need to be made, can the Convener give us an assurance that the administration won't shy away from making these in the 2018/19 budget year given the additional funding which is welcome, coming at this Council and those won't be kicked down the road in future years when we know they will be necessary. And also will the Administration now consider reviewing its presumption of a 3% increase in Council Tax given the very obvious problems with delivering Council services to the citizens of Edinburgh?

Comments by Councillor Rankin

It wasn't so much of the eloquence of the question it was because I was busy looking at my notes, so I would be grateful for your indulgence and a repetition of the question.

Comments by the Lord Provost

Councillor Hutchison could you repeat the questions.

Supplementary Question

So, that the first part of the question Convener was, will you give us an assurance that the Administration won't shy away from making difficult budget decisions in 2018/19 on the basis that additional funding is now being promised over what we expected initially, and secondly will the Administration review its presumption of a 3% council tax increase on the basis of additional funding given that this Council clearly has issues delivering basic services to citizens of Edinburgh.

**Supplementary
Answer**

First of all I thank Councillor Hutchison for his forbearance in that he was prepared to repeat the question.

On the 3%, no I'm afraid the 3% Council Tax increase is as the saying goes baked into our figures at the moment and I don't see any realistic prospect that that's going to change.

As for the increase in funding which we are told by the Cabinet Secretary for Finance is due to come to local authorities as a result of negotiations with the Green party, I think that is something which we are plainly going to take into account, we will use that money to the best extent possible. As you know however much, even if we receive twice as much say from the Cabinet Secretary, we would still be in a difficult financial position because of rising demand for Council services principally in areas like Education, Health and Social Care and Homelessness which actually make it very difficult for us to meet those demands in full, but we will look to deploy that additional money in the most effective way we can to meet the needs of the city, thank you.

QUESTION NO 20

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 1 February
2018**

- Question** (1) While recognising that the localities model is designed to promote local decision making, does the Convener agree that standardised agendas would have been appropriate for the first meeting of the four locality committees?
- Answer** (1) Core items have been identified for the consideration of each locality committee. However, it is important to allow each agenda planning meeting to feed into that process to allow for other items to be added, reflecting the established practice at other Council committees.
- Question** (2) Does the Convener agree that the agendas for the first meeting of all four localities should include discussion on the future of Neighbourhood Partnerships or the role of Community Councils in the new localities model?
- Answer** (2) The agendas will include a report on the review and consultation of governance and partnership working arrangements by the Edinburgh Partnership. This includes Neighbourhood Partnerships, which as well as being advisory committees of the Council, are also a key component of the community planning structure. Any change to the Neighbourhood Partnerships should be done in conjunction with our partners (which include community councils) and Locality Committees will be key contributors to that discussion.
- Question** (3) Does the Convener agree that the absence of this item from the agenda in any of the localities will continue to undermine the faith of local groups in the localities model and compounds the lack of communication and engagement as the localities model has developed?

Answer (3) As stated above an item on the review and consultation of governance and partnership working arrangements by the Edinburgh Partnership is on the agenda. Updates on the development of Locality Committees have been presented to neighbourhood partnership meetings in both the autumn and current rounds of meetings, and have led to considerable debate and discussion, not least with representatives of local groups. The upcoming review of community planning processes in Edinburgh will provide an opportunity for all partners including community groups to have their say on current arrangements and how they might be improved, including the relationship between community planning and Locality Committees going forward.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost. I thank the Convener for his answer. Given his answer in part one stating the importance of agenda planning meetings, and the need for us to follow the established practice at our Council meetings, would the Convener care to comment on the decision of the senior Councillor on the North-West Locality not to bother holding an agenda planning meeting and further, given the lack of engagement with community groups to date in this process in terms of developing it from the ground up rather than from the top down, and the inclination of his coalition partners to centralise everything which you can get your hands on, can the Convener give us any assurances at all that he believes this will deliver true local democracy under this localities model?

Supplementary Answer First of all the answer to your question is no and yes. I don't agree that I should be interfering in the agenda set by the localities because obviously the whole point is that localities will set their own agendas. Your question was - should the Neighbourhood Partnerships and their future beyond that, and it is on that because there's a report going about them to the first meetings of all the localities. Should I be interfering with the conduct of their business, absolutely not, and the structure of that, again no. Should we be making sure that the consultation on the future of community planning in those local areas takes place, then yes we should but that is going to take place, unless under the normal conduct of business they choose to ignore the

reports that are coming to localities and I am quite sure that that won't happen. There has been a lot of misinformation about both the intent and the practice of the move to localities and I addressed the Association of Community Councils a couple of months ago on the subject, and first had to get through all the misinformation before you could actually explain what the intent was and by the end of that, the general feedback that I got was that it had been very positive and informative. Certainly, particularly in the case of community councils, there are justifiable fears if these were based on what they think that we are trying to do but there has to be a lot more clear definition of what this is all about. This is about the devolution of powers that hitherto been held by full Council or by Committees to take them at a more local level. It is not an attempt to get round or replace community planning at those local levels and that's what the consultation which is ongoing at this moment in time is all about. The future of the Neighbourhood Partnerships obviously is critical but there is an absolute assurance that where the local Neighbourhood Partnerships are valued and are providing an input from community councils and others into the community planning process then that will continue, is going to be up to those local areas to decide what happens at that level in those localities. I have to say that generally speaking a lot of the debate on this subject has been based on misinformation, I would certainly appreciate the help of all my Councillor colleagues in putting the message of what is actually intended to localities as we go forward.

QUESTION NO 21

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

What progress is being made about the removal of unsightly metal grilles from the windows of Craigentenny Primary School, which has been requested on more than one occasion by the Parent Council?

Answer

There are no proposals to remove the grilles at Craigentenny Primary School. The grilles were installed to deter vandalism and are still needed for that purpose.

Comment by Councillor McLellan

Thank you very much, no supplementaries, just to say the parents of Craigentenny Primary will be rather disappointed with the somewhat blunt response, thank you.

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

To ask the Transport and Environment Convener how much the Council is saving by switching off flashing 20mph warning signs outside schools, and whether she will commit to having them reactivated when requested by the school and/ or its parent council?

Answer

This type of flashing sign is used to indicate that a part time 20mph speed limit is in force. The lights only flash during the periods at the start and end of the school day when the 20mph limit applies. The 30mph default speed limit for the street applies at all other times.

The legislation that governs the use of traffic signs and road markings is the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016. This only permits the use of flashing speed limit signs of this type to denote part time speed limits. In streets where a full time 20mph speed limit is now in place these signs are no longer legally permitted. They have therefore been removed and have been replaced with alternative school warning signs.

There are a number of part time 20mph limits that remain in force outside schools where the default speed limit for the street has not been reduced and the flashing signs at these schools remain operational.

Where flashing signs have been removed, this has been done to comply with legislation and not as a cost saving exercise. Whilst the value of any consequent saving to the Council has not been calculated, it is considered that this is marginal.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you very much Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her answer. The matter was raised with me by the Chair of Royal High Primary School Parent Council where since the introduction of the 20 mile an hour speed limit there's continued anecdotal evidence of an increase in speed of traffic on the very wide Northfield Broadway. The Parent Council were given the reason for the turning off of the flashing lights, that cost was the issue which I see has been discounted.

I have been through the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 and in Section 10, Signs for Speed Limits, I can't see any mention of the illegality of flashing speed warnings where the limit is constant. I would be grateful if the Convener could point me to the correct section. I can however point to part 2 paragraph 11 which states that nothing in these general directions limits the power of the Scottish Ministers to dispense with, add to, or modify any of the requirements of these general directions in their application to any particular case. In other words even if it is illegal to have flashing warning signs outside schools in a 20 mile an hour limit, which I find hard to believe, it is in the gift of the Scottish Transport Minister to change the rules. So I would ask whether the Convener will now agree to make an approach to the Transport Minister to clarify the situation, after all now we know it won't cost the Council any money to turn them back on, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

I appreciate that each individual school will have particular concerns about their own individual context and particularly in terms of anecdotal, and I stress, anecdotal evidence of speeding. I won't commit to approaching the Minister on this, what I will commit to however, is to investigate this a little further and I would invite Councillor McLellan to come to a meeting with me which we'll set up to discuss this in more detail. I have a suspicion that it's not going to go terribly far as a topic.

QUESTION NO 23

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

What provision for sports amenities in North East Edinburgh will be made to replace the loss of pitches at Meadowbank and Westbank Street?

Answer

Edinburgh Leisure (EL) have relocated clubs as best they can across the Council's sport and leisure estate. The majority of 3G pitches are in the school estate and as EL manage community access to these facilities this has helped the relocation process.

The loss of pitches at Meadowbank is temporary whilst the new sports centre is developed. Once finished, new Meadowbank will have two 3G pitches (existing Meadowbank has one) along with new and improved indoor sport facilities. Two 3G pitches will be delivered at Hunter's Hall Park and the new high school proposed for Craigmillar, would provide indoor and outdoor sport facilities for the local community.

QUESTION NO 24

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

What measures are being taken to ensure that proper pedestrian access is maintained to and from the Urban Eden development at all times, and how much longer it will take to settle the dispute over ownership of the Crawford Bridge?

Answer

Council Officers have been in contact with Places for People to remind them that there are legal procedures that must be followed to close any road. Access will be maintained for pedestrians at all times as this is legally required.

The Council is currently working with Registers of Scotland to provide relevant legal documentation in order to conclude the ownership dispute.

It is anticipated that the complexities surrounding title to land over which the bridge is constructed will take some months to resolve.

The Local Transport and Environment Manager will continue to update local members on progress.

QUESTION NO 25

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question

When the Council will take direction to have the relevant work carried out to allow the reopening of the Wolseley Steps on London Road?

Answer

Edinburgh Shared Repair Service has issued a Statutory Notice informing the owners that we would be enforcing the repairs under section 26 of the City of Edinburgh Council Confirmation Act (1991).

As part of this process, a tender is currently being prepared for the necessary works. This tender will be issued in February with a return date of 13 March 2018. It is anticipated that the successful contractor to be on site in April 2018.

QUESTION NO 26

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question How many Council Tax arrears warnings have been issued in error in each of the past five years and the measures taken to reduce the number?

Answer The level of Council Tax arrears warnings that have been issued in error and subsequently withdrawn are shown in the table below:

Council Tax Year	Council Tax Reminders Error Rate (Percentage of total reminders issued)	Second Council Tax Reminder / Final Notice Error Rate (Percentage of total second reminders issued)	Summary Warrants withdrawn (Percentage of total warrants issued)
2013/14	548 (0.36%)	49 (0.31%)	2,189 (4.7%)
2014/15	639 (0.47%)	58 (0.41%)	1,787 (4.0%)
2015/16	578 (0.46%)	46 (0.36%)	1,455 (3.7%)
2016/17	514 (0.42%)	64 (0.10%)	1,456 (4.0%)
2017/18*	314 (0.30%)	38 (0.39%)	To be confirmed at year end

**year to date reporting to the end of December 2017.*

A range of improvement actions are being applied to reduce the error rate. These include:

- An increase in the staffing levels within the Council Tax team, to support processing activities and ensure accounts are as up to date as possible.
- The deployment of online forms that enable people to update their own Council Tax accounts. This is supported by an automated system that generates timely account updates.

- Text (SMS) reminders are issued to account holders prior to any formal recovery notices being sent.
- An ongoing programme of performance management, staff training and quality reviews within the Council Tax team to reduce errors by Council officers.

Management information review prior to the commencement of the summary warrant process to identify people with an outstanding enquiry. These cases are prioritised for resolution and do not progress through recovery process until the enquiry has been completed.

Supplementary Question

Very grateful for the detailed reply. Members will remember the flurry of gossip a few months ago when it was revealed no less than 17 of our number were in arrears with their Council Tax. No names, no pack drill, so the rumour mill was in full swing.

Well recently, I have a confession to make. No I was not one of them, but earlier this month I was in receipt of an official Council warning that we were in arrears and unless payment was received, further action would be taken. You will of course all be very relieved to hear that we were not in arrears, it would be pretty stupid of us after 25 years of dutifully and meticulously ensuring our dues were paid to wait until I became an elected member to default, but it took a day of checking our bank details, checking with the bank to confirm the money had gone out and then hours on the phone trying to find a way through the Council's Kafkaesque telephone system where like something from the Prisoner the answer is always press 1.

This will be the story behind each one of what we now know, that hundreds of errors, so will the Convener agree to progress a further report to achieve further reductions and to have them monitored and for further work to be done to improve the call system in which human contact is not only a reluctant last resort?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I thank Councillor McLellan for his question and I can quite understand why his own experience has prompted the question. I think it's a perfectly fair point, it can be very alarming for people to receive warnings of that kind when there's actually no basis for it.

What we do have in the customer function is a continual improvement programme which is underway and you can see in the response the number of things that we are doing to improve that and I think that those figures although low in percentage terms are in absolute terms certainly too high and we want to see that change. I think that there is as I say as that programme is underway and I'm expecting update reports to come from the customer function to let us know how far these improvements have actually come about and what further improvements can be made because I think this is certainly something we need to keep on top of and I am happy to ask officers about bringing a report of the kind that you mentioned to my Committee.

QUESTION NO 27

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Conveners of the Planning and Regulatory Committees at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question (1) Which industry bodies, groups, companies or organisations in the short stay holiday accommodation industry has the Council met (remotely or in person) during 2017 and 2018?

Answer (1) Meetings have taken place with both Airbnb and the UK Short Term Lets Association.

In addition, Councillors may have met with individuals on this matter as part of their ward business.

Question (2) On what date did each meeting take place with which organisation and which council departments attended

Answer (2) With Airbnb the following meetings have taken place:

- On 10 October 2017 representatives of Airbnb met with officers from the Place Directorate at their request.
- A follow up meeting took place on 30 November 2017 between representatives of Airbnb and the Regulatory Services Manager to discuss the possibility of a meeting with elected members of the Council
- On 22 January 2018 representatives of Airbnb met with Councillors of all political groups at a meeting chaired by the Convener of Housing and Economy Committee. Officers from the Place Directorate also attended that meeting.

With the UK Short Term Lets Association the following meetings have taken place:

- The Association requested a series of meetings on 23 and 24 Nov 2017 where representatives met the following Council representatives:
 - a) Regulatory Services Manager
 - b) Executive Director of Place
 - c) Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee accompanied by the Service and Policy Advisor for Housing and Economy and the Chief Planning Officer
 - d) Convener of Communities and Culture Committee and Vice Convener of Housing and Economy Committee accompanied by the Service and Policy Advisor for Housing and Economy.

These meeting allowed Council Officers and Councillors to explore issues relating to the short term let industry operating in the city. In return their representatives outlined plans for self-regulation including drawing up a charter

Question

- (3)** What notes and actions have been taken from these meetings and to whom have these been reported?

Answer

- (3)** These meetings were used to discuss issues relating to the short term let industry operating in the city. The only action from the initial meetings with Airbnb was to arrange a meeting with a wider representation of elected members. This meeting took place on 22 January 2018.

A note of this meeting will be prepared and the outcomes will be reviewed by elected members in the working group being set up following the decision of Council on [14 December 2017](#).

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Conveners of Planning and Regulatory for their answers to my questions. It was disappointing to me and to colleagues from all parties that we were given such incredibly short notice of the meeting with Airbnb which took place on 22nd January and it was also a surprise to me to hear at that meeting, the Council had already been meeting with industry players and I feel it is a shame that when there is cross party agreement on the need to act on this issue that the conversations had started without involvement of the Greens and the other groups in the Council. I believe that now that the Advisory Panel has now published its report on the collaborative economy, that the Council needs to act with some urgency and ensure that we're clear in our representations to the Scottish Government about what Edinburgh needs. But in order to do that we need to pick up the pace on our cross party working to ensure that we're agreed on the asks of the Government.

Therefore could I ask the Conveners please to commit to ensuring that the cross party working group that we agreed in this Council in December meets within the next fortnight, so that we can ensure that all groups are involved in working with the companies in the short term lets industry and working with the Scottish Government to identify solutions for Edinburgh's residents. I understand that there is a bit of confusion around who's answering this because I had addressed my question to the Conveners of Planning and Regulatory, but I understand that Councillor Barrie is answering, so I think that there is a slightly second question, which is to ensure that we have members from those Committees involved as I understand that the solutions to these issues will cut across a number of Committees, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer
(Councillor
Barrie)**

Thank you for your supplementary. It was regrettable that it was relatively notice, so really grateful (and expressed that if you recall) that all parties managed to get represented at that meeting. It is quite difficult because the people, as you will recall, were flying in from Dublin, from London, we had residents that addressed that meeting very eloquently I have to say.

I think later today you'll see, I'm sure you will see, that there's a motion, an addendum and bits and pieces going up, we do have cross-party support to deal with this problem.

It's every intention now, how soon we can get a meeting together of groups, I'm absolutely adamant that will take place as soon as we possibly can. Can I give you an absolute timescale on that today - it will depend on everybody's diaries but I can give you absolute assurance that the administration wants everybody on board, it's across every ward I believe that short term lets are a problem so now that report's published you'll see that both ourselves and other political groups are calling for officers to get in contact with Scottish Government to progress this as quickly as we can. I promise you that's what will happen.

QUESTION NO 28

**By Councillor Mary Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 1 February 2018**

Question **(1)** How many play parks within Edinburgh Council have accessible equipment for children with physical disabilities?

Answer **(1)** Of the 200 play park areas in the city, one has step access, 15 are reached over a grassed area (restricting accessibility to fine weather) and 174 have easy access. There are 46 play parks which have some accessible equipment for children with physical disabilities. When there is demand, we can also modify existing equipment to facilitate the use of safety harnesses.

Question **(2)** Does the Council have a policy to ensure that the number of accessible pieces of play park equipment will increase in future years and be included in any new play park or upgrade to existing play parks?

Answer **(2)** Yes, it is a fundamental design principle, outlined within the Council Play Area Action Plan, that new play parks and play park upgrades have accessible pieces of play equipment installed.

QUESTION NO 29

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer
by the Convener of the Planning
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 1 February 2018**

Question

What action has the Convener taken to progress the recommendation of the Music is Audible working group and the report prepared by the Music Venues Trust that the Council should consider adopting the agent of change principle?

Answer

Following the recommendation made by the Music Venue Trust, and adopted by the previous Culture and Sport Committee, Culture the Agent of Change principle was investigated by the Music Is Audible Working Group.

A meeting was held with Scottish Government officers in 2016 to discuss the issue and whether there was an appetite to introduce it into planning law and/or guidance in Scotland. The group also consulted with Planning colleagues as there was some confusion as to where Agent of Change sits in planning law – nationally or at local government level.

Both parties agreed at the time that introducing Agent of Change principles into planning legislation, whilst being proposed by the live music and entertainment industry, would not necessarily provide the solution that sponsors of the idea were seeking. It was also clarified that noise nuisance relating to music venues and other premises is managed by local authorities through licensing and environmental health policies but national planning guidance has a role to play in influencing local policy.

More recently, when the Planning Bill was introduced, the Minister for Local Government and Housing stated, in response to a question from Lewis Macdonald about Agent of Change: *“We all know that there have been difficulties in certain places with live music venues, and we have to do all*

that we possibly can to ensure that we protect that vital part of our heritage. I do not know whether primary legislation is necessarily required; it might be that changes to Scottish planning policy are required. However, whatever change is required, he [Lewis Macdonald] can be assured that I will be positive on the issue.”

Introducing Agent of Change remains an important principle for the live music industry. Noting that the UK Government has recently announced their intention to introduce Agent of Change into national planning guidance for England, dialogue has continued with Scottish Government officers and the issue under consideration. Also, the Welsh Government issued a ‘chief planner’ style letter in 2017 setting out that planning authorities should consider noise issues in granting consent for new developments and their intention to introduce Agent of Change into Welsh Planning Policy.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. I thank the Convener for his answer which was very comprehensive on Agent of Change but wasn't very committal. So I'd like to ask the Convener does he agree with the conclusion reached by meeting in 2016 that Agent of Change whilst being proposed by the live music and entertainment industry would not necessarily provide the solution that sponsors of the idea were seeking and if he does agree with that, what measures would he proposed to retain what remains of our sadly dwindling live music scene in Edinburgh?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Lord Provost, I'll address the questions. Thank you Councillor Staniforth for the question and it is something we really need to work on to protect the live music industry in the city. Agent of Change, in answer to your question, the principle is a good one, a sound one, if you'll pardon the use of that in this context, whether it's fit for purpose is another question because in a way it implies that the southside developer must provide soundproofing on the venue which is a very very complex and probably unworkable situation so it's something we need to work on and I'd be quite happy to meet you outside of this meeting to discuss further, anything you wish to bring to the table, a mechanism for addressing

it may be through the LDP process but it's early days at how we can tackle that. I hope that answers your question for now.

QUESTION NO 30

By Councillor Gloyer for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question (1) How many communal glass recycling bins are emptied to a set schedule?

Answer (1) All communal glass recycling bins are on a fixed schedule whether that be a weekly or fortnightly collection.

Question (2) How many are emptied only after a member of the public has reported them full?

Answer (2) No bins are only emptied when highlighted by members of the public. There are some sites that may require additional collections due to high volumes of glass, but once we are informed of these, the sites are cleared as a priority and revisions to frequencies of collections are made accordingly.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her answer but I confess I am a bit puzzled by it. I asked the question because just before Christmas a resident contacted me to report that a glass recycling bin in Corstorphine had not been emptied quote “for months” so I reported it to the member's waste e-mail address. I was startled to be informed and I quote “according to the information on my system this bin does not have a regularly scheduled collection day. We rely on members of the public informing the waste department when it requires emptying” and that's a verbatim quote from the e-mail I received.

So will the Convener ensure that all front line Council officials are provided with accurate information about the schedules for emptying glass recycling bins and perhaps she could further ensure that the bin on Station Road in Corstorphine is included in these schedules, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Gloyer for your supplementary. I am disappointed to hear that there is some mismatch between what your resident was told and what we understand to be the service. I'll pick it up with officials and will hopefully get it solved in particular for that, thank you.

QUESTION NO 31

**By Councillor Gloyer for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 1 February
2018**

Question Will the Cycling Champion use his influence with Spokes to encourage them to speak out against inconsiderate or illegal behaviour by cyclists?

Answer Yes

Supplementary Question Thank you again Lord Provost and I thank the Council Leader for the succinctness of his answer. Perhaps it was the tonsillitis that he knew about already at that point. I read the additional information with interest, I did note that the partners with which the Council works on these matters didn't seem to include Spokes, but the initiatives are all very valuable. I know the Active Travel Team is very conscious of the need to inform cyclists of their responsibilities and we've all seen cyclists behaving inconsiderately. We know that they're a minority but they give all the responsible cyclists a bad name and the more we all do to deter that kind of behaviour the better.

I was aware of the trials on the North Edinburgh path network and hope they're a success although it does strike me that a cyclist who doesn't notice pedestrians is unlikely to notice a couple of signs.

Will the Council Leader ensure that an analysis is conducted of how cyclists behaviour actually changes as a result of the trials on the North Edinburgh path network and I suggest that this analysis might be brought to the Transport and Environment Committee before the trials are rolled out across the rest of the City.

Supplementary Answer Yes.

Council Question 31 – Additional Information

An online forum which is very popular in Edinburgh is the City Cycling Edinburgh Forum, which has a dedicated section for 'Today's Rubbish Cycling' in which they highlight and debate the standard of cycling in Edinburgh:

<http://citycyclingedinburgh.info/bbpress/topic.php?id=7059&page=113>

The Council's Road Safety and Active Travel teams also undertake or participate in initiatives to encourage safe and responsible cycling.

Some examples of this are:

Be Bright, Be Seen

The Be Bright, Be Seen campaign is delivered under the Council's Streets Ahead road safety partnership and is supported by Police Scotland, NHS Lothian, The University of Edinburgh, Heriot Watt University, Edinburgh Napier University and Edinburgh College. Events have been held at King's Buildings, Middle Meadow Walk, the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, the Western General Hospital and Sighthill Campus. The media campaign associated with the initiative promoted a radio message aimed at drivers and cyclists and involved the use of a set of driver-specific and cycle-specific lamp post wraps that were erected in streets around the venues.

Free lights and high visibility accessories, such as backpack covers and reflective bands, were handed out. Police officers also gave advice on the legal requirements for the use of lights and reflectors and the dangers of not using high visibility/reflective clothing when cycling in the dark.

Paths for Everyone

The '[Paths for Everyone](#)' campaign aims to encourage all users of the city's off-road path network to ensure that they are visible, that they stay alert on the paths and that they are considerate of the needs of other path users.

A code of conduct has been developed and a trial of courtesy signs, which have been developed in consultation with the Council's Active Travel Forum, is underway on the North Edinburgh Path Network. If the trial proves successful, the signs will be rolled out widely across the city's off-road paths.

Council and Sustrans officers have also been engaging with path users to encourage the use of bells, high visibility clothing/accessories and lights. Feedback from the public has been very positive and more events are planned for Spring 2018.

Young Driver Event

All sixth year school pupils in Edinburgh are invited to attend an annual Young Driver event, held at the Corn Exchange. Spokes have participated in this multi-agency event for the last two years, presenting to a total audience of around 2,000 pupils in 2017 as well as hosting a static display to promote cycling and its responsibilities as part of the key message of the event to “look out for each other”.

QUESTION NO 32

**By Councillor Rae for answer by the
Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 1 February
2018**

- Question** (1) What action has the Council taken to deal with the issue of graffiti/tagging which is becoming a blight across the city?
- Answer** (1) The Council responds to graffiti reports from members of the public or colleagues. The aim is to remove offensive graffiti from Council property within 24 hours. Non-offensive graffiti on Council buildings is removed within 10 working days. If the graffiti is on private land then it is up to the owner to treat it. On certain types of private land the Council does have enforcement powers which can be used to require the landowner to remove graffiti. Obviously these legal powers would only be used as a last resort.
- Question** (2) Are there plans for the Council to maintain a tagging database?
- Answer** (2) The Head of Place Management has been tasked with creating a working group of relevant officers to identify potential solutions to reducing the amount of graffiti in the city. The potential for a tagging database to be established will be considered by the working group.
- Question** (3) Are there plans for a multi-agency approach to resolve the problem?
- Answer** (3) The internal working group will meet for the first time in February and will consider which partner agencies should be involved in resolving this problem. I am more than happy for members to make suggestions of agencies they feel would be appropriate.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Convener and you Lord Provost. I'm now going to make a 25 minute speech.

I welcome your response Convener and I welcome the commitment to any elected members group on the issue of tagging and am wondering if you could please confirm at least a date for the invitations to go, out if you can at this point, confirm the day of the meeting, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Yes.

QUESTION NO 33

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 1 February 2018**

Question

- (1)** Will the Convener please identify:
- a) When the Council introduced a 'grace period' for parking enforcement whereby a vehicle illegally or inappropriately parked will be observed by a parking attendant for a certain period of time before a penalty charge notice is issued?
 - b) What the reason for this grace period is?
 - c) Whether the grace period varies by vehicle type, and if so what the reason for this variation is?
 - d) When the grace period was last reviewed?
 - e) Whether the grace period varies by location, and if so what this variation is?

Answer

- (1)** (a) 'Grace periods' (or observation periods) have been in place since Decriminalised Parking Enforcement was introduced in Edinburgh in 1998.
- (b) There are two reasons for 'grace periods':
- Loading/Unloading
- National legislation states that loading and unloading is permitted on areas of yellow line for up to 30 minutes (providing no loading prohibition is in force). An observation period is used by parking attendants to determine whether or not any loading or unloading activity is taking place before a parking ticket is issued.

Pay and Display

Observation periods are used for the enforcement of public parking bays to allow for any slight variations in timekeeping (e.g. fast/slow clocks) and to ensure that a driver does not receive a parking ticket whilst in the process of locating a ticket machine/paying for parking time.

- (c) Passenger vehicles are given a five-minute observation period to determine if loading and unloading is taking place, whilst goods vehicles are given a 10-minute observation period for the same purpose due to the potential bulk and weight of the items they may be loading/unloading.
- (d) Grace periods were last reviewed in 2006, at which time the extended 10-minute observation period for goods vehicles was introduced.
- (e) Observation periods are consistent across the city.

Question (2) What methods does the Council and our parking enforcement contractor use to pass on real-time complaints from members of the public about illegal or inappropriate parking, in order to allow any parking attendants in the vicinity to attend, and when were these methods last reviewed?

Answer (2) All complaints received by the Council are passed to enforcement contractor as soon as they are received, either by email or by phone.

Question (3) If the Convener will identify which streets within the controlled parking zones and priority parking areas are currently lacking valid signs and/or lines in force to allow enforcement, and in the case of each street, how long the signs and/or lines have been lacking?

Answer (3) All known lining and signing issues that can be corrected are added to a schedule of works on a weekly basis and take an average of six weeks to be rectified. Any issues which prevent enforcement from taking place are prioritised so they can be corrected at the earliest opportunity. The schedule or works is constantly being updated as road markings and signs are replaced and new faults are identified.

Question (4) What action is the Council currently taking to minimise parking-related fraud?

Answer (4) The Council's Corporate Fraud Team undertake fraud prevention exercises relating to blue badges and all parking permits issued by the Council.

Question (5) When was the price of a Penalty Charge Notice last increased, by how much, and what conversations has the convener had with the Scottish Government about further increases, variable increases, or about devolving power to set the price of a PCN to councils?

Answer (5) The current Penalty Charge Notice charges have been in place since 2001. The Council have recommended that the Scottish Government consider reviewing the Penalty Charge Notice charges on several occasions, most recently as part of the Scottish Government consultation on Improving Parking in Scotland in 2017. Prior to 2001, Penalty Charge Notices were issued at £40 with a prompt payment discount of £20.

Supplementary Question Thank you very much Lord Provost, thank you for your flexibility in terms of the Standing Orders.

I thank the Convener for her response in terms of parking enforcement. She will recall that in August of last year there was an agreement at Transport and Environment Committee that we would receive a report on parking enforcement, I think it was proposed by Councillor Key.

Could she outline when that report will be coming forward because I don't believe that is outlined in the Forward Action Plan of the Committee. Will she agree on the issue of

passing on real-time complaints about parking enforcement from members of the public. My understanding is that although they currently come through the Council and are passed on to our contractor, the delay of sometimes up to three hours can mean that these are no longer real time complaints and we potentially lose the benefit of the information that we're getting from the public. Will she commit to the report coming forward to Committee examining what we can do to improve that and specifically looking at whether it's possible to allow our parking contractor to set up social media accounts to allow members of the public to directly report incidents of illegal and bad parking to enable them to take action on that, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Yes I can confirm that this report is coming forward to what is shaping up to be a busy May Transport Environment Committee. In terms of the Real Time complaints I understand the frustration expressed by the subtext to Councillor Booth's question. We all know of people who run out and move their cars as soon as a traffic warden is spotted anywhere in the area and it's a deeply frustrating aspect of parking enforcement. So yes I will commit to examine this to see what we can do to collapse the time between reporting and the people on the street actually being able to take some action and clearly part of that is examining whether or not a separate Twitter account might work for that. So yes to all of the above.

QUESTION NO 34

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by
the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 1 February 2018**

Vehicle Mileage Allowance

Question (1) Please provide a breakdown of the total number of miles and total cost of claims for each of the last 5 years?

Answer (1)

Year	Mileage Claimed	Amount Claimed
2013	3,232,685	£1,271,260.83
2014	3,094,133	£1,256,953.11
2015	2,923,734	£1,220,207.64
2016	2,571,350	£1,126,395.75
2017	2,172,176	£978,363.50

Question (2) What is the procedure for approval of claims for vehicle mileage allowance?

Answer (2) If the employee has direct access to the Council's HR and Payroll system, then the claim can be submitted electronically for line manager approval, which enables this to be processed directly for payroll purposes. If the employee does not have direct access to the system, they submit a manually completed expenses claim form and submit this to the manager for approval. These manual claims are then input to the system via the Council's payroll staff.

Supplementary Questions

Thanks very much Lord Provost. The 3 following questions are all related, I only have one supplementary.

The question is about the vehicle mileage that the Council approves for staff in using their own vehicles on Council business. The answer's come back that the average mileage approved every year over the last five years is between 2 and 3 million miles, an average annual cost of more than a million pounds every year for the Council. Now, whilst I appreciate that some of this mileage will be absolutely necessary for staff providing their own vehicles on Council business, in that that is useful for the Council. It does seem to me that 2 to 3 million miles is a very high number at a very high cost in monetary terms. In terms of the environmental impact, this this sort of mileage is producing around 9 kilotonnes of climate changing pollution every year, so given the Council has the aim of reducing traffic and its impacts on the city, would the Finance and Resources Convener be willing to ask the Council Director of Resources to review the Council's policy on mileage allowance with a view to encouraging more sustainable travel on Council business.

Supplementary Answer

I thank Councillor Burgess for his question, I think it's a very fair objective. This is a sum of money which can obviously in some ways be spent elsewhere, but as you say the use of people's own vehicles can sometimes be the most efficient way of managing business, but I think it would be useful to have a reconsideration of this and to see how far what we are doing still makes as much sense as it did when the policy was first initiated although we do have an annual policy review process as you know. So yes I think it is worth looking at and I will talk to the relevant Director about that.

QUESTION NO 35

By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 1 February 2018

Question (1) How many pool vehicles of each fuel type (electric, hybrid, petrol, diesel) does the Council have?

Answer (1) There are nine pool vehicles - three electric vehicles and six diesel vehicles. All other Council vehicles are allocated to Council service activities.

As part of the ongoing fleet review, officers are investigating alternative approaches to providing the car and van fleet. This includes potential for improved usage of the Enterprise Car Club, more appropriate use of public transport and opportunities to introduce more electric and hybrid vehicles into our fleet.

Question (2) What was the total mileage done by pool vehicles for each of the last five years?

Answer (2) The pool vehicles were replaced in 2015 so we only hold data from this point for all nine vehicles:

In 2015 – 16 the total mileage was 33,164 miles.

In 2016 – 17 the total mileage was 45,094 miles.

In 2017 – 18 the total mileage was 33,396 miles.

We do hold mileage for one pool vehicle which was not replaced in 2015 and this completed 6,919 miles in year 2013 -14 and 7,995 miles in year 2014 – 15.

The Council is also due to implement a fleet telematics system which will allow us to gather more accurate management information relating to all of the Council's fleet vehicles.

QUESTION NO 36

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by
the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 1 February 2018**

Question

How many parking spaces does the council provide in total
and at each of its main sites?

Answer

City Chambers – 4

Waverley Court – 82

East Neighbourhood Office – 12

South Neighbourhood Office - 29

North West Neighbourhood Office – 81

South West Neighbourhood Office - 0