

## The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 20 September 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  
Derek Howie

Graham J Hutchison  
Andrew Johnston  
David Key  
Callum Laidlaw  
Kevin Lang  
Lesley Macinnes  
Melanie Main  
John McLellan  
Amy McNeese-Mechan  
Adam McVey  
Claire Miller  
Max Mitchell  
Joanna Mowat  
Gordon J Munro  
Hal Osler  
Ian Perry  
Susan Rae  
Alasdair Rankin  
Lewis Ritchie  
Cameron Rose  
Neil Ross  
Jason Rust  
Stephanie Smith  
Alex Staniforth  
Mandy Watt  
Susan Webber  
Iain Whyte  
Donald Wilson  
Norman J Work  
Louise Young

## 1 Minutes

---

### Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 23 August 2018 as a correct record.

## 2 Questions

---

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

### Declaration of Interests

Councillors Barrie, Bridgman, Dixon, Hutchison, Ritchie and Whyte declared a financial interest in the above item (Question 6) as registered landlords.

Councillor Young declared a non-financial interest in the above item (Question 16) as the parent of a young person attending Kirkliston Primary School.

## 3 Leader's Report

---

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

- Weather conditions – thanks to staff
- Congratulations to Councillor Cook on becoming a father

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Whyte	- Administration's Budget proposals
Councillor Booth	- Budget consultation – powers to Councils from the Scottish Government
Councillor Aldridge	- Thanks to staff for response to weather events - Janitorial costs
Councillor Munro	- Robust representations being made on Council funding, replacement Council Tax, Tourist Tax and seeking allocation of the underspend by the Scottish Government.
Councillor Gardiner	- Impacts on our workforce following Brexit
Councillor Hutchison	- Edinburgh 2050 City Vision – conditions residents face at the moment

Councillor Mary Campbell	-	Provision of public toilets and public drinking fountains
Councillor Lang	-	Proposed cuts to street cleaning and road repairs
Councillor Cameron	-	Execution of commitment to accelerate investment in the upgrade of Council owned high rise stock
Councillor Howie	-	All Under One Banner March – 6 March 2019
Councillor Johnston	-	Council budget cuts
Councillor Ritche	-	Edinburgh Food Project – urgent appeal for donations – Council support for Edinburgh food banks
Councillor Macinnes	-	Edinburgh Bikeshare scheme
Councillor Main	-	Affordable housing
Councillor Dickie	-	New participation officers
Councillor Rust	-	Removal of hybrid buses on Number 10 route

## 4 Elected Member Champions

---

The Council had agreed to a review being carried out on elected member champions. Details were provided on the current position with elected member champions.

### Motion

- 1) To note the work carried out by Champions contained in the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To amend the cycling champion role to an expanded remit of Active Travel Champion.
- 3) To agree that the next Group Leaders' meeting should consider any further changes to the roles and remits of champions, with a report being brought to Council on the proposed changes.
- 4) To agree to a monitoring report on work carried out in one year's time.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

## Amendment 1

To delete all of the motion and replace with:

Council notes the varying level of details given in the Appendices by the Champions and is concerned that a Report to Full Council does not give sufficient scrutiny of the role and its linkages to Committees and agrees:

1.1. Each Champion is linked to a Parent Committee as detailed in the table below:

Canal	Transport and Environment
Carers	Culture and Communities
Child Poverty	Housing and Economy
Cycling	Transport and Environment
Equalities	Corporate Policy and Strategy
Festivals	Culture and Communities
Gaelic	Education, Children and Families
Homelessness	Housing and Economy
Small Business	Housing and Economy
Sustainability	Corporate Policy and Strategy
Veterans	Council
Volunteers	Council
Young People	Education, Children and Families

1.2 That each Parent Committee agrees the remit of its Champions and whether the role is required;

1.3 That each Champion report back on their activities annually to the Parent Committee;

1.4 That each Committee review annually whether the role is still required and whether the current Champion should remain in post and report with recommendations to Full Council.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor McLellan

## Amendment 2

Add recommendation 1.5

To note that the Union Canal strategy dates from 2011 and that the Canal Delivery Board, comprised of the council, Scottish Canals and other partners, has recommended that preparatory work should be undertaken with an aim of producing a refreshed strategy by 2021, prior to the Union Canal bicentenary in 2022; and endorse that recommendation.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Miller

### **Amendment 3**

To agree the recommendations and to add new recommendation 1.5:

That each champion produce a work plan with clear SMART objectives and report annually to the appropriate committee to enable public scrutiny of their work.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Gloyer

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

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	56 votes
For Amendment 3	-	6 votes

(For the motion as adjusted: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Cook, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Donaldson, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Howie, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Ritchie, Rose, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Work

For Amendment 3: Councillors Aldridge, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young)

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To note the work carried out by Champions contained in the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To amend the cycling champion role to an expanded remit of Active Travel Champion.
- 3) To agree that the next Group Leaders' meeting should consider any further changes to the roles and remits of champions, with a report being brought to Council on the proposed changes.
- 4) To agree to a monitoring report on work carried out in one year's time.
- 5) To note the varying level of details given in the Appendices by the Champions and express concern that a Report to Full Council did not give sufficient scrutiny of the role and its linkages to Committees and agree:

- a) that each champion be linked to a Parent Committee as detailed in the table below:

Canal	Transport and Environment
Carers	Culture and Communities
Child Poverty	Housing and Economy
Cycling	Transport and Environment
Equalities	Corporate Policy and Strategy
Festivals	Culture and Communities
Gaelic	Education, Children and Families
Homelessness	Housing and Economy
Small Business	Housing and Economy
Sustainability	Corporate Policy and Strategy
Veterans	Council
Volunteers	Council
Young People	Education, Children and Families

- b) That each Parent Committee agrees the remit of its Champions;
- c) That each Champion report back on their activities annually to the Parent Committee;
- d) That each Committee review annually and report with recommendations to Full Council.
- 6) To note that the Union Canal strategy dated from 2011 and that the Canal Delivery Board, comprised of the council, Scottish Canals and other partners, had recommended that preparatory work should be undertaken with an aim of producing a refreshed strategy by 2021, prior to the Union Canal bicentenary in 2022; and endorsed that recommendation.

(References: Act of Council No 2 of 23 August 2018; report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

## 5 Burgess Roll

---

Details were provided on the current arrangements relating to the Burgess Roll and the issuing of Burgess tickets together with proposed new arrangements for the handling of these.

### Decision

- 1) To agree that the keeping of the new Burgess Roll now be carried out by the Burgess Association of Edinburgh, including the setting and collection of fees.
- 2) To agree that the Lord Provost, the Lord Dean of Guild, and the Deacon Convener of the Trades (as all might be appointed from time to time) and / or

their Deputies now sign the newly designed Burgess ticket attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.

(Reference – report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

## **6 Edinburgh Boundaries Extension and Tramways Act 1920**

---

The Edinburgh Boundaries Extension and Tramways Act of 1920 led to a major expansion of the city's boundaries. A business case had been developed which set out proposals for the City of Edinburgh Council to celebrate the centenary of the Edinburgh Boundaries Extension and Tramways Act of 1920.

Details were provided on the project proposal and associated costs to ensure this event could be celebrated through a series of outreach and community focused events.

### **Decision**

- 1) To note the project proposals and business case to celebrate the centenary of the Edinburgh Boundaries Extension and Tramways Act 1920.
- 2) To agree that any Council spend required above that achieved through sponsorship would be considered by the Finance and Resources Committee.

(Reference – report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

## **7 Trinity Academy – 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary – Motions by Councillor Day and Jim Campbell**

---

The Lord Provost ruled that the following motions, which had been submitted in terms of Standing Order 16, be considered together:

### **Motion 1 - By Councillor Day:**

“That Council notes:

- a) The success of Edinburgh's Trinity Academy, which has been at the heart of the community for now 125 years supporting student to achieve their best.
- b) The well-established, dedicated parent council and their tremendous efforts in supporting the school.
- c) The excellent work of teaching and support staff and the continued success of trinity academy pupils both in school and in wider sports and extra curricular activities.
- d) This administration is commitment to proceed with much needed investment at Trinity Academy including a new Bangholm Sports Facility

Council requests the Lord Provost acknowledges this 125th anniversary in an appropriate manner.”

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Bird

**Motion 2 – By Councillor Jim Campbell:**

“Council

- 1) Marks the occasion of the 125 anniversary of the opening of Trinity Academy on Wednesday 4 September.
- 2) Pays tribute to all the staff students, past and present, who have played their part in reaching this milestone.
- 3) Notes that the original building has been in continued use as a school since Queen Victoria was on the throne and the very first women in the world were given the vote in New Zealand.
- 4) Celebrated that this year two girls are fulfilling the role of School Captains building on, and developing new, traditions as the Academy reflects our evolving communities.
- 5) Takes pride in the broad education provided by Trinity Academy over many many years, delivering outstanding success in sports, arts and examinations again this last year.
- 6) Looks forward to the Officers coproducing the Business Case Options analysis, recently agreed by the Education & Families Committee, with the whole Trinity Academy community, that we might all together lay the foundations for the next 125 years.”

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell seconded by Councillor Hutchison

**Decision**

That Council marks:

- a) The success of Edinburgh’s Trinity Academy, which has been at the heart of the community for the last 125 years.
- b) Pays tribute to all the staff students, past and present, who have played their part in reaching this milestone on 4 September 2018.
- c) Recognises the tremendous efforts the well-established and dedicated Parent Council make in supporting the school.



- d) The excellent work of teaching and support staff and the continued success of Trinity Academy student both in school, in sports and other extra-curricular activities witnessed by some fabulous results again this year.
- e) Looks forward to coproducing the Business Case Options analysis, recently agreed by the Education & Families Committee, with the whole Trinity Academy community, including plans for new Bangholm Sports Facility that we might all together lay the foundations for the next 125 years.

Council requests the Lord Provost acknowledges this 125th anniversary in an appropriate manner.

## **8 Queensferry Churches Care in the Community 25<sup>th</sup> Anniversary – Motion by Councillor Lang**

---

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

“Council:

1. congratulates the Queensferry Churches Care in the Community (QCCC) on its silver jubilee anniversary.
2. recognises the significant contribution which the organisation has made over the last 25 years to the health, well being and activity of older people and carers in communities across rural north west Edinburgh.
3. expresses its sincere thanks to the hard work and dedication of the QCCC staff and volunteers.
4. asks the Lord Provost to write to QCCC and mark this important anniversary in the appropriate manner.”

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

## **9 Graffiti Working Group – Motion by Councillor Rose**

---

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

“Council

- 1) Commends the Southside Association and Southside Community Council for raising funds and volunteers in order to design and paint community murals in two graffiti-stricken closes in Nicolson Street. Notes that along with an earlier

project in Gifford Park these three projects have thus far been successful in reducing graffiti.

- 2) Notes the Marine Parade Graffiti Wall and the international event at this, the longest graffiti wall in the UK, earlier this month.
- 3) Notes that in September 2017 the administration opposed a motion by Councillor Laidlaw to re-establish a Graffiti Task Force. In place of this immediate action, they resolved to establish a graffiti working group. Since September 2017, the Graffiti Working Group has met once and, to date, there is no clear evidence of resulting action or recommendations.
- 4) Notes that the administration's actions effectively prevented concerted immediate action to address an upsurge in graffiti which is of concern to residents of, and visitors to, Edinburgh.
- 5) Instructs that the Graffiti Working Group be scrapped and the Director of Place be instructed to reform a Graffiti Task Force in order to co-ordinate and address the prevalence of graffiti in Edinburgh's streets.
- 6) Instructs the Director of Place, after
  - noting any discussions undertaken by the Graffiti Working Group
  - noting previous best practice and opportunities to intervene
  - taking action he considers appropriate
  - to report progress with measures within three cycles."

### **Motion**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rose:

#### Council

- 1) Commends the Southside Association and other local people for raising funds and volunteers in order to design and paint community murals in two graffiti-stricken closes in Nicolson Street. Notes that along with an earlier project in Gifford Park these three projects have thus far been successful in reducing graffiti.
- 2) Notes the Marine Parade Graffiti Wall and the international event at this, the longest graffiti wall in the UK, earlier this month.
- 3) Notes that in September 2017 the administration opposed a motion by Councillor Laidlaw to re-establish a Graffiti Task Force. In place of this immediate action, they resolved to establish a graffiti working group.

- 4) Notes that the administration's actions effectively prevented concerted immediate action to address an upsurge in graffiti which is of concern to residents of, and visitors to, Edinburgh.
- 5) Instructs that the Graffiti Working Group be scrapped and the Director of Place be instructed to reform a Graffiti Task Force in order to co-ordinate and address the prevalence of graffiti in Edinburgh's streets.
- 6) Instructs the Director of Place, after
  - noting any discussions undertaken by the Graffiti Working Group
  - noting previous best practice and opportunities to intervene
  - taking action he considers appropriate
  - to report progress with measures within three cycles.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Laidlaw

### **Amendment**

Council

deletes paragraphs 3 to 6 of the motion and replaces with:

- 3) Notes that the Graffiti Working Group has met 3 times, however there was no Conservative representation at the meeting on 6 September 2018.
- 4) Notes that the final meeting of the Graffiti Working Group will take place on 4 December 2018 to review a report on agreed actions drafted by the Head of Place Management. The finalised version of this report will be presented to the next Culture and Communities Committee.

- moved by Councillor Wilson, seconded by Councillor McNeese-Mechan

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	18 votes
For the amendment	-	44 votes

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

For the amendment: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell,

Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young

## **Decision**

To approve the amendment by Councillor Wilson as follows:

Council:

- 1) Commends the Southside Association and other local people for raising funds and volunteers in order to design and paint community murals in two graffiti-stricken closes in Nicolson Street. Notes that along with an earlier project in Gifford Park these three projects have thus far been successful in reducing graffiti.
- 2) Notes the Marine Parade Graffiti Wall and the international event at this, the longest graffiti wall in the UK, earlier this month.
- 3) Notes that the Graffiti Working Group has met 3 times, however there was no Conservative representation at the meeting on 6 September 2018.
- 4) Notes that the final meeting of the Graffiti Working Group will take place on 4 December 2018 to review a report on agreed actions drafted by the Head of Place Management. The finalised version of this report will be presented to the next Culture and Communities Committee.

## **10 School Recruitment – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell**

---

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

“Council

Notes the efforts Officers made this year to recruit newly qualified teachers earlier than previous years, and is interested to understand how successful this was.

Therefore, asks for a report to Education, Children & Families Committee within two cycles to include:

- 1) The number of teaching and teaching assistant posts which were (a) taken up and (b) still vacant as schools and nurseries returned for this new academic year, providing a comparison with the previous five years.
- 2) A survey of Head Teachers assessing their satisfaction with the end to end recruitment process. Other sources of Head Teachers' views should also be included.

- 3) Data covering the last five years obtained from Education or HR records, indicating the average number of days between:
  - (a) Head Teachers advising of a vacancy (or the need to re-advertise a vacancy) and an advert being placed?
  - (b) Head Teachers advising of a vacancy and the last interview being held?
  - (c) A successful candidate first being interviewed and an offer being made to that candidate?
  - (d) A candidate accepting an offer and the Council gaining PVG clearance?
  - (e) A Head Teacher advising of a vacancy and a new appointment taking up that role?
- 4) An analysis of any candidates that were made offers but chose not to take up any role with this Council.
- 5) Reviews any benchmark reporting of end to end recruitment performance for similar vacancies within the Council, with other Councils, or with other organisations.”

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

## **11 Liberton High School – Motion by Councillor Smith**

---

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

“Council

- 1) Notes serious concerns over the Liberton High School remedial works which were to be completed over the summer break which have not been completed in line with deadlines set out to both the parent council and the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 2) Calls for an action plan and strategic timetable be drawn up urgently for the required works to reassure parents, children and teachers at Liberton High School that the safety in our schools is of utmost importance.
- 3) Requests that a report to update members on the remedial works is brought to the next Education, Children and Families Committee.”

## **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Smith.

- moved by Councillor Smith, seconded by Councillor Cook.

## **Amendment**

To note that the Convener and Vice Convener have agreed to meet with the Head Teacher and chair of the Parent Council at Liberton High School and that local ward councillors will be invited to attend.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dickie

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 Smith:

Council

- 1) Notes serious concerns over the Liberton High School remedial works which were to be completed over the summer break which have not been completed in line with deadlines set out to both the parent council and the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 2) Calls for an action plan and strategic timetable be drawn up urgently for the required works to reassure parents, children and teachers at Liberton High School that the safety in our schools is of utmost importance.
- 3) Requests that a report to update members on the remedial works is brought to the next Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 4) Notes that the Convener and Vice Convener had agreed to meet with the Head Teacher and chair of the Parent Council at Liberton High School and that local ward councillors would be invited to attend.

## 12 Improving Bus Services in Rural West Edinburgh – Motion by Councillor Lang

---

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

“Council

1. notes commitment 19 of the administration’s coalition agreement to “improve public transport to rural west Edinburgh”.
2. recognises that increased bus service provision is critical to the delivery of this commitment.
3. regrets that since the coalition agreement was signed:
  - a) The direct bus link between Queensferry, Kirkliston and St John’s Hospital has ceased.
  - b) The frequency of bus services between Kirkliston and Edinburgh city centre has reduced significantly following the decision of First Bus to end its 38A service.
  - c) route changes by First Bus have meant services to and from Edinburgh city centre are no longer passing through Newbridge.
  - d) The frequency of the bus service between Balerno and Edinburgh city centre has reduced in evenings and weekends.
  - e) Despite being included in the February 2018 budget, the subsidised service to St. John’s Hospital from Balerno, Currie and Juniper Green has yet to be reinstated having been withdrawn on the 10 April 2016.
4. notes that whilst Lothian Buses has launched two new services in West Lothian, with further services to start in September, it does not provide either Kirkliston or Ratho with a direct city centre service.
5. further notes that there is no direct service between Currie and Balerno with the Gyle.
6. welcomes the initiatives set out in the Public Transport Priority Action Plan as approved by the Transport and Environment Committee but believes the proposals on their own will be insufficient to deliver the promised improvement to public transport in rural west Edinburgh.
7. believes a comprehensive action plan is urgently required to improve public transport in the rural west of the City and therefore agrees for a report to come

before the Transport and Environment Committee, North West Locality Committee and South West Locality Committee in two cycles, setting out such a plan.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Webber

### **Amendment**

Deletes all after 2 in the motion and replaces with:

3. recognises the need to continue work with bus operators and local communities, including West Lothian Council, to achieve an appropriate mix of services for resident communities.
4. recognises that decisions about routes and withdrawal of services are commercial decisions by operators and are not within the gift of the Council; indeed that the Council cannot subsidise bus routes in direct competition to commercial services.
5. recognises the difficulty for operators in providing commercially successful services when demand is demonstrably low.
6. notes the ongoing level of subsidy to bus services across Edinburgh provided by CEC to ensure community links, amounting to approximately £1.2 million pounds per annum, much of which is spent in West Edinburgh. Routes include Lothian Bus routes 63 (Queensferry – Kirkliston – Riccarton), 20 (Chesser – Gyle – Ratho) and cross boundary contracts with West Lothian Council: EM Horsburgh route no 7 from Queensferry to St John’s Hospital in Livingston and the no 40/X40 EM Horsburgh route between Livingston and Royal Infirmary Edinburgh, including Ratho.
7. notes the response to a Council question raised by Cllr Webber (August 23, 2018) which states clearly that allocation of the approved additional budget allowance of £100,000 is subject to a new Framework Agreement for Supported Bus Services which will cover several routes including the need for travel between St John’s Hospital and Balerno, Currie and Juniper Green.
8. notes that the development of the Framework Agreement will allow us to work with local communities to establish route options and a true picture of the priorities of local communities for bus services; and that that work has already begun.



9. Agrees that other outstanding community concerns about public transport in West Edinburgh will be part of the Local Transport Action Plan process.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	25
For the amendment	-	36

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

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

Abstention: Councillor Bridgman)

### **Decision**

To approve the amendment by Councillor Macinnes as follows:

Council

1. notes commitment 19 of the administration's coalition agreement to "improve public transport to rural west Edinburgh".
2. recognises that increased bus service provision is critical to the delivery of this commitment.
3. recognises the need to continue work with bus operators and local communities, including West Lothian Council, to achieve an appropriate mix of services for resident communities.
4. recognises that decisions about routes and withdrawal of services are commercial decisions by operators and are not within the gift of the Council; indeed that the Council cannot subsidise bus routes in direct competition to commercial services.
5. recognises the difficulty for operators in providing commercially successful services when demand is demonstrably low.

6. notes the ongoing level of subsidy to bus services across Edinburgh provided by CEC to ensure community links, amounting to approximately £1.2 million pounds per annum, much of which is spent in West Edinburgh. Routes include Lothian Bus routes 63 (Queensferry – Kirkliston – Riccarton), 20 (Chesser – Gyle – Ratho) and cross boundary contracts with West Lothian Council: EM Horsburgh route no 7 from Queensferry to St John’s Hospital in Livingston and the no 40/X40 EM Horsburgh route between Livingston and Royal Infirmary Edinburgh, including Ratho.
7. notes the response to a Council question raised by Cllr Webber (August 23, 2018) which states clearly that allocation of the approved additional budget allowance of £100,000 is subject to a new Framework Agreement for Supported Bus Services which will cover several routes including the need for travel between St John’s Hospital and Balerno, Currie and Juniper Green.
8. notes that the development of the Framework Agreement will allow us to work with local communities to establish route options and a true picture of the priorities of local communities for bus services; and that that work has already begun.
9. Agrees that other outstanding community concerns about public transport in West Edinburgh will be addressed as part of the Local Transport Action Plan process.

### **13 Muriel Spark Centenary – Motion by Councillor Main**

---

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

“Council agrees

Dame Muriel Spark (1918-2006) is one of Scotland's greatest novelists.

Muriel Spark was critically acclaimed throughout a career which spanned six decades and is best known as the author of 'The Prime of Miss Jean Brodie'.

Born in Edinburgh in 1918 and a pupil at James Gillespies’ School, Spark lived an international life, journeying from Edinburgh to Africa, London, New York, Rome, and Tuscany.

Council congratulates ‘Muriel Spark 100’, a year-long programme of events and activities celebrating the centenary of Muriel Spark’s birth. As part of the celebrations the city has honoured Dame Muriel by naming Muriel Spark Walk on Bruntsfield Links and Miss Jean Brodie Steps in the Grassmarket.

Council requests that the Lord Provost investigates how the council might best celebrate the life of Muriel Spark in this centenary year of her life.”

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Main.

## **14 Bonfire Night – Motion by Councillor McLellan**

---

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

“Council

- 1) Welcomes community-led initiatives to ensure community bonfires are properly marshalled to avoid a repeat of last year’s disorder.
- 2) Will assist communities to encourage volunteering to help steward events.
- 3) Welcomes Police Scotland’s “Operation Moonbeam” preparations to prevent a repeat of last year’s disorder
- 4) Instructs the Head of Strategy, Insight and Communications to ensure a community safety communications plan is in place for this year’s events.”

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor McLellan.

## **15 Professor Dame Jocelyn Bell Burnell DBE – Motion by Councillor Cameron**

---

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

“Council:

Congratulates Professor Dame Jocelyn Bell Burnell DBE on being awarded the Breakthrough Prize for her work on the discovery of pulsars, and her lifetime of scientific achievement;

Welcomes and supports Dame Jocelyn’s decision to award her £2.3 million Breakthrough Prize money to the Institute of Physics to establish research studentships for people from under-represented groups; and

Conveys its warm thanks and appreciation to Dame Jocelyn for her contribution to the Royal Society of Edinburgh during her term as President from 2014-2018; and for her work as a role model for young students and female scientists throughout the world.

Council asks the Lord Provost to write to Dame Jocelyn in these terms.”

**Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Cameron.

## Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 2 of 20 September 2018)

### QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Booth for answer by  
the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

#### Question

Please list the number of vehicles in the council's own fleet by euro emissions standard, and also list the number of electric vehicles in the council's fleet.

#### Answer

The information below was prepared in August 2018 as part of an annual audit submission. Since this data was prepared, a further five electric vehicles have been added to the fleet. Four will replace diesel vehicles included below.

Euro Standard	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018
Pre-Euro	0	0	0	0	0
Euro 1	0	0	0	0	0
Euro 2	0	0	0	0	0
Euro 3	44 5%	44 5%	21 2%	15 2%	14 2%
Euro 4	476 49%	183 19%	238 26%	217 25%	221 24%
Euro 5	440 45%	708 73%	532 58%	497 56%	376 42%
Euro 6	0	10 1%	104 11%	128 15%	267 30%
Electric	11 1%	27 3%	27 3%	25 3%	25 3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>971</b>	<b>921</b>	<b>882</b>	<b>903</b>

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her answer. While I very much welcome the general improvement on a cleaner fleet for the Council, it appears that the figures on electric vehicles within the Council's fleet remain more or less static. Does the Convener agree that the Council should be leading from the front on electric vehicles and what action will the Council be taking over and above the forthcoming report to the Transport and Environment Committee to ensure that we do lead from the front on electric vehicles?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Booth, thank you for your question. In terms of electric vehicles, I think as a Council we should be leading from the front and I think we can represent that in two ways, one is the report that the reference coming forward to the Transport and Environment Committee next month which will indicate very clearly our direction of travel on that in terms of infrastructure provision and I think that will be quite a step forward for us. In addition to which, though you referenced the fleet that we run ourselves for a variety of purposes. As you know we're moving more towards less from ownership towards hire arrangements and that allows a greater degree of flexibility in how we respond to this and I expect to see more electric vehicles coming into our fleet through that route, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 2**

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

- Question** (1) How many residents are currently on the waiting list for allotments?
- Answer** (1) The Culture and Communities Committee on [11 September](#) noted that there were 2,697 people on the waiting list for allotments in the city when the report was written. Since then a further 28 people have been added.
- Question** (2) How many new allotments will the council be able to provide in each year of this council term?
- Answer** (2) We are unable to quantify the number of new allotments which will be delivered each year at this time. However, the Coalition manifesto gives a clear commitment to increase allotment, community garden and food growing provision across the city. The 11 September report outlined ways in which we can increase provision and officers are working on identifying sites for this provision and associated financial costs.
- Supplementary Question** Thanks to the Convener for her answer. There are over 2,700 people on the waiting list for allotments. Can I clarify if the Convener is aware that the Community Empowerment Act imposes a duty on local authorities to keep the allotment waiting list at no more than half the current number of allotments and that the Council therefore needs to create 1,300 additional plots, almost double the current provision and that the recent report to the Culture and Communities Committee said that the existing allotment strategy alone is unlikely to meet the demand for an allotment and therefore is the Convener prepared to ask officers to explore further more radical steps to create more allotments?

**Supplementart  
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you for the question. The answer to that is absolutely yes, I mean the report that came out on 11 September was I see a first step in just exactly where we are but as was made very clear at the Committee the competition on the use of land is such that it is very difficult to find. Obviously plots of land that are suitable but there was a plea made that as local experts in your local area is that if people have pieces of land that they think may be suitable they should bring them forward. Are we prepared to look at more radical ways I would suggest yes, we are because the competition on land makes it almost impossible to actually allocate land for allotments but we are looking at all options and we are prepared to look at more radical solutions.



**QUESTION NO 3**

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) How many applications to close streets for Playing Out events have there been this year?

**Answer** (1) 31

**Question** (2) How many applications were granted, and how many refused?

**Answer** (2) All of the applications were granted.

**Question** (3) How many approved events went ahead?

**Answer** (3) The Council does not record the number of events held.

**Supplementary Question** I thank the Convener for the answer about closing streets for play. It's welcome to hear that this season there were over 30 applications to close streets for play, but will the Convener agree that in evaluating and improving on the success of this initiative, it would be useful to know how many street play events actually did take place and would that be possible for this to be recorded and in future?

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you Councillor Burgess. I do believe that it would be valuable. This is a very important initiative I think in terms of people that are reclaiming the streets and having control over their neighbourhoods in a way that is not permitted at the moment, in the way the City operates. I think that we have to recognise the fact that weather for example can often stop an event which is planned, so there is a bit of an ad hoc feel to the process between us agreeing to close a street and the event actually happening. I will ask officers to look at some means of recording it as we go forward. This season was a little special because we started relatively late with this application process, so I hope that by the time next summer rolls around that will be in a better position to record those, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 4**

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

Why does Edinburgh spend so much less on its parks (£6,767) than the national average (£21,581) and comparable cities like Aberdeen (£17,855) and Glasgow (£38,691)?

**Answer**

The comparison which is referred to, is the net cost of parks and open spaces per 1000 people (as shown in the Local Government Benchmarking Framework). This would be a different comparison if the gross cost of the service were being used.

Edinburgh Council has a good track record of attracting income into our parks through events and concessions. This income offsets a significant amount of the gross cost of the service.

Although we have the third lowest net cost per 1000 people, we also have the fifth highest level of resident satisfaction with parks and open spaces in Scotland (at 91%) and have 32 Green Flag standard parks – far and away the highest number of any of the other Scottish Councils.

**Supplementary Question**

Thanks to the Convener for the answer about the Council spending on parks. The Convener may be aware of concerns that the current level of investment in Edinburgh's park infrastructure may not be enough to maintain footpaths, benches and other structures in a satisfactory condition into the future and that the Council may be building up a significant liability for the future. Can I ask if the Convener would be willing to request an audit of the condition of park infrastructure to inform the Council's future spending decisions on parks?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Burgess. I mean I will point out the fact that despite our relatively low expenditure in parks we enjoy enormous success with them, both in terms of those people who want to come forward to use our parks for events and happenings, but also in addition to the recognition that were given with the number of Green Flag status. It's a remarkably high level that this City receives and enjoys, and I think that that is a reflection of the quality of our parks and the work that is done within them. In terms of an audit I agree with you there are always issues about looking forward towards maintenance and support of those very valuable assets to the City. I will discuss with officers how the best way is to move forward on this, to help enlarge our picture of what's happening and how we go forward in the future, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 5**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by  
the Convener of the Housing and  
Economy Committee at a meeting of  
the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) How many residential properties in Edinburgh are owned by the Council?

**Answer** (1) There are 19,836 residential properties presently within Council ownership.

**Question** (2) How many of these residential properties are currently vacant or unoccupied?

**Answer** (2) There are 566 (as at 17/9/18) Council homes vacant or unoccupied, at present. This includes 372 homes that are currently in refurbishment programmes. The remaining 194 homes are in the letting process.

On average, the Council advertise 35 homes per week through Key to Choice. The current average relet times for a Council home is 28 days.

**Question** (3) Since March 2017 how many residential properties owned by the Council

a) have been sold or

b) have been identified for sale?

The answers to all of the above questions (1), (2) and (3) to be broken down for each Ward

**Answer** (3) a) Since March 2017, 18 Council properties have been sold.

This is further broken down by the following wards:

City Centre	3
Forth	2
Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	2
Inverleith	3
Leith	1
Liberton/Gilmerton	1
Morningside	1
Sighthill/Gorgie	4
Southside/Newington	1

b) Since March 2017, 35 Council properties have been identified for sale, broken down into the following wards:

Almond	1
City Centre	1
Craigtinny/Duddingston	1
Drum Brae/Gyle	1
Forth	9
Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	2
Inverleith	5
Leith	2
Leith Walk	2
Liberton/Gilmerton	4
Pentland Hills	1
Portobello/Craigmillar	1
Sighthill/Gorgie	3
Southside/Newington	2

**Question** (4) What criteria do the Council apply, when deciding to sell a Council-owned residential property?

**Answer** (4) The overarching objective of the acquisition and disposal policy is to increase supply and reduce ongoing management and maintenance costs through block consolidation. This is achieved through the purchase of homes where full block consolidation is achievable over 25 years, or to divest from blocks where the Council is the minority owner.

**Question** (5) Is the criteria (4) the same across all Wards?

**Answer** (5) Yes

**Question** (6) How many new Council owned properties have been built/purchased since March 2017? Broken down for each Ward.

**Answer**

**(6)** Since March 2017, the Council has completed 103 new build properties. This is broken down by ward below:

Leith	32
Forth	71

In addition to the above, there are currently 3,000 Council homes in design & development with 2,300 affordable homes under construction on 35 sites.

There has been a total of 28 acquisitions, broken down by ward as follows:

Colinton/Fairmilehead	1
Craighentony/Duddingston	3
Forth	2
Inverleith	1
Leith	2
Liberton/Gilmerton	6
Pentland Hills	10
Portobello/Craigmillar	2
Sighthill/Gorgie	1

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener for your answers. At this present stage we have just under 3% of our housing stock unoccupied, two thirds of which are being refurbished. Considering the emergency motion agreed at the North West Locality Committee last week regarding the poor state of the Muirhouse high-rise presently occupied by council tenants, how bad are these properties that they are actually unoccupied?

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you Councillor Osler for your question. The properties that will be unoccupied, that are being refurbished, will be properties that have become vacant. I don't have all of the details, I am happy to follow up on some of the detail of that. It's a slightly strange question I think in terms of the properties will have become vacant and obviously when properties become vacant there is an opportunity for us to do some of the important works like refurbishing kitchens and bathrooms, also in terms of more structural things such as heating systems, so it's an opportunity for us to undertake those larger works while they are unoccupied.

**QUESTION NO 6**

**By Councillor Rae for answer by the  
Convener of the Regulatory  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

For 2016/17 and 2017/18 what is the total income to the Council of fees paid by private landlords to be on the landlord register; and what assessment has the council made of likely income increase in light of Scottish Government consultation on landlord fee increases?

**Answer**

The total income to the Council from fees paid by private landlords to apply to be a registered landlord was:

2016/17 = £721,799.71

2017/18 = £752,548.20

Scottish Government have proposed a 26% uplift to all landlord registration fees to account for inflation over the last 10 years. Based on the 2017/18 income it is estimated an increase of 26% would result in additional income of c.£195,662 per annum.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you for your answer on this. In the light of the welcome anticipated increase in income from landlord registration, could the Convener please confirm to committing to bring forward proposals that would ensure private landlords are made fully aware of their new responsibilities following significant and very welcome changes in tenancies last December and could you further ensure that firm enforcement action will be taken against any landlords who fail to meet the responsibilities in future? Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Rae for your further question. All I can confirm at this stage is the extra income will be used for licensing, licensing enforcement and HMO enforcement. We certainly can get more detail to you in due course.

**QUESTION NO 7**

**By Councillor Rae for answer by the  
Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

Of the 18,988 student bed-spaces in Edinburgh, for each of the three years 2015/16, 2016/17 and 2017/18

- a) for how many are non-domestic rates paid during non-term time when they are being let commercially;
- b) how much was raised in NDR and
- c) what representations has the city council made to the Scottish Government following the Barclay Review of NDR to address the taxation position of student accommodation let out in non-term times.

**Answer**

- a) Non Domestic Rates is a property based tax and it has not been possible to identify student bed spaces from the Rates Valuation Roll. There are however four entries that Lothian Valuation Joint Board has valued for commercial purposes during non term time.
- b) The following properties are currently valued for commercial purposes outwith term time.

**1-4 Kincaids Ct** (now known as 2-12 St Johns Hill)

Financial Year	Amount charged
2015/16	£9,786.18
2016/17	£11,141.75
2017/18	£14,323.27

**7-13 Robertson Close** (occupied by Scottish Youth Hostel and as a registered charity receives 80%)

2015/16	£1,006.07
2016/17	£1,233.36
2017/18	£1,986.87



### **1-3 College Wynd**

2015/16	£2,344.92
2016/17	£2,489.48
2017/18	£5,992.96

### **50 Blackfriars Street**

2015/16	£41,539.29
2016/17	£103,530.01
2017/18	£130,343.76

**TOTAL                                    £325,717.92**

- c) Council officers participated in various groups that contributed to the Barclay Review and were supportive of the position that commercial elements should be liable for rates. At this time further views on the specific topic of student accommodation and the application of reliefs are not being sought by the Scottish Government's consultation on the implementation of the Barclay Review. Lothian Valuation Joint Board is continuing to engage with providers of student accommodation to ensure that all appropriate properties are included on the valuation roll.

**QUESTION NO 8**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

At the 14 December 2017 meeting of the Council and in response to question 5.10 on the Davidson's Mains roundabout, the Convener said "it is intended to consult with the local community and other stakeholders over possible improvements to the roundabout in spring next year."

**Question** (1) Why was a consultation on changes not progressed within the timescale originally advised?

**Answer** (1) In response to your previous [Council question](#) (Item 5.10) on 31 May 2018 the timetable was confirmed.

The initial proposals were sent to Davidson's Mains and Silverknowes Association (DMSA) in June. However, their feedback indicated support for a traffic signal controlled junction. This is currently being assessed and required survey work planned.

**Question** (2) What is the latest timetable for this consultation to take place?

**Answer** (2) The public consultation timetable will be developed once the assessment is complete. If this is assessed as a viable alternative to replacing the roundabout, detailed designs will be required in advance of the public consultation.

**QUESTION NO 9**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

Further to the answer she gave at the 23 August 2018 Council meeting in response to question 5.25 (3), does the Convener believe the existing Fairtrade road signs in place in Edinburgh meet the requirements under the standing legislation?

**Answer**

No, in the light of the guidance recently provided by the Scottish Government it would appear that these signs do not conform with the legislation.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you very much and I thank the Convener for her honest answer. Given the fact that it's her view that the existing signs may not be compliant with the legislation, does she intend to ask for them to be removed, and if she doesn't, and she does think it's still a relatively low risk scenario, is it possible to request low-risk new signs in Queensferry?

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you Councillor Lang. I intend to work with officers to see what we should do about a programme where we move towards a position where we are not in contradiction to the legislation. So clearly we have to deal with the fact we already have some of these existing signs and work out how best we can move towards conforming with legislation. In that light I think it would be unwise to add new ones. This does not indicate any degree of lack of support for Fairtrade, in fact I can mention the fact that the scarf I'm wearing today was made by Palestinian women in the Gaza Strip under a UN Fair trade agreement, purchased here in Edinburgh I hasten to add, if anybody's looking for Christmas gifts with a conscience. I think it's very very clear that Fairtrade is a very important aspect of what Edinburgh represents and I would like to see that reflected in some way whether or not it's within specific road signs remains to be seen, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 10**

**By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) Please could you list the number of cycle racks that have been installed in each ward for the past 5 years?

**Answer** (1) Please find below details of the number of cycle rack sites and spaces available by ward. Information is not held for the number installed prior to 1 January 2016 however it is understood that most of these spaces have been installed as part of phases 1 and 2 of the current roll-out

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Sites</b>	<b>Spaces</b>
Almond	7	65
City Centre	230	1829
Colinton/Fairmilehead	1	4
Corstorphine/Murrayfield	16	81
Craigtinny/Duddingston	9	68
Drum Brae/Gyle	7	71
Forth	8	48
Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	22	190
Inverleith	42	412
Leith	25	173
Leith Walk	45	160
Liberton/Gilmerton	14	158
Morningside	47	231
Pentland Hills	2	20
Portobello/Craigmillar	12	82
Sighthill/Gorgie	13	66
Southside/Newington	102	731

**Question** (2) What is the current cost to install one/two/three/four cycle racks?

**Answer** (2) The unit cost per cycle rack or hoop, including installation costs and officer time, is approximately £250.00.

**Question** (3) How many cycle racks do you intend to install in each Ward before the end of this financial year?

**Answer** (3) There are two further phased roll-outs planned. It is hoped that Phase 3 will be delivered this financial year, with Phase 4 to follow in 2019/20.

The table below shows the total number of spaces planned in Phase 3:

**Phase 3**

<b>Ward</b>	<b>Spaces</b>
City Centre	98
Corstorphine/Murrayfield	6
Leith	6
Leith Walk	14
Morningside	28
Portobello/Craigmillar	10
Sighthill/Gorgie	14

**Question** (4) How many requests for cycle racks are awaiting start dates by each Ward?

**Answer** (4) There are 75 sites that are awaiting assessment for their suitability for cycle parking facilities. This list of potential sites for assessment is not split according to ward location as this is not a factor in the assessment process.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener for your answers to the questions. One cycle rack in Colinton, Fairmilehead, two cycle racks sites in Pentland Hills installed since January 2016, zero cycle racks to be installed in these wards before the end of the financial year.

I requested a cycle rack over a year ago near to the Pentland surgery and subsequently one for Currie Community Centre, still no sign of any bike racks. On top of that, no walk cycle projects scheduled in either part of these wards. Active travel encouragement in this part of the city seems to have braked to a standstill. There are also two wards that are very high in car ownership and if you are serious about getting people out of their cars and on to bicycles in these areas, then quite simply what are you going to do about, it looking for a steer.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost, thank you Councillor Bruce for your supplementary. I think it's absolutely clear that this Administration is deeply committed to providing alternative modes of transport in the city, I think however you can see from the figures where there's been a history of concentration that's in the city centre and that reflects commuting patterns. It reflects increased use within the city centre, it does not mean to say that we're ignoring what's going on in the further out parts of Edinburgh. So, for example, in Phase 4 we have planned 18 cycle racks in Pentland Hills and that's reflected in some of the other figures attached to other wards. I don't think any inference can be taken from the fact that at the moment you've experienced a small delay on one cycle rack request. If you care to drop me the information because I have no approach on this from you, if you'd like to give me the information, I'll follow it up specifically and ensure that that one particular one that you are looking for is installed as soon as possible, thank you.

**Comments by  
the Lord  
Provost**

Before we move on to the next question, I've been fairly lenient up until just now because I have reminded members in previous meetings that supplementary questions are for clarification on points raised in the written response. If members want to expand the topic the option is there to raise motions for this meeting so I would expect and ask members to respect by going forward, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

What services to the public were provided from the public counter at 249 High Street prior to the renovation works and where can the public now access these services?

**Answer**

Before and after the renovations at 249 High Street the public counter has provided a range of services, with the main functions detailed below:

- Licensing applications and payments
- Payment for Council services
- Council Tax/Benefit enquiries
- Scottish Welfare enquiries
- Young person services and signposting
- Immigration queries and advice
- Family Household support and signposting
- Housing support and advice
- General Council enquiries

At the time of the renovation the resident parking service moved to the Council's Drumbrae office. The Drumbrae office continues to be the main service location and will shortly be supported by an online parking application service, which is scheduled to go live at the end of 2018. This was the only service that did not return to 249 High following the renovation.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you for the response. Given that most of the areas in the city with permit parking are within easy access of the city centre, is there any intention to move the residents parking service back to the city centre where people can walk to pick up their permits rather than have to drive to Drum Brae in line with the Council's active travel policies?

**Supplementary Answer**

I thank Councillor Mowat for her supplementary. In fact the feedback from customers suggests that they are, the problem has been about driving into the city centre in order to pick up their parking permits and it seems that there's a

lot more parking space available in Drum Brae for them to use and so far there hasn't been any negative feedback that I'm aware of, but as you know and as the answer says, there will increasingly be possible for people to apply online which means they won't have to travel at all.



**QUESTION NO 12**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the  
Leader of the Council at a meeting of  
the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) When was the decision taken to seek appointment of a Commercial and Procurement Director?

**Answer** (1) The decision to test the labour market for a potential Commercial Director was taken in April 2018

**Question** (2) Who took the decision and when was the minority Administration advised?

**Answer** (2) The decision was taken by the Chief Executive as the Council's statutory Head of Paid Service, in consultation with the Leader and Depute Leader of the Council, as well as the Convenor of the Finance and Resources Committee

**Question** (3) How does this role relate to the position of Director of Finance, Treasury Manager and other existing positions?

**Answer** (3) The Council has not employed a Director of Finance since the senior management structure was reorganised in 2011, when the posts of Director of Corporate Services and Director of Finance were merged into the role of Director of Corporate Governance.

The Executive Director of Resources, within the Council's current senior management structure, is now responsible for these functions, supported by the Head of Finance as the Council's Statutory Chief Financial Officer (Section 95 Officer) and other Heads of Service. The role of Commercial Director, if a successful appointment is made, will report to the Executive Director of Resources, alongside the Head of Finance. The Treasury Manager role, which leads upon the Council's treasury management activities, continues as a part of the Finance Division's management structure, within the Resources Directorate.

If a successful appointment is made to the proposed Commercial Director role, then the Executive Director of Resources will consider realigning some existing teams

within the directorate in support of this post. Such changes would be delegated operational management decisions.

**Question** (4) Was there consideration given to this being a commission based position?

**Answer** (4) This is a commission based position, i.e. any appointee would be expected to fully recover their own costs and to generate significantly greater income/savings. The post is also intended to be on a fixed-term basis only so that this does not add to the Council's senior management structures on a recurring basis. The initial costs for this position would be funded from the vacant post of Head of ICT within Resources, consequently there are no additional costs associated with this proposed appointment.

**Question** (5) What are the recruitment and any other costs to date?

**Answer** (5) The costs to date for the search activities for this role are £15,557 and these have been commissioned via the Council's approved supplier for search and selection activities. These costs have been fully underwritten from the savings generated through the vacant Head of ICT post.

**Question** (6) Why did the recruitment advertisement not mention the City Council?

**Answer** (6) Professional advice from the Council's search and selection supplier recommended that candidates with the right skills and expertise for this role would be predominantly based with private industry and that they would be highly unlikely to engage with a standard recruitment advert, or one in which a public-sector organisation was explicitly named.

**Question** (7) Will the identification and delivery of new commercial opportunities and savings from existing and future suppliers be subject to Committee/Council approval?

**Answer** (7) Any income generation opportunities or savings proposed through this approach will be subject to formal scrutiny, review and approval by Council or Committee, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation and Contract Standing Orders.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Than you Lord Provost, I will leave the Council Leader to reflect on the fact that we can employ a pupil support assistant for a year on the amount that has been spent on recruitment alone thus far, or indeed more reflective of Administration priorities he could have had more than 20 times the current number of pop-up Bob models. However, my question is, given the strategic nature of the senior position, is the Council Leader content for the written answer to form part of the report to the Finance and Resources Committee on this proposed appointment to ensure proper governance scrutiny and transparency, given that elected members, including with the terms of the answer, the Vice-Convenor of Finance and Resources, have been kept in the dark to date?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Obviously I don't recognise that characterisation. This has been a very long running process. The Conservatives will remember in previous years the Council did similar exercises to this Lord Provost but it wasn't bringing someone in to upskill us as an organisation, to make sure we are spotting the opportunities for additional revenue and also getting best value for money out of the public purse. In previous years what we did was employ firms to come in and do a kind of smash-and-grab raid in giving us recommendations to take forward and sometimes that worked and sometimes it didn't and I have to say the amount that this Council has paid for those services in the past has been vast. What we're talking about in this model is bringing in someone with those skills and expertise so that the senior management team of this organisation can be upskilled and so the organisation as a whole can be upskilled and so that they have a legacy of enormous hopefully financial benefits to this city which far far outweigh the salary and recruitment costs. So I find the comparison wrong and frankly crass from the Conservatives because the comparison shouldn't be with some of the dedicated hard-working frontline staff this Council employs, the cost comparison for us should be around the alternatives to this model of working. This has been an operational decision but it's at the end of a process led by my colleague Councillor Dixon and of course Councillor Rankin in terms of income maximisation which has gone on for some time and this has been the logical conclusion of all that work. In terms of a Committee report on the impact, if the Committee

wants to have a report the Committee can have a report, I don't think it's for me to stand here and commit to that so I'll speak to the Finance Convener about bringing something forward to Finance and Resources but the differential and the opportunity cost should be accurate, it shouldn't be against a teaching assistant, it should be against the millions of pounds, millions of pounds, that this Council has spent in the past getting similar strands of work from big firms like PWC who have come in and left us with those action points. So I'm happy for a cost comparison to be done, I'm happy for that to be done in Committee, I am happy to be done in this Council, but this cost comparison should be honest and transparent.

**QUESTION NO 13**

**By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

What official polling has been carried out by the Council to find the opinions of Edinburgh residents with regards to the expansion of 20mph zones?

**Answer**

There has been no polling carried out.

A series of before and after public perception surveys are being undertaken as part of the monitoring of the impacts of the roll out and will be used, alongside other information, to inform the evaluation report which will be considered by Transport and Environment Committee in 2019.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you, I thank the Convener for the answer. In a recent press release regarding the expansion of 20 mile an hour zones, the Convener said we need this quieter majority to speak out and make their voices heard. Am I right in thinking then from this answer that this statement wasn't based on any official polling and is in fact guesswork and is therefore very possible that the quiet majority she speaks of might in fact be in favour of a more targeted approach to 20 mile an hour zones rather than a ham-fisted blanket approach?

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you for your question Councillor Douglas but I do occasionally wonder whether or not we live on the same planet and the reason why I say that is that the premise of your original question was about official polling. I can talk to you at some degree of length about what went on before this Administration, about intentions, the surveys that were put out ahead of the 20 miles per hour zone being introduced, the level of support that was received through the Edinburgh People Survey for that. There are various elements of that which I could probably bore your rigid with, but are there and could have been part of your dearth research before you actually submitted this question. In

addition to which there are two questions asked in February, one by yourself and one by Councillor Lang both of which referred in the answers to the survey that has been taken care of at the moment.

I'm sorry, I'm speaking to Councillor Douglas but he doesn't appear to be listening to my answer. Would you like me to start at the beginning, well I trust that one of your more attentive colleagues can brief you on what I've just said.

As I was mentioning there were two questions asked of me in February of this year, both of which refer to the survey that is coming forward, the full survey attached to all aspects of the 20 mile per hour action that will be coming forward to the Transport and Environment Committee in 2019, one of those questions was asked by yourself.

In terms of the silent majority that you refer to I'm talking about the need for those voices to be heard in the media and in communities because I think they're often drowned out by quite frankly the nonsense that has stirred up around certain aspects of transport policy by some of the opposition policy opposition politicians in this room. 20 miles an hour saves lives, that I think is the most important aspect of this policy and one that you should remember when you decide to bring forward yet another question about it to me in this committee

**QUESTION NO 14**

**By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

In light of the reported falling of masonry on 7 September from a building at the corner of Shandwick Place, within yards of where Christine Foster was tragically killed from falling stonework in June 2000, can the Convener update on discussions with the Scottish Parliament and Government on improving the legal framework for private property maintenance; and also on what steps are being taken to improve the range and quality of inspections of older buildings.

**Answer**

The incident at Shandwick Place was attended to by Shared Repairs who made safe the high level remaining loose leadwork on the building following the piece that fell onto the pavement.

On legislative change, there have been three meetings of the Parliamentary Working Group on Maintenance of Tenement Scheme Property. The purpose of the group is to consider and establish solutions to urge, assist and compel owners of tenement properties to maintain their property through legislative change, new initiatives and enhancement of existing rules and/or further action by Local Authorities. The Council are represented on this group and have extensively added to the discussion on what changes are required.

The options discussed by the group include Standard entities for Owners (residents associations), Sinking Funds and Building Inspections, however, the group has yet to finalise their recommendations and the timing of those.

Research done so far by MSP's, has found that only 7 local authorities use the Missing Share powers and less than 50% use enforcement powers to undertake repairs in default of owners. The principal reason cited for this is lack of resource. Edinburgh Council use both these powers.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Lord Provost by way of further clarification, does the Convener agree with me that the stormy weather over the last 24 hours shows the need for more not less to be done to ensure the safety of property throughout the city?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I thank Councillor Corbett for his supplementary. Yes I do think it's particularly important that the Council service, which is currently in place and looks after emergency situations, are quite sure that that's something that ought to continue. It's a question of whether or not we decide to make that self-funding, or whether the extent to which we charge owners for any emergency works or prevention of works that are necessary. But I do think it is something that we need to continue to play close attention to. I think it's something as you know we've been working with a cross party group in the Scottish Parliament about this, and I think what we need to do is to identify where there may be gaps in the legislation and seek to take those forward so we have the powers to look after the city in the way that we need to and the safety of our citizens.



**QUESTION NO 15**

**By Councillor Young for answer by  
the Convener of the Education,  
Children and Families Committee at a  
meeting of the Council on 20  
September 2018**

**Question**

Please provide details on:

1. Council funding (routine funding or project-specific) given to the Muirhouse Millennium Centre in each of the last 5 financial years (including the current 2018/19 year)
2. For the amounts provided at (1), describe what the funding was to be used for and under which department it was funded (e.g. Children & Families)
3. Any non-financial council support (e.g. officer time) provided to the centre or to run clubs from within it, in each of the same 5 years
4. What formal representations have been made by the Millennium Centre in the past year, for assistance with Funding
5. What council-funded (in total or in part) youth services are provided in the Muirhouse area, out with the Millennium Centre

## Answer

### 1. and 2.

The organisation has received a grant from H&SC over this time as follows;

2014-15	£67,200
2015-16	£51,782
2016-17	£49,660
2017-18	£47,476
2018-19	£47,476

Below is the description of activity supported by the H&SC grant as shown in the grant register entry;

*The project provides training in numeracy /literacy /computing /Internet and life skills and job placements & college placements to motivate and help self development. Provides access for Community Employability/Community Renewal, Telford/Stevenson College to see clients and also make referrals. Enables children to access healthy snacks at no cost on a regular basis. Provides cooking classes for all ages producing low cost nutritional healthy meals. Provides opportunities for local residents to access various health and fitness programmes and live in a healthy environment and have access to green space and information and support for local residents from the Chest Heart & Stroke Association Scotland whom we are affiliated to. The project aims to improve mental health and well-being of older people. It offers support to single parents from the Muirhouse area through social and group work sessions and provides a safe and secure environment for counselling/mediation sessions. It also provides weight management and exercise groups.*

### 3.

A Lifelong Learning Development Officer was allocated time to support the development of provision for primary aged children in Muirhouse and the surrounding area. Prior to the development of the Locality Model (2016-17) this would amount to between 5-10 hours of support to the Muirhouse Millennium Centre per week. After the restructuring of Lifelong Learning this support was reduced to between 4-6 hours per week (2017-18). Due to other additional commitments, support to the Muirhouse Centre has been further reduced to about 2 hours per week in this current financial year.

We are still supporting the Junior Award Scheme Scotland (JASS) at the Muirhouse Millennium Centre.

This extends to two sessions per week for 30 weeks per year. We currently contribute 3 hrs of Part time Youth Worker time per session but no contribution to the running costs or room hire. Each group has 16 members and average attendance is 13.

4.

Muirhouse Millennium Centre has applied to Communities and Families for a grant award twice in the last 5 years (£15,554 for 2014-15 & £4,114 for 2016-17) however both bids were unsuccessful.

5.

Please see table below:

	<b>14-15 Total</b>	<b>15-16 Total</b>	<b>16-17 Total</b>	<b>17-18 Total</b>	<b>18-19 Total</b>
PYCP	250,659	242,387	238,276	154,946	153,875
Granton YC	116,700	112,849	107,207	51,609	49,575
MYDG	89,158	86,216	81,905	81,905	81,905
Spartans	-	-	-	2,000	-
Fetlor	4,821	4,662	-	5,000	5,000

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you very much Convener for the answer and for providing those details of the grant reduction of 30% and the officer support reduction of 80% over the last five years. So for the Millennium Centre could I ask the Convener please just by follow-up to provide details of the two Communities and Families applications that are mentioned in the answer and the reason for their refusal and I'm happy to have that sent to me by e-mail following the meeting.

**Supplementary Answer**

Yes, that can be done.

**QUESTION NO 16**

**By Councillor Young for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) Please provide information on any outstanding pavement repairs in the Almond ward, where the footpath is part of a recognised safe route to school (officially or informally), including but not limited to the pavements on Pentland View Road and Liston Drive, around at the original entrance to Kirkliston Primary School.

**Answer** (1) Having clarified the question with Cllr Young, this answer covers the specific pavements surrounding Kirkliston Primary School.

Necessary repair works on Liston Drive, Liston Road and Liston Place (grass verge) are planned and liaison with local members and the community council on the timing of these will commence shortly. There are no plans to resurface the pavement on Pentland View Road as officers consider this to be in reasonable condition.

**Question** (2) For the list above, please provide details on when the work was requested and when it is due for completion.

**Answer** (2) The above works were originally identified following the installation of utility cables in the area in autumn 2017. The planned works and should be completed by Spring 2019 (School holidays).

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much for the answer and I will say I will be very very attentive to the follow up response that I am given, sitting in my seat. Now I appreciate the answer given addresses the particularly bad example that I mentioned in my question about Kirkliston Primary so I will follow up directly with officers about the other impacted schools in the ward. As regards the rest of the question but on Kirkliston Primary and the response that we've been given of the

timescales of spring of next year, could I ask the Convener if she is aware that following me raising the condition of this pavement back in August of last year that I have been assured of repairs in the new budget year and then at the Easter holidays and then in the school summer holidays and here we stand now with a deadline of spring of next year. We do have an essential route to school where I can literally pick up chunks of the pavement in my hand when I'm walking children to school. So can the Convener please agree to review this timescale as a matter of urgency and see if we can try and bring these repairs forward to even the October holidays and if I could add my apologies for not perhaps declaring an interest as I have children at this school.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Young. I'm aware that this question has been the subject of some back and forth with officials and thank you for the clarification on it. Clearly there are always problems when projects are pushed further back. My understanding is that there was a delay in securing the capital funding for this and that that helps explain some of the delay and that engagement around it will begin quite shortly. Being able to put something in place for this for October would be somewhat difficult I suspect but I will explore it with officers and we will come back to you on it, 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 20 September 2018**

Following the request made by the Liberal Democrats after the 2017 event, increased engagement has taken place between the event organisers and the Kirkliston Community Council. It is hoped that feedback from the community will reflect some improvement on last year.

Please confirm the following:

- Question** (1) When the debrief from the 2018 event is due to take place
- Answer** (1) The date of the debrief is still to be agreed with Cycling Scotland and the event organisers.
- Question** (2) That the Kirkliston Community Council will be invited to participate in the debrief
- Answer** (2) Feedback will be sought from Kirkliston Community Council in advance of the debrief meeting and will be used, together with feedback from the other Community Councils on the route, by officers in the meeting discussion.
- Question** (3) Whether the Council intends on returning the event to Kirkliston in 2019
- Answer** (3) The route for 2019 has not yet been confirmed by the event organisers.
- Question** (4) If the answer to (3) is yes or unconfirmed, to please explain what alternative routes have been explored for the event, now that Kirkliston has grown considerably in size.
- Answer** (4) The contract to deliver this event in the next three years is currently being tendered by Cycling Scotland. I am aware that Cycling Scotland would like to explore alternative finishing points for the event but there have been no discussions on alternative routes or end points.

**QUESTION NO 18**

**By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) How many school let applications have been lost or turned down in the year to date because of a shortage of janitorial cover?

**Answer** (1) Currently we have not turned down any full let applications due to a shortage of Janitorial cover.

We have had to delay some of these lets however with the added pressure on the lets team of having to look for alternative venues for some groups, or/and source Janitorial cover from the wider FM pool.

Officers are gathering information on numbers of bookings that have been unable to be taken due to lack of janitorial cover, the number of bookings that have had to be cancelled due to no cover and how many instances have people turned up having not been notified of a cancellation in advance. These will be circulated to members as soon as this is available.

**Question** (2) What progress is being made with a recruitment programme by Facilities Management to recruit new janitorial staff?

**Answer** (2) In addition to our normal recruitment processes (advertising on myjobscotland), a dedicated webpage was set up and a social media campaign using Google adverts was run to promote the vacancies. This campaign had 70,000 views with 542 sharing the advert or clicking the link. This campaign resulted in 82 applications. It is likely all full time posts will be filled but a second, more local targeted campaign will be run to try for those harder to fill part time posts that are still outstanding.

**Question** (3) What guarantees can be given to applicants for school lets that their applications will be dealt with timeously, even if it is a rejection, so the services they provide are not disrupted?

**Answer**

- (3) All let applications are now confirmed within 14 days of the original request and this is the timescale agreed with FM for their confirmation of Janitorial cover.

If there are issues with finding Janitorial cover or if there are additional issues caused by a result of the works program, the lets team would not issue a lets permit.

It is part of our agreed business processes that a let applicant should not attempt to enter a Primary school for their let without a permit being granted.

We endeavour to give as much notice as possible regarding changes to a let but acknowledge that due to volumes of requests and relocating of venues, affected by works this year, this hasn't been as timeous as we would like.

Our position would be in all cases to offer an alternative location to ensure that lets continue to go ahead for our Citizens rather than to reject.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you very much and I think it's fair to say that all members of this Council across all wards will probably have had contact from members of the public about concerns about the school letting system this summer. We had a very helpful briefing note issued earlier this week, although I don't think that concerns that communities have have been entirely alleviated especially with the advice that requests can't be guaranteed, unforeseen circumstances will obviously occur from time to time, this does seem to give a rather large get out.

I have also heard this week from the Head of Customer, Nicola Harvey, who's looked into this issue and I'm happy to report that she's introducing a much more robust process into the communication of lettings and the outcomes. So given we're waiting for further information it might be best that that information is contained in a report to the Education, Children and Families Committee, but can I ask the Convener if he will ensure that the new measures that are being taken to communicate the way the system will operate to the public will be put in place and that there will be a more effective understanding of what to expect when



you try to book a let and will he also continue to work with officers to find permanent solutions to minimise the doubt from the system? Thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thanks for that supplementary and I would agree we've all had e-mails about this and clearly something hasn't gone right with this process. I certainly know in the past once you change a system things can happen and things pop up, which you didn't expect. For instance, in Royal High Primary School, I had a letter from the cubs and scouts organisation saying a janitor didn't turn up and the reason the janitor didn't turn up was because it wasn't on the central letting system, the janitor locally had just done a local agreement with these two organisations and it was not registered centrally, so clearly when you change a system then these things do pop up. We need to wait for the information to come back in paragraph 3 so we can then review what's happening. Not only can we review what's happening, we need to review the management of the system and where that is reported back in. Clearly in the first instance that will come to the Education, Children and Families Committee but part of that report needs to look at the future and how we manage in future, so all that information will come back in that report.

**QUESTION NO 19**

**By Councillor McLellan for answer by  
the Leader of the Council at a  
meeting of the Council on 20  
September 2018**

**Question** (1) In light of the absence of any mention of the Transient Visitor Levy (TVL) in the Scottish Government's Programme for Government, to ask the Council leader:

What meetings have taken place with the Cabinet Secretary for Culture Tourism and External Affairs to discuss TVL since her July 4 message to him that he had "no shared plans, no tourist business consultation and no agreement with the Scottish Government?"

**Answer** (1) Since the 4<sup>th</sup> of July I've had a brief direct conversation with the Cabinet Secretary and arranged to follow this up with a more substantive meeting to discuss a range of topics of importance to the Capital.

**Question** (2) What discussions there have been with the Cabinet Secretary for Finance about TVL and their outcome?

**Answer** (2) I've had a number of meetings with the Cabinet Secretary to discuss Edinburgh's TVL proposition and a range of other topics of importance to the Capital.

**Question** (3) To confirm there is no realistic prospect of legislation being introduced in this Parliament to enable the Council administration to establish a TVL system in Edinburgh

**Answer** (3) I'm working to deliver this key part of the administration's programme. If Cllr McLellan is concerned with the likelihood of implementation, he should encourage his Conservative Council group to support the administration's plans (bearing in mind every Conservative Council leader in Scotland has supported COSLA's request for these powers).

**Question** (4) To provide full details of the total expected cost of the TVL consultation

**Answer**

- (4) The cost of roundtables etc. to date have been met by the existing council officer workforce, and under their standard job roles and duties. The consultation exercise carried out by Marketing Edinburgh was carried out at no cost to the Council.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you very much, it's the SNP's own version of wackamo when the council leader pops up to talk about the TVL down comes the mallet from his ministerial masters not once but twice. I just have three questions, supplementaries.

Firstly, what contact has he and his officers made with the Scottish Tourism Alliance to persuade them of the case for TVL particularly in the past week since he told the Culture and Tourism Committee he didn't recognise the STA's claim that there had been no consultation with them?

Secondly while I don't doubt he's working to deliver the TVL no doubt that it's a key part of this programme, can I ask again whether or not he accepts that setting aside the arguments for and against, that with the absence of TVL from the programme of government the necessary legislation will not be introduced in this parliament?

Thirdly, if it doesn't accept that legislation will not be brought forward and thinks that it will before 2021 and now possibly 2020 thanks to Lord Faulks, what information does he have to support that view?

**Supplementary Answer**

Apologies Lord Provost, I missed the first of the third question but I'll answer the first two and then the Councillor can come back. In terms of engagement with the STA, members of the Scottish Tourism Alliance have taken part in the round table events that we have run over the last few months, Councillor Day and myself have attended I think 4 such events with key stakeholders in the city. Our senior policy officers also briefed the Edinburgh Tourism Action Group where the STA were in attendance and our senior policy officers have offered to attend the STA's conference this year to present our plans and our findings. It's worth saying Lord Provost, the STA are not the only show in town on this, the Federation of Small Business obviously are an important lobby group as are the Association of Self

Caterers who I've met not only through our round table events but one on one which I followed up with as well, and obviously we've had discussions with a whole host of key large scale players in the City. But there are also organisations that we shouldn't forget about like the European Tourism Association who I think are in a far better place understanding the context of this policy in a continental context and some of the impacts that it's had elsewhere and some of the benefits that it may bring so we shouldn't be ignoring all the other representative bodies as well as some of the big players within this city.

We did not request this policy to be in the announcement of the Programme for Government. That is not the time scale we are waiting for, we are working to a very robust process to finalise the plans that we have and at that point maybe the Conservatives should actually have read our paper that went in May Lord Provost, setting out the process that we have committed to, I hope they pay a bit more attention when we bring our paper to the 2 October's Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee, then they might actually understand the issue a bit more.

I'll bow to Councillor McLellan to just give me the first bit of the third bit of the question that I missed.

**Councillor  
McLellan**

It's simply if you don't accept the legislation will be brought before 2021 what information do you have to support that view?

**Councillor  
McVey**

Thank you very much. This is the second Programme for Government that's been announced in this parliament so I don't accept that this somehow is the only announcement that the Scottish Government will make between now and 2021. We are working to a timescale to deliver this within our Administration term. The Programme matrix that we have brought I think three times to various Committees and Council sets a target date of the end of this Administration, that is our commitment that is what went out to the people of Edinburgh and committed to and that's what I'll be focused on delivering and I'm confident of delivering it for the people of Edinburgh.

**QUESTION NO 20**

**By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) How many complaints of poor workmanship have been made to the Council's trading standards service in the past three calendar years?

**Answer** (1) Complaints of poor workmanship will only be passed to the Council by the Citizens Advice Consumer Service where a criminal element has been identified. There is no specific category for poor workmanship on our system however officers consider the total number of these complaints to be low.

**Question** (2) How many of those complaints has the service been able to act upon?

**Answer** (2) All cases of criminality have been investigated.

**Question** (3) How many complaints involved concerns about safety of power supplies?

**Answer** (3) Again, the Council system does not record this information.

**Question** (4) How many complaints were referred to the Health & Safety Executive?

**Answer** (4) It is extremely rare for the Council to refer a complaint to the Health and Safety Executive as the Citizens Advice Consumer Service will normally direct enforcement actions to the appropriate agency on receipt.

**Question** (5) What input into the Scottish Government's proposed new consumer protection service will the council have?

**Answer** (5) The Society of Chief Officers of Trading Standards in Scotland (SCOTSS) will be considering its formal response to the current Scottish Government Consultation exercise on 27 September. City of Edinburgh Council will contribute to this discussion through officers in attendance.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you very much. There's an obvious irony in asking about standards in the trading standards department and if anything these answers demonstrate gaps in the knowledge of the work of a Department which the public would probably still perceive as being an important Council resource.

This issue came to light as a result of a complaint from a constituent who suspected that electrical work carried out in his home was contrary to regulations and was dangerous.

To cut a very long story short he has been passed around from Citizens Advice, our Trading Standards Department into a kafkaesque limbo in which the Department will only confirm receipt of a complaint if they're launching an investigation. After I got involved with this issue he was told the matter would be reported to the Health and Safety Executive which makes me wonder about the answer to question 4. So I have three further questions, firstly

**Lord Provost**

One please, Councillor MacLellan.

**Councillor  
MacLellan**

In the light of how little information there is, how do we know that the claim in answer one is reliable and how many cases of criminality have been investigated in the last year and what were the outcomes?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I'm not entirely sure how to answer that interesting question. You've received a set of answers from our officials which state quite clearly that we understand that there is an issue with where these complaints go to. I think you're asking about something which should be dealt with by an organisation other than ours, in other words the Health and Safety Executive. There are many routes to achieving resolution around some of these issues and it may be that your particular constituent needed to find the right route to that, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 21**

**By Councillor Doggart for answer by  
the Chair of the Edinburgh  
Integration Joint Board at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) Could the Chair confirm what management actions have been completed for the 19 high rated and 22 medium rated findings from the 2017/18 Internal Audit Report referred to the EIJB by GRBV?

**Answer** (1) Of the 19 high rated findings, there were 47 management actions agreed and of those:

- 23 management actions have been closed and verified by Internal Audit.
- 19 management actions have been implemented and is pending Internal Audit Validation or further evidence to support closure is required.
- Work has begun to implement 5 management actions.

Of the 22 medium findings, there were 83 management actions agreed and of those:

- 37 management actions have been closed and verified by Internal Audit.
- 30 management actions have been implemented and is pending Internal Audit Validation or further evidence to support closure.

Work has begun to implement 16 management actions, some of which require collaboration with other Council departments. This collaboration is in hand.

**Question** (2) Which of those 41 findings does the Chair now believe are closed?

**Answer** (2) A total of 15 risk findings are closed with 11 high risk findings and 4 medium risk findings

**Supplementary Question** Lord Provost I do have a supplementary but given we have an empty chair representing the IJB I just wondered if there is another Administration councillor who can take the question?

**Lord Provost** Councillor Child?

**Councillor Child** Not to take the question but Councillor Henderson has been unavoidably detained in London by the storm and trees down on the line, so he gives his apologies to the Council, but has asked me to say that if there are any supplementary questions then he will be happy to respond in writing.

**Lord Provost** So you can feel free either to give your supplementary question here so that it's on record for him to then respond or you can contact directly whichever.

**Councillor Doggart** I think it's important that the question's on the record Lord Provost so could, sorry to disappoint you but that's the purpose of this meeting, could the Chair confirm when all the Internal Audit findings will be completed and particular could he confirm that the actions resulting from the unsatisfactory processes into commissioning on Social Care will be met by the target date of December 2018 so that we have a start date for improving the possible Council performance in this area, thank you.

**Councillor Aldridge** Lord Provost, just on a point of order, we had a similar experience at the last meeting, I just wanted to confirm that the written answer to that supplementary question will be included in the minutes of this meeting.

**Lord Provost** Yes it will.

**Supplementary Answer** From the 19 high findings:

- 13 audit findings have been closed
- 2 audit findings are due for completion by June 2019
- 4 audit findings are undergoing IA validation

From the 22 medium findings:

- 9 audit findings have been closed
- 2 audit findings are due for completion by November 2018
- 1 audit finding is due for completion by July 2019
- 5 audit findings are due for completion by December 2018
- 2 audit findings are due for completion by January 2019
- 3 audit findings are undergoing IA validation

For those audit findings beyond December 2018, Internal Audit are in agreement with the date extension.



**QUESTION NO 22**

**By Councillor Smith for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) Of the school estate works previously advised to Members, as a result of the 2018 Outcome of Property Condition Surveys report, that had been planned to take place before the start of the new 2018/19 school year, what work:

- (a) was completed to standard;
- (b) was started, but not completed to program or standard;
- (c) was not started.

**Answer** (1) The report on the outcome of the property condition surveys prompted the allocation of significant additional investment in addition to the standard annual upgrade programme of £14m pa. This extra resource enabled the Council to focus upon 21 primary schools most in need of investment. Of these 21 schools, none were programmed for completion for by the start of the 2018/19 school year. All of the projects are of significant scale and programmed to continue into 2019/20 financial year, or beyond, before full completion. The answer to questions 1 (a), (b) and question 2 is therefore none.

The answer to question 1 (c) is that there was some slippage in project commencement at 8 schools due to the following factors:

- Pressures on the procurement framework; the tender returns were considerably higher than the estimated budgets for some projects. In a few instances no tender returns were received, requiring retendering to additional contractors and project value engineering wherever possible;
- Allocating additional time to enabling works prior to project mobilisation to mitigate health and safety risks resulting from the extent of asbestos identified following intrusive surveys

- Detailed surveys in a number of schools revealed historic issues which triggered the need to reduce or increase the scope of works to align with the wider property strategy.

This slippage is expected to be recovered over the duration of the project works.

**Question** (2) For any work that was not completed as programmed, what were the reasons?

**Answer** (2) There were no programmed works that were not completed.

**Question** (3) What meetings have the Vice Convener and Convener attended over the last four months in an attempt to keep this work programme on schedule?

**Answer** (3) The management of these issues is an operational and contract management responsibility. As such an officer led asset management works board meets on a 6-weekly basis to oversee the entire asset management works programme. This board includes officers from Communities and Families and the Communications Team, as well as Property and Facilities Management. To ensure elected member oversight and scrutiny, regular updates are provided on the asset management works programme to the Finance and Resources Committee, as part of the Asset Management Strategy Update reports.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer. Given there's been some slippage, to use the Convener's word, in the timescales for starting some of the works, I wonder if after each significant school break we could have an update, even by way of short briefing notes of the works that have been started and completed in the interim period and keep all members and particularly local members briefed and not just those on the Finance and Resources Committee as I am aware there were projects due to start in a number of schools over the summer which either haven't been started and completed and it would be helpful to have a note of where we are in the programme as we go along.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I thank Councillor Smith for her supplementary. I perfectly well understand that this programme of works was of interest to more people or more Councillors than the members of my Committee, so I'd be happy to ask the officers to produce that information in a timely fashion for our members as a whole.

**QUESTION NO 23**

**By Councillor Webber for answer by  
the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) How much Public Funding has been awarded to Councillors through the Access to Work Programme?

**Answer** (1) The Access to Work Programme is operated by Department for Work and Pensions as an employment support programme to help disabled people start or stay in work. Discretionary grants are made to the employee (the councillor) not to the Council, to provide e.g. equipment or support workers

**Question** (2) In each case when was this funding first applied for and when was the funding put in place?

**Answer** (2) Any application for Access to Work funding is made by the individual with funds awarded to that employee. The date of any application and award of funding will be held by the councillors concerned not by the Council.

**Question** (3) In each case what is this funding being used for?

**Answer** (3) Each individual case is determined by DWP based on the needs of the employee.

**QUESTION NO 24**

**By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

What is the early feedback from the implementation of new arrangements for facilities management at schools and community centres, as regards community and post-school use; what options are available to schools and community centres to sustain and expand use in non-core hours; and when will a review be undertaken of the impact of new arrangements

**Answer**

The new janitorial model went live on 6 August. Recruitment is actively being pursued because the new service model included an equivalent increase of 33 full time equivalent staff, as well as introducing the new Janitorial Supervisor roles.

In general, the feedback from schools is encouraging at this early stage, but there are some very specific challenges around resources which is as a direct consequence of a labour supply shortage in this area. In addition, the janitorial team are supporting a significant level of capital works projects across the Council's operational estate following the additional investment approved by the Council. Within community centres, many of the Janitorial roles are part-time, and these make up the larger part of vacancies.

The janitorial model does not restrict the use of schools or community centres to sustain or expand use in non-core hours. However, out with the funded core hours additional janitorial hours will need to be funded.

A period of three months has been set to carry out an initial review of the new model.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thanks Lord Provost. This obviously is similar to Question 18 that Councillor MacLellan asked, but I just want to make sure that given there's now an assurance about three month review being carried out which would be mid-November in my estimation that it won't just be a review of procedural matters, but will actually take into account the concerns that many community groups and schools have raised about access to schools.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I thank Councillor Corbett for his supplementary. You raise a perfectly valid point and I do understand the concerns that have been expressed as a result of the janitorial review and I'll ensure that the points that you mentioned are addressed in the report when it comes forward.

**QUESTION NO 25**

**By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

Seafield Recycling Centre

**Question** (1) To provide an assessment of the new traffic system at the Seafield recycling centre.

**Answer** (1) The current traffic management arrangements are temporary to facilitate site construction and has therefore not been assessed. These are continually being monitored to ensure the safety of staff and the public.

(2) To detail the monitoring and evaluation arrangements for the new system.

(2) Informal arrangements are in place currently to monitor arrangements and to deal with issues as soon as these arise.

(3) To reassure Craigentenny residents using the centre that the new arrangements will be reviewed in light of the considerable inconvenience they are now being caused.

(3) These temporary arrangements are in place for the duration of the development works. Entrance and exit arrangements for the public will be via Seafield Road when the redevelopment is complete.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much and thank you very much for the answer which confirms that the substantial changes are indeed permanent at the Seafield recycling centre whereby local people will now have to exit and egress on to what is already a very busy road and turns what was a matter of a couple of hundred yards into a 30 mile round trip. I've had a number of contacts from constituents about this issue and can the Convener therefore commit to a further review of the arrangements to monitor the impact in Seafield Road, with a view to making adjustments as necessary?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I can commit to coming back to you on some of those matters yes and I will discuss with officials exactly the most efficient way to do so. I would add that the arrangements in place at the moment are temporary as a result of the construction.

**Lord Provost**

Time has now expired, the allotted time for questions has now expired, we'll move on to the next item on the agenda.



**QUESTION NO 26**

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question** (1) Could the Convener supply details of why the Council were unsuccessful in attracting any bids for the proposed clean-up and cut-back of the A1/Sir Harry Lauder road when the project was put out to tender earlier this year? And can the Convener commit to now utilising Council resources for this key maintenance plan, at a key gateway to the city, which was first agreed at the start of the year but is yet to secure a start date.

**Answer** (1) No reason has been provided by commercial contractors for not tendering for this work when it was advertised, and reasons would not normally be provided or expected given the commercial nature of decisions by individual firms.

Council resources are currently being co-ordinated to allow litter picking, vegetation cutting, street sweeping and drainage clearing to be undertaken at this location.

**Question** (2) If so could the Convener inform Council of an indicative date.

**Answer** (2) It is anticipated that this work will be undertaken in October 2018.

**Question** (3) Can the Convener confirm how often road cleansing and maintenance programmes are offered to private contractors and how frequently the Council fails to attract any bidders?

**Answer** (3) Road maintenance programmes are routinely offered to external contractors as part of a Framework Agreement. Generally these arrangements do attract bids from the approved contractors.

There is no such arrangement for routine grounds maintenance of arterial routes in the city although this is currently being investigated.

**QUESTION NO 27**

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by  
the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**           (1) Could the Convener supply details of the cost of resourcing the software upgrades required to bring computers supplied to schools as part of the IT Refresh programme up to the required standard, following reports that CGI supplied classroom computers that were not equipped with the software to run the interactive Smartboard white boards and which were not supplied with Optical Drives which are now being retrofitted?

**Answer**           (1) Within the Learning and Teaching (Schools) ICT estate the agreed deployment model is for software to be downloaded and installed directly within schools using a self-service portal. This enables individual schools to flexibly address their curricular needs from a software perspective. There are no additional costs relating to the self-service portal software updates. Positive feedback and examples already exist of specialist software being successfully deployed within the Schools ICT estate and improving the experience of learning and teaching.

To ensure that an effective deployment approach was undertaken, a number of pilot school implementations were completed, in both primary and secondary settings. These pilots identified an issue with the installation of Smartboard software. This has now been addressed as part of the lessons learned and measures have been put place for all future rollouts. There are no additional costs to the Council or the Schools in relation to this adjustment.

Feedback from the pilot schools also identified a small number of areas where DVDs were still required for curricular purposes. These are being provided to the pilot schools at no cost to the Council. For the broader school deployment, a process has been put in place to identify

devices that require DVD drives in advance. Such devices can be ordered at a small cost to the school. Strategically, the requirement for DVD drives will be phased out over time through the transition to digital web services.

**Question** (2) And can the Convener confirm if CGI will be held accountable for failure to supply the correct hardware or will meet the costs required to upgrade and retrofit these computers, or will the additional resource be met by City of Edinburgh Council budget?

**Answer** (2) CGI has not failed in the deployment of the correct hardware or software to the Council's Schools. Working in partnership with the Council's ICT Team and with the Schools themselves, CGI is continuing with the deployment of new devices as part of a major, planned investment in the ICT estate which will continue to the end of June 2019. This planned upgrade will extend to all Schools and across the Council's corporate ICT estate. The costs of this device refresh are fully contained within the existing ICT Budget for the Council.

The only minor additional cost to individual Schools that may arise through this project, as indicated in the response to question 1, is the purchase of DVD drives. However, as indicated the requirement for DVDs for curricular use should be reducing over time.

**QUESTION NO 28**

**By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

To ask the Convener what the estimated cost will be of providing 'pop-up Bob' cut outs as part of the policing of 20mph zones, and how many the council are expecting to be distributed?

**Answer**

'Pop up Bob' is a plastic, re-useable model of a police officer with a hand-held, speed detection device that is deployed to help deter speeding and improve road safety. It is one of a suite of measures included in a toolkit of activities and resources that has been put together to help local communities promote calmer speeds.

City of Edinburgh Council has spent £734.15 on 'Pop up Bob' cut outs.

**QUESTION NO 29**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

For each of the council's controlled parking zones and priority parking areas: what is the total number of vehicles with a parking permit; and, of that number, how many are permits in respect of second vehicles for the same household?

**Answer**

The table below provides the number of valid first and second residential parking permits across all parking zones.

<u>Permit Zone</u>	<u>Total Permit Count</u>	<u>Permit 1</u>	<u>Permit 2</u>
Zone 1	1120	957	163
Zone 1A	606	504	102
Zone 2	269	236	33
Zone 3	601	565	36
Zone 4	1039	948	91
Zone 5	1079	922	157
Zone 5A	1174	1004	170
Zone 6	1579	1367	212
Zone 7	1264	1132	132
Zone 8	1233	1087	146
Zone N1	1727	1572	155
Zone N2	777	690	87
Zone N3	1267	1114	153
Zone N4	87	81	6
Zone N5	291	265	26
Zone S1	1128	976	152
Zone S2	1505	1327	178
Zone S3	1399	1219	180
Zone S4	1217	1145	72
Zone K	22	22	0
PPA B1	486	412	74
PPA B2	313	266	47
PPA B3	25	19	6
PPA B4	51	42	9
PPA B5	35	30	5
PPA B6	199	168	31
PPA B7	154	125	29
PPA B8	23	20	3
PPA B9	270	205	65
PPA B10	49	48	1
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>20989</b>	<b>18468</b>	<b>2521</b>

**QUESTION NO 30**

**By Councillor Main for answer by the  
Chair of the Edinburgh Integration  
Joint Board at a meeting of the  
Council on 20 September 2018**

Gylemuir Care Home for older people has received poor Care Commission inspection reports for the last couple of years and the most recent review, published on 8th August this year shows further decline

	<b>3 May 2018</b>	<b>8 August</b>
<b>2017</b>		
Quality of care and support	2 – Weak	2 – Weak
Quality of environment	3 – Adequate	3 - Adequate
Quality of staffing	3 – Adequate	3 - Adequate
Quality of management & leadership	2 – Weak	3 - Adequate

The Care Commission's Quality Framework for Care homes for Older People, July 2018 provides the definitions:

An evaluation of adequate applies where there are some strengths but these just outweigh weaknesses. Strengths may still have a positive impact but the likelihood of achieving positive experiences and outcomes for people is reduced significantly because key areas of performance need to improve. Performance which is evaluated as adequate may be tolerable in particular circumstances, such as where a service or partnership is not yet fully established, or in the midst of major transition. However, continued performance at adequate level is not acceptable.

An evaluation of weak will apply to performance in which strengths can be identified but these are outweighed or compromised by significant weaknesses. The weaknesses,

either individually or when added together, substantially affect peoples' experiences or outcomes. Without improvement as a matter of priority, the welfare or safety of people may be compromised, or their critical needs not met.

**Question** (1) What immediate actions have been taken to ensure that the elderly and frail living at Gylemuir are not at risk and that their critical needs are being met?

**Answer** (1) Considerable work to improve standards in Gylemuir has taken place over the past 8 months and an action plan has been put in place to address the requirements from all inspections.

Some of the actions that have been completed include:

- A robust referral process and better working relationships are now in place across the system, to ensure that Gylemuir is a suitable placement and all necessary paperwork is complete (e.g. medical history and funding arrangements) before transfer.
- Utilisation of an assessment tool, that provides a consistent method of translating the needs of residents into the number of care hours required which is measured fortnightly.
- All residents have a person-centred care plan, focusing on a 6-week period which is the expected maximum length of stay. The care plan would be adapted if a resident's stay is likely to exceed 6 weeks.
- Staff have organised to have children from a local nursery visit Gylemuir on a regular basis to encourage and develop inter-generational relationships, which is widely acknowledged as very good practice.
- Gylemuir is the first care home to sign up to John's Campaign, encouraging engagement and involvement of families and carers to enhance the care provided to residents.

Gylemuir has the capacity to care for 60 residents, however to ensure the environment is adequate to support high



quality care, the capacity will remain at 40 until it has satisfactorily progressed to be suitable for an increase to the number of residents.

**Question** (2) Have the 7 new required actions been met within the timescales to be achieved of 30 June to 31 August? If not, what actions remains outstanding?

**Answer** (2) Five out of the seven actions required have been met within the timescales and the manager is looking at further ways to improve service delivery within Gylemuir.

In relation to the two outstanding actions, one relates to training and the manager is developing a training and development plan with staff and the second relates to community-based activities, and this is being explored further.

**Question** (3) What progress has been made with the 5 outstanding requirements from previous inspections dated February 2016 and September 2017?

**Answer** (3) Four out of the five outstanding actions have been met and are now in place, the one outstanding action relates to community benefits which is being explored further by the Service Manager.

**QUESTION NO 31**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

At the full council meeting on 23 August 2018, the Vice-Convener of Transport & Environment agreed to meet with cycling and pedestrian organisations to discuss a timetable for the opening of the cycle path on Leith Street for use by cyclists.

When did that meeting happen, who was invited, and what was the outcome of the meeting?

**Answer**

As a result of objections to the proposed cycle path on Leith Street this cycle route has been closed until the redetermination order (RSO) is received. This matter is currently with the Scottish Ministers. Whilst Council Officers are liaising with the representative of the Scottish Government, the council is not in control of either the process or programme.

Once the outcome of this RSO process is known then, as has been committed to, a meeting will be arranged with relevant the cycling and pedestrian organisations to communicate the outcome, including the ramifications of the decision to the affected consultees.

This meeting will also address the short-term measures and modifications that will be necessary to recognise the impact of the works being undertaken in Picardy Place prior to implementation.

In the meantime, Officers continue to meet with Spokes and Living Streets regularly and there is ongoing dialogue, particularly with Spokes on Leith Street, at these meetings

**QUESTION NO 32**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 20 September 2018**

**Question**

What progress has been made in the working group to discuss the feasibility of training volunteers in the use of speed guns? What is the timetable for this work?

**Answer**

This is a Police Scotland project and the working group are awaiting research on the scheme and its operation in a neighbouring Local Authority area before discussing the feasibility of training volunteers to use speed guns. We do not currently have a timetable for this work.