

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 25 October 2018

Present:-

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

COUNCILLORS

Robert C Aldridge
Scott Arthur
Gavin Barrie
Eleanor Bird
Chas Booth
Claire Bridgman
Mark A Brown
Graeme Bruce
Steve Burgess
Lezley Marion Cameron
Ian Campbell
Jim Campbell
Kate Campbell
Mary Campbell
Maureen M Child
Nick Cook
Gavin Corbett
Cammy Day
Alison Dickie
Denis C Dixon
Phil Duggart
Marion Donaldson
Karen Doran
Scott Douglas
Catherine Fullerton
Neil Gardiner
Gillian Gloyer
George Gordon
Ashley Graczyk
Joan Griffiths
Ricky Henderson

Derek Howie
Graham J Hutchison
Andrew Johnston
David Key
Callum Laidlaw
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 Revenue Monitoring 2018/19 – Progress Update – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

a) Deputation - UNISON

The deputation expressed concern at the proposals for the £1m uncommitted monies and questioned whether or not there was evidence that the proposals were a good use of public money. They sought re-assurances that the engagement of dedicated internal project management resources would assist in the development of individual proposals for the Change Strategy.

The deputation felt that the efficiencies had all been carried out over the previous few years and that there was very little left to cut.

b) Referral report from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on progress in addressing the projected in-year overspend and a proposed timeline for identifying measures, the full effect of which would provide greater stability across the framework going forward to the Council for approval.

Motion

- 1) To note the extent of progress made in moving towards a balanced overall position for the year.
- 2) That subject to the additional information provided in paragraph 1.3.2 of the referral report, to approve the use of up to £1m of uncommitted monies previously earmarked to support the Transformation Programme to facilitate the engagement of dedicated internal project management resource to develop individual proposals comprising the broader Change Strategy.
- 3) To note that a further update, additionally detailing measures to address current-year pressures on a sustainable basis, would be presented as part of the half-year monitoring report to the Finance and Resources Committee's next meeting on 4 December 2018.
- 4) To agree that approval for spending this funding would be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Convener and Vice Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee with quarterly reporting to the Finance and Resources Committee as part of the financial monitoring.

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Donaldson

Amendment 1

- 1) To note with concern the number of current projected savings showing as “red” on which there was unlikely to be any progress before the end of the financial year end.
- 2) To note that a number of Administration decisions since setting the 2018/19 Budget, in particular fees for school lets and projected capital receipts from Meadowbank, had contributed to a further unravelling of that Budget resulting in greater short and medium term revenue pressures.
- 3) To express concern that the required savings in the delivery of Health and Social Care had not been realised despite constant re-budgeting under the management of three Directors. These projected savings were based on expensive external consulting reports, adopting best practice from other Local Authorities and with assurance from the Chief Executive, and others, they would be delivered. Council requests the Chief Executive to report to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee within two cycles on delivery possibilities of all these projected savings plans.
- 4) To instruct the Chief Executive in the same report mentioned in paragraph 3 to determine how Council could scrutinise publicly the delivery of future savings plans, given failure to achieve such savings, especially in light of the chaotic implementation of the Administration’s Garden Tax.
- 5) To note with concern, the failure of the Administration to provide specific proposals in its longer term Budget strategy, reluctantly agreeing to proposal 2.1.2 of the referral report. Consequently, to call for the identification of such specific proposals in an initial brief business case to the Finance and Resources Committee on 4 December 2018.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the extent of progress made in moving towards a balanced overall position for the year.
- 2) That subject to the additional information provided in paragraph 1.3.2 of the referral report, to approve the use of up to £1m of uncommitted monies previously earmarked to support the Transformation Programme to facilitate the engagement of dedicated internal project management resource to develop individual proposals comprising the broader Change Strategy, and to ensure that robust arrangements were put in place to ensure that enhanced project management capacity shared learning with permanent staff teams so that long term change project capacity was increased.

- 3) To note that a further update, additionally detailing measures to address current-year pressures on a sustainable basis, would be presented as part of the half-year monitoring report to the Finance and Resources Committee's next meeting on 4 December 2018.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Miller

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	40 votes
For Amendment 1	-	22 votes

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

For Amendment 1: Councillors Aldridge, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rankin:

- 1) To note the extent of progress made in moving towards a balanced overall position for the year.
- 2) That subject to the additional information provided in paragraph 1.3.2 of the referral report, to approve the use of up to £1m of uncommitted monies previously earmarked to support the Transformation Programme to facilitate the engagement of dedicated internal project management resource to develop individual proposals comprising the broader Change Strategy, and to ensure that robust arrangements were put in place to ensure that enhanced project management capacity shared learning with permanent staff teams so that long term change project capacity was increased.
- 3) To note that a further update, additionally detailing measures to address current-year pressures on a sustainable basis, would be presented as part of the half-year monitoring report to the Finance and Resources Committee's next meeting on 4 December 2018.

- 4) To agree that approval for spending this funding would be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Convener and Vice Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee with quarterly reporting to the Finance and Resources Committee as part of the financial monitoring.

(References: Finance and Resources Committee of 11 October 2018; referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted).

2 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 20 September 2018 as a correct record.

3 Questions

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

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Cook and Work declared a non-financial interest in the above item (Question 12) as members of the Hawes/Longcraig Piers User Committee.

4 Leader's Report

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

- Delivery of Programme for the Capital – Key achievements
- Setting of timeline for business case for tram extension
- Chair of Poverty Commission – appointment of Dr Jim McCormick
- Change of the Scottish Government position on the Transient Visitor Levy

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor McLellan	Withdrawal of the report at Item 8.2 on the agenda – Planning Statutory Scheme of Delegation
Councillor Whyte	- Does the Council deserve a Leader that stands up for the City's interests?
Councillor Mary Campbell	- Climate breakdown
Councillor Aldridge	- Chaotic implementation of various Council policies and in particular the introduction of the Garden Tax

Councillor Day	- Carers Rights Day
Councillor Gordon	- Budget setting process
Councillor Jim Campbell	- Target for more affordable homes in the City
Councillor Booth	- Inter-governmental report on climate change – urgent need to reduce carbon emissions
Councillor Young	- Bin collections – rural west Edinburgh - communications
Councillor Cameron	- Views of coalition to be treated with respect
Councillor Fullerton	- Regulations for Short term lets
Councillor Johnston	- Tram extension project
Councillor Main	- IPCC Report – climate change
Councillor Webber	- Delayed discharge figures and targets
Councillor Cook	- Missed bin collections – use of communal bins
Councillor Doggart	- 3 official futurists to learn from cities abroad
Councillor Munro	- Robust representations for block grant, council tax replacement, increased powers for the council and funding for Edinburgh
Councillor Bridgman	- Update on bringing on board an expert to maximise the Council’s income generation from the TVL
Councillor Kate Campbell	- Universal credit full roll out – protection for Edinburgh citizens

5 Education, Children and Families Committee – Appointment of Religious Representative

The Council had agreed its political management arrangements and made appointments to a range of Committees, Boards, Joint Boards and outside organisations. The Roman Catholic Church Representative on the Education, Children and Families Committee had resigned and the Council was required to formally appoint a replacement.

Decision

- 1) To note the resignation of Marie Allan as the Roman Catholic Church representative on the Education, Children and Families Committee and to record appreciation for her commitment to the work of the Committee during her tenure.
- 2) To note the nomination by the Roman Catholic Church of Monsignor Anthony Duffy and to formally appoint him to the Education, Children and Families Committee.

(References: Act of Council No 4 of 24 August 2017; report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

6 Chief Officer Roles

The Council had agreed a revised organisational structure at the top level of the organisation to realign responsibilities to forge a stronger level of focus around matters of strategic importance.

Details were provided on proposals to adjust the current management structure.

Decision

- 1) To agree to hold the vacant post of Head of Communications in the Chief Officer structure of the Chief Executive's Service;
- 2) To agree the appointment on an interim basis, of the Head of Strategy and Insight to a redesignated role of Head of Strategy and Communications, with immediate effect.
- 3) To agree the deletion of the vacant post of Head of Information and Communications Technology from the structure of the Resources Directorate.
- 4) To agree the appointment, on a permanent basis, of the Head of Customer to the redesignated role of Head of Customer and Digital Services, with immediate effect.
- 5) To note that, the Council had reduced the number of Chief Officials it employed by 2 posts permanently during 2018 and was holding a further post vacant at this level.

(References – Act of Council No 4 of 10 December 2015: report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

7 Planning Statutory Scheme of Delegation

Decision

To note that the report had been withdrawn.

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

8 Edinburgh Partnership Community Plan 2018-28

Details were provided on the development process for the Edinburgh Partnership Community Plan 2018-22 which provided the framework for supporting the delivery of partnership working to improve outcomes for those residents in the city experiencing the greatest inequality. The final draft plan was presented.

Motion

- 1) To approve the Community Plan as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To note the plan would be subject to the approval of the Edinburgh Partnership on 30 October 2018.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

- 1) To approve the Community Plan as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To note the plan would be subject to the approval of the Edinburgh Partnership on 30 October 2018.
- 3) To express disappointment that despite agreement at the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee and at the Edinburgh Partnership Board that SMART outcome measures be identified as part of the process, these remained outstanding and the Partnership plan remained vague with ill-defined outcomes.
- 4) To call for a report to Council within 6 months detailing meaningful, measurable priorities, outcomes and targets for the Plans.
- 5) To call on the various bodies involved to indicate through that report the detailed actions they would take to support the achievement of the priorities.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment 2

- 1) To approve the Community Plan as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To note the plan would be subject to the approval of the Edinburgh Partnership on 30 October 2018.
- 3) To note that there were further areas that could benefit from partnership working, such as the shared statutory duties on public bodies relating to climate change which requires them to: 'contribute to carbon emissions reduction targets; contribute to climate change adaptation; and to act sustainably' and therefore welcome development of partnership working in such areas.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Main

Amendment 3

- 1) To approve the Community Plan as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive, subject to the inclusion of actions relating to veterans in priority 2 and a general recognition in all actions of the needs of isolated individuals experiencing poverty and exclusion in areas generally considered to be more affluent.
- 2) To note the plan would be subject to the approval of the Edinburgh Partnership on 30 October 2018.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Gloyer

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11);

- 1) Amendments 2 and 3 were accepted as addendums to the motion.
- 2) Amendments 2 and 3 were accepted as addendums to Amendment 1

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	39 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	22 votes

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

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aldridge, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Ritchie, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To approve the Community Plan as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive, subject to the inclusion of actions relating to veterans in priority 2 and a general recognition in all actions of the needs of isolated individuals experiencing poverty and exclusion in areas generally considered to be more affluent.
- 2) To note the plan would be subject to the approval of the Edinburgh Partnership on 30 October 2018.
- 3) To note that there were further areas that could benefit from partnership working, such as the shared statutory duties on public bodies relating to climate change which requires them to: 'contribute to carbon emissions reduction targets; contribute to climate change adaptation; and to act sustainably' and therefore welcome development of partnership working in such areas.

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

9 Rolling Actions Log

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

Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:

Action 1 – Political Management Arrangements

Action 4 - Appointment of Elected Member Champions

Action 5 - Public Water Bottle Refill – motion by Councillor Burgess

Action 7 - Prison Community Integration Working Group – motion by Councillor Graczyk

Action 8 - National Children's Day UK 2018 and the Year of Young People – motion by Councillor Day

Action 9 - Appointment of Committee Members

Action 10 - Webcasting of Public Meetings – motion by Councillor Miller

Action 12 - Edinburgh Transient Visitor Levy

2) To otherwise note the rolling actions log.

(Reference: report by the Chief Executive (circulated))

10 City of Edinburgh Council – 2017-18 Annual Audit Report and the Corntroller of Audit – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the principal findings arising from the Council's 2017/18 external audit to the Council for information.

Decision

To note the report by the Finance and Resources Committee.

(References: Finance and Resources Committee of 27 September 2018 (item 7); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted).

11 Wave 4 Infratructure Investment Programme – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the Wave 4 Infratructure Investment Programme whose focus was the replacement of seven secondary schools throughout the city which had not benefitted from any investment through the PPP1, PPP2 or Wave 3 investment programmes to the Council for approval of the reallocation of the existing £25m Wave 4 capital budget to Castlebrae High School and Bangholm sports facilities.

Motion

- 1) To approve the reallocation of the existing £25m Wave 4 capital budget to Castlebrae High School and Bangholm sports facilities.
- 2) To note that a further report would be considered by the Finance and Resources Committee prior to any contract award.

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Donaldson

Amendment 1

- 1) To note with concern the risks identified in point 6.1 of the report by the Executive Director for Communities and Families.
- 2) To note with concern that the delivery and prioritisation proposed was not in line with Council's investment Strategy and the agreed prioritisation scheme detailed in the report and appendices by the Executive Director for Communities and Families, and that the proposals for size and scope of new build schools did not meet with the Council's own agreed criteria for such buildings.
- 3) To agree that the Council Leader make urgent representation to the Scottish Government to seek clarity on the level of funding available for Wave 4 investment in order that the Council could properly prioritise its investment and be clear with the public as to the implications, and reports back to Council within 1 cycle on the outcome of his negotiations.
- 4) To agree in the meantime to suspend the programme until funding assurances were forthcoming from the Scottish Government. To agree to defer a decision on investment until at least the point when the Scottish Government announces its draft budget in order to use this information to outline a fully thought through investment strategy.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Hutchison

Amendment 2

- 1) To approve the reallocation of the existing £25m Wave 4 capital budget to Castlebrae High School and Bangholm sports facilities.
- 2) To note that a further report would be considered by the Finance and Resources Committee prior to any contract award.
- 3) To instruct the Executive Director for Communities and Families, in light of the commitments in this paper, to make further contact with the Scottish Government to seek further clarity on the timing of and criteria for future school capital funding programmes.
- 4) To recognise the need to continue to set specific investment plans in the context of the education needs of the city as a whole, taking account of the quality of the existing school estate and the challenge of rising population.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	45 votes
For Amendment 1	-	16 votes

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

For Amendment 1: Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Webber and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rankin:

- 1) To approve the reallocation of the existing £25m Wave 4 capital budget to Castlebrae High School and Bangholm sports facilities.
- 2) To note that a further report would be considered by the Finance and Resources Committee prior to any contract award.
- 3) To instruct the Executive Director for Communities and Families, in light of the commitments in this paper, to make further contact with the Scottish Government to seek further clarity on the timing of and criteria for future school capital funding programmes.
- 4) To recognise the need to continue to set specific investment plans in the context of the education needs of the city as a whole, taking account of the quality of the existing school estate and the challenge of rising population.

(References: Finance and Resources Committee of 11 October 2018; referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted).

12 Top-up Funding for Community Councils – Motion by Councillor Staniforth

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

“Council:

Notes that costs for community councils to conduct regular business, and undertake their consultation role, can vary widely, especially in regard to the cost of a meeting hall.

Notes that Portobello Community Council have a demonstrable need for £200 a year extra in order to maintain regular meetings and good community consultation.

Resolves that Community Councils be eligible for a top-up grant of up to £500/year, if they can demonstrate a genuine need.

Agrees to investigate the provision of shared services (web hosting, consultation hub, insurance) as well as support and training for community councillors to avoid having to hire outside expertise (such as for minute-taking) and report back to Culture and Communities committee on those options within 2 cycles.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

Amendment 1

- 1) Delete : “Resolves that Community Councils be eligible for a top-up grant of up to £500/year, if they can demonstrate a genuine need.”

Replace with : “ Resolves to delegate authority to the Chief Executive to determine whether any community council requires additional interim funding until the review of the community council scheme is completed in 2019. The community council must show a demonstrable need whilst maintaining best value.”

- 2) Delete : “to Culture and Communities committee on those options within 2 cycles.”

Replace with : “as part of the review of the community council scheme.

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

Amendment 2

Deletes all after Council and replace with:

Notes that a consultation on the scheme for Community Councils is about to be carried out and requests that this includes a review of the accounts for all Community Councils over the last five years to assess whether the budget granted is sufficient; and calls for evidence of what support Community Councils have identified which would enable them to better carry out their statutory roles to be reported to the Culture and Communities Committee within 2 cycles.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendment 1 was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	45 votes
For Amendment 2	-	16 votes

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

For Amendment 2: Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Webber and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Staniforth:

Council:

Notes that costs for community councils to conduct regular business, and undertake their consultation role, can vary widely, especially in regard to the cost of a meeting hall.

Notes that Portobello Community Council have a demonstrable need for £200 a year extra in order to maintain regular meetings and good community consultation.

Resolves to delegate authority to the Chief Executive to determine whether any community council requires additional interim funding until the review of the

community council scheme is completed in 2019. The community council must show a demonstrable need whilst maintaining best value.

Agrees to investigate the provision of shared services (web hosting, consultation hub, insurance) as well as support and training for community councillors to avoid having to hire outside expertise (such as for minute-taking) and report back as part of the review of the community council scheme.

13 Council Branding and Advertising Policy – Motion by Councillor Main

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

“Council notes:

The Council does not have in place a city branding and advertising policy to inform decisions made about sponsorship and advertising by the council or those contracted to do so on its behalf.

Schools policy on sponsorship was agreed by the Education, Children and Families Committee in 2016.

Under the 2013 Planning Committee decision under ‘planning for the city’, decisions are informed by the Code of the Advertising Standard Agency only. However also notes further development including, ‘neighbourhood plans’, referred to in the report have not been brought forward.

Agrees that:

Council advertising and sponsorship should support the strategic aims of the Council, including the health and well-being of citizens.

Where sponsorship and advertising has a direct association with the Council, there is a risk of impact on the Council and city reputation.

Agrees that draft policy on sponsorship and advertising is brought to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee within 3 cycles.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Main.

- moved by Councillor Main, seconded by Councillor Booth

Amendment

To take no action on the matter

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Rose

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	44 votes
For the amendment	-	17 votes

(For the motion; 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, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Main.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Cameron declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of Marketing Edinburgh.

Councillor McLellan declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of the Advertising Standards Authority.

14 Neo Edinburgh West (New) Town – Motion by Councillor Hutchison

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

““Council:

- 1) Recognisees the challenges and opportunities facing our City on current trends.

- 2) Notes the formation of the West Edinburgh and Edinburgh Waterfront All Member Oversight Groups in an effort to co-ordinate the work of Council and Committees to enable the growth of our City in a responsible way.
- 3) Thanks officers for the emerging work building understandings and High-Level Delivery Masterplans for the Waterfront.
- 4) Understand the imperative to establish a New Town sense of place in West Edinburgh, and to co-ordinate the efforts of all parties to deliver more homes, office and industrial space while improving infrastructure to the benefit of new and existing residents and businesses.
- 5) Accordingly, asks that officers organise a Conference for all interested parties on the NEW Town concept for Edinburgh by the end of 2018, with a view to establishing common understandings and producing a High-Level Delivery Masterplan by November 2019.
- 6) Looks forward to these High-Level Delivery Masterplans informing the City Plan 2030.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Hutchison.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Brown

Amendment

To note the terms of the Conservative Motion seeking to coordinate the work of the Council and Committees to enable the growth of our City in a responsible way.

Council:

- 1) Recognises the growth challenges and development opportunities facing our City, particularly in West Edinburgh and Edinburgh Waterfront
- 2) Thanks Officers for the emerging work that is already taking place to build understanding, and create ambitions for these areas; for example, through high-level delivery Masterplans for the Waterfront and emerging options work for West Edinburgh
- 3) Understands the imperative to establish a new sense of place, spatial connectivity and active travel in West Edinburgh and Edinburgh Waterfront, and to co-ordinate the efforts of all parties to deliver more sustainable homes, office and industrial space while improving infrastructure to the benefit of new and existing residents and businesses.

- 4) Notes that the *West Edinburgh and Edinburgh Waterfront All Party Oversight Groups* have been established to co-ordinate the work of Council and Committees to enable the growth of our City in exactly this way.
- 5) Notes that, once the oversight group is established, it will have the opportunity to influence various place making and visioning exercises (which could include events and public consultation at the appropriate time) which will look at both what West Edinburgh and Edinburgh Waterfront should be, its future development potential and how this is delivered.
- 6) Looks forward to the outputs of this work informing the City Plan.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	17 votes
For the amendment	-	44 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Ritchie, Rose, Rust, 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, Henderson, Howie, Key, 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 Gardiner.

15 Kiltwalk – Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the success of the 2018 Kiltwalk which saw over 20,000 walkers participate in the four Kiltwalks across the country and raised over £4.5million for charity.

- 2) Congratulates the near 5,000 people who participated in the Edinburgh Kiltwalk on 16 September including the Lord Provost.
- 3) Recognises the particular achievement of those who walked in support of the Thistle Foundation, including all four Portobello Craigmillar ward councillors, raising over £4650.
- 4) Agrees for the Lord Provost to write formally to the Thistle Foundation to recognise the organisation's efforts to raise funds to support people across the city and beyond with long term conditions to live their lives to the fullest. “

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Ladlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Bruce

Amendment

In point 3 of the motion, delete 'raising over £4650' and replace with 'staff from Fort Kinnaird, and others participating remotely, raising nearly £14,000 after the 40% additional funding from The Hunter Foundation and top up from Fort Kinnaird.'

- moved by Councillor Mary Campbell, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11) the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Laidlaw:

Council:

- 1) Notes the success of the 2018 Kiltwalk which saw over 20,000 walkers participate in the four Kiltwalks across the country and raised over £4.5million for charity.
- 2) Congratulates the near 5,000 people who participated in the Edinburgh Kiltwalk on 16 September including the Lord Provost.
- 3) Recognises the particular achievement of those who walked in support of the Thistle Foundation, including all four Portobello Craigmillar ward councillors, staff from Fort Kinnaird, and others participating remotely, raising nearly £14,000 after the 40% additional funding from The Hunter Foundation and top up from Fort Kinnaird.

- 4) Agrees for the Lord Provost to write formally to the Thistle Foundation to recognise the organisation's efforts to raise funds to support people across the city and beyond with long term conditions to live their lives to the fullest.

16 40 Years Edinburgh Rape Crisis Centre – Motion by Councillor Griffiths

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

“Asks that Council:

- 1) Acknowledges the 40th Anniversary of the Edinburgh Rape Crisis Centre;
- 2) Thanks the Centre for providing 40 years of emotional and practical support, counselling, information and advocacy to thousands of survivors of sexual violence;
- 3) Welcomes and values the Centre's ongoing commitment to support survivors, promote prevention and campaign for the change needed to reduce – even eradicate – sexual violence from our society; and
- 4) Continues to support Edinburgh Rape Crisis in the exemplary work that it does.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Griffiths.

17 Testing of P1 Pupils – Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

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

“Council

- 1) Believes that although good-quality pupil assessment is an essential component of the drive to raise educational standards in Scotland's schools, it acknowledges the will of the recent Parliamentary vote on 19 September to call on the Scottish Government to halt testing of children in their first year of primary school;
- 2) Notes the level of concern which has been raised by teachers, education professionals, parents and MSPs regarding the introduction and delivery of new testing arrangements for Primary 1 pupils;

- 3) Further notes that this parliamentary motion was informed by feedback from parents, children and the EIS teaching union in favour of more play based learning;
- 4) Acknowledges that although formal, standardised testing is essential in Primary 4 and Primary 7, it should not happen in Primary 1 where it cannot deliver the same meaningful results;
- 5) Therefore instructs the Chief Executive to ascertain the options available to us as an Education Authority in relation to suspension of testing of Primary1 pupils and report back to Full Council within 1 cycle.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Rust

Amendment 1

To delete the motion and replace with:

The Council notes in relation to the assessment of pupils in P1:

- 1) That P1 standardised tests were but one of the tools used in supporting the teacher’s ultimate judgement, and in identifying early interventions for individual pupils to raise attainment for all young people and close the poverty related attainment gap.
- 2) Believes that professional teacher judgement was of the greatest value in determining pupil progress, and that this expertise is informed by a wide range of formative and summative assessment strategies, that were a natural part of daily classroom learning, and deployed at the teacher’s discretion.
- 3) Welcomes the strong focus and real benefits of play-based learning, especially outdoor learning, in Primary One, and the work underway to further support and maximise on this learning across all our schools.
- 4) Recognises the need to protect teachers from the additional workload and change that any new system would bring, such as with any alternative to standardised assessments, particularly given the move away from the more bureaucratic tracking and monitoring methods of the past and years of Council tests that were less reliable and costlier in terms of time, personnel, and finance.
- 5) The Council instructs appropriate officials to report back to the Education, Children, and Families Committee in one cycle on,

- a. The status of the motion past in Parliament cited in the Conservative motion at point 1.
- b. How P1 standardised assessments are being implemented across our schools in Edinburgh, how that relates to the wider range of assessments in P1 learning, and guidance from the Scottish Government.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dickie

Amendment 2

To replace point 1 of the motion with points 1-3 below and renumber original points 2-3 accordingly -

- 1) Acknowledges the central importance of education in council services and the value of delivering high quality education for all.
- 2) Agrees that the initial focus of Curriculum for Excellence on formative assessment was the appropriate one, and that any standardised national testing within primary schools risks disadvantage to some children who find it difficult to express their learning under those circumstances.
- 3) Acknowledges the outcome of the recent Parliamentary vote on the 19th of September 2018 which called on the Scottish Government to halt the standardised testing of children in their first year of primary school.

AND

Replace the original points 4-5 in the motion with -

- 6) Acknowledges that formative assessment, individually tailored child-by-child, based on the expert and professional judgement of teachers who have the highest level of knowledge about an individual child's learning, should be the focus within primary schools and is far more likely than national standardised testing to provide meaningful feedback to children, parents and carers.
- 7) Therefore instructs the Executive Director for Education, Children and Families to ascertain the options available to the Council as an Education Authority in relation to the suspension of all standardised national testing in primary schools and report back to the Education, Children and Families Committee within 2 cycles.

- moved by Councillor Mary Campbell, seconded by Councillor Corbett

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	22 votes
For Amendment 1	-	31 votes
For Amendment 2	-	8 votes

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

For Amendment 1 The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Donaldson, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work

For Amendment 2: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Perry as follows:

The Council notes in relation to the assessment of pupils in P1.

- 1) That P1 standardised tests were but one of the tools used in supporting the teacher's ultimate judgement, and in identifying early interventions for individual pupils to raise attainment for all young people and close the poverty related attainment gap.
- 2) Believes that professional teacher judgement was of the greatest value in determining pupil progress, and that this expertise is informed by a wide range of formative and summative assessment strategies, that were a natural part of daily classroom learning, and deployed at the teacher's discretion.
- 3) Welcomes the strong focus and real benefits of play-based learning, especially outdoor learning, in Primary One, and the work underway to further support and maximise on this learning across all our schools.
- 4) Recognises the need to protect teachers from the additional workload and change that any new system would bring, such as with any alternative to standardised assessments, particularly given the move away from the more bureaucratic tracking and monitoring methods of the past and years of Council tests that were less reliable and costlier in terms of time, personnel, and finance.

- 5) The Council instructs appropriate officials to report back to the Education, Children, and Families Committee in one cycle on,
 - a. The status of the motion past in Parliament cited in the Conservative motion at point 1.
 - b. How P1 standardised assessments are being implemented across our schools in Edinburgh, how that relates to the wider range of assessments in P1 learning, and guidance from the Scottish Government.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Arthur declared a financial interest in the above item as a member of staff at Heriot Watt University.

Councillor Young declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the parent of a young person who would be affected by the testing.

18 Heart of Midlothian FC Disability Awareness Day – Motion by Councillor Graczyk

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes, that on 22nd September Heart of Midlothian FC held a Disability Awareness Day as they hosted Livingston FC at Tynecastle Park, with the aim to raise awareness that our supporters can play their part in improving the matchday experience of our supporters who are disabled;
- 2) Further notes, the Club’s Disability Awareness Day ensured that a visit to Tynecastle Park to watch The Jambos was a thoroughly enjoyable and inclusive experience for all, this included:
 - a) Welcoming members from Heart of Midlothian FC Disabled Supporters Club (HDSC), OrCam, Team United and Deafblind Scotland to Tynecastle;
 - b) HDSC assisting with information relating to support for supporters who are disabled;
 - c) OrCam demonstrating some of the world’s most advanced wearable mobile artificial visual aids;

- d) Team United providing information on the work they do with young people and their families in a bid to assist them with taking part in sport or physical activity;
 - e) DeadBlind Scotland having a presence in the Main Stand and on the Foundation Plaza pre and post-match, where they invited fans to experience football with and without sight and sound;
- 3) Congratulates, the Heart of Midlothian FC and their Disability Access Officer, Keith Ferguson, for one of the best football atmospheres in our City – a Tynecastle for all.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Graczyk.

- moved by Councillor Graczyk, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

Amendment

Council

Deletes point 3) in the motion and replaces with:

- 3) Asks the Lord Provost to write to Ann Budge, Chairwoman of Heart of Midlothian FC, and their Disability Access Officer, Keith Ferguson, congratulating them for one of the best football atmospheres in the city – a Tynecastle for all – and recommends the Lord Provost writes to other football clubs in Edinburgh encouraging them to host similarly inclusive days.

- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Webber

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11) the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Graczyk.

Council:

- 1) Notes, that on 22nd September Heart of Midlothian FC held a Disability Awareness Day as they hosted Livingston FC at Tynecastle Park, with the aim to raise awareness that our supporters can play their part in improving the matchday experience of our supporters who are disabled;

- 2) Further notes, the Club's Disability Awareness Day ensured that a visit to Tynecastle Park to watch The Jambos was a thoroughly enjoyable and inclusive experience for all, this included:
 - a) Welcoming members from Heart of Midlothian FC Disabled Supporters Club (HDSC), OrCam, Team United and Deafblind Scotland to Tynecastle;
 - b) HDSC assisting with information relating to support for supporters who are disabled;
 - c) OrCam demonstrating some of the world's most advanced wearable mobile artificial visual aids;
 - d) Team United providing information on the work they do with young people and their families in a bid to assist them with taking part in sport or physical activity;
 - e) DeadBlind Scotland having a presence in the Main Stand and on the Foundation Plaza pre and post-match, where they invited fans to experience football with and without sight and sound;
- 3) Asks the Lord Provost to write to Ann Budge, Chairwoman of Heart of Midlothian FC, and their Disability Access Officer, Keith Ferguson, congratulating them for one of the best football atmospheres in the city – a Tynecastle for all – and recommends the Lord Provost writes to other football clubs in Edinburgh encouraging them to host similarly inclusive days.

19 ACES Aware Council – Motion by Councillor Graczyk

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes, the term Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) is used to describe a wide range of stressful or traumatic experiences that children can be exposed to whilst growing up. ACEs range from experiences that directly harm a child (such as suffering physical, verbal or sexual abuse, and physical or emotional neglect) to those that affect the environment in which a child grows up (including parental separation, domestic violence, mental illness, alcohol abuse, drug use or incarceration);
- 2) Recognises, the indisputable link between ACEs and poor health outcomes in later life. A public health approach to childhood distress is crucial to raising the next generation of Scottish children and to helping adults heal, thus limiting the chance for adversity to pass down through generations;

- 3) Calls, for the City of Edinburgh Council to commit being an 'ACEs-Aware' Council, and maintain the high profile of the needs of vulnerable children and young people, especially in the Year of Young People;
- 4) Commends:
 - a) CEC Children & Families, NHS Lothian, the academic community, and other relevant stakeholders for stimulating awareness and discussion about ACEs;
 - b) Council and relevant stakeholders' effort for working together to raise awareness and improve policy and practice to prevent ACEs and mitigate their negative impact;
 - c) The imbedding of an understanding of ACEs within every aspect of the Council organisation;
- 5) Requests, consideration for Elected Members to attend a screening of the documentary film 'Resilience', facilitated by someone with knowledge in this area."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Graczyk

- moved by Councillor Graczyk, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment

- 1) To add a new point 2 to the motion:

"Acknowledges, that child poverty, bereavement and wider risk factors were not included in the original ACE study, but are vital in all current and forward ACE related work."

- 2) Add a new sentence at end of point 4.b in the original motion:

"This includes Growing Confidence training and Turn Your Life Around project."

- moved by Councillor Dickie, seconded by Councillor Perry

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11) the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Graczyk:

Council:

- 1) Notes, the term Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) is used to describe a wide range of stressful or traumatic experiences that children can be exposed to whilst growing up. ACEs range from experiences that directly harm a child (such as suffering physical, verbal or sexual abuse, and physical or emotional neglect) to those that affect the environment in which a child grows up (including parental separation, domestic violence, mental illness, alcohol abuse, drug use or incarceration);
- 2) Acknowledges, that child poverty, bereavement and wider risk factors were not included in the original ACE study, but are vital in all current and forward ACE related work.
- 3) Recognises, the indisputable link between ACEs and poor health outcomes in later life. A public health approach to childhood distress is crucial to raising the next generation of Scottish children and to helping adults heal, thus limiting the chance for adversity to pass down through generations;
- 4) Calls, for the City of Edinburgh Council to commit being an 'ACEs-Aware' Council, and maintain the high profile of the needs of vulnerable children and young people, especially in the Year of Young People;
- 5) Commends:
 - a) CEC Children & Families, NHS Lothian, the academic community, and other relevant stakeholders for stimulating awareness and discussion about ACEs;
 - b) Council and relevant stakeholders' effort for working together to raise awareness and improve policy and practice to prevent ACEs and mitigate their negative impact. This included Growing confidence training and Turn Your Life Around project;
 - c) The imbedding of an understanding of ACEs within every aspect of the Council organisation;
- 6) Requests, consideration for Elected Members to attend a screening of the documentary film 'Resilience', facilitated by someone with knowledge in this area.

20 Purchase of Developer Share in National Trust Limited Liability Partnership – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Council, in terms of Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, excluded the public from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business for the reason that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 6, 8 and 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the Council entering into a Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) with Miller Homes Limited (Miller) and the Scottish Future Trust (SFT), to own and manage 89 homes for mid-market rent at Telford North to the Council for ratification of the use of the Council Tax Discount Fund.

Motion

To ratify the use of the Council Tax Discount Fund.

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Donaldson

Amendment

- 1) To ratify the use of the Council Tax Discount Fund.
- 2) To recognise that the rights of the tenants of Telford North LLP to buy the properties they rent, instanced at 3.9 in the report by the Executive Director of Place, were unaffected by this transaction. To instruct officers on conclusion of this transaction to ensure that all tenants of National Housing Trust LLPs in which this Council is a Partner receive clear communication on their rights, including how and when they can exercise them in a meaningful way.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Rose

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11) the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rankin:

- 1) To ratify the use of the Council Tax Discount Fund.
- 2) To recognise that the rights of the tenants of Telford North LLP to buy the properties they rent, instanced at 3.9 in the report by the Executive Director of Place, were unaffected by this transaction. To instruct officers on conclusion of this transaction to ensure that all tenants of National Housing Trust LLPs in

which this Council is a Partner receive clear communication on their rights, including how and when they can exercise them in a meaningful way.

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 3 of 25 October 2018)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Mary Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 October 2018

Question

In the last five years, how many property tenders put out by the council have received -

a. No bids

b. 1 bid

Please break down the information by financial year.

Answer

The table below provides year by year breakdown.

Year	Total Property tenders	No. Nil Bids	No. '1' Bids
2013/14	3	0	0
2014/15	1	0	0
2015/16	4	0	0
2016/17	8	0	0
2017/18	1	0	0

Note: The data is taken from 'contracts awarded' using Public Contract Scotland – there may be other projects published in 17/18 but not awarded until 18/19.

Additional New build / building extensions are awarded using the SCAPE or HUBCo Frameworks – these are 'single supplier' Frameworks and are not included in the data above.

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer
by the Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 25 October
2018**

The council has recently passed a Fair Fringe charter. Despite that this Fringe it has been alleged that C Venues classes its staff as 'volunteers' and pays them only £200 plus accommodation for working over the festival period.

Question (1) What is being done to publicise venues that have signed up to the Fair Fringe Charter and to make both the public and performers aware when a venue has not?

Answer (1) The Council approved a Edinburgh Festival Workers Welfare Commitment on 31 May 2018. It is working with the Fringe Society to promote a responsible and credible Festival worker environment in the city.

The information on who has signed up for the Fair Fringe Charter is held by Fair Fringe (an alliance of Fringe workers and Edinburgh-based campaign groups advocating for improvements in pay and conditions). The Fringe Society have been in contact with Fair Fringe to discuss sharing this information but there has not yet been an agreement.

Question (2) What is being done to ensure that those venues signed up to the Fair Fringe Charter adhere to it?

Answer (2) The Council expects that the Fair Fringe grouping will monitor adherence with the Charter.

However, following the Fringe Society's independent workers' survey in October 2017, the Fringe Society has been working closely with City of Edinburgh Council, participants, venues, and third parties on a number of practical measures to address issues flagged by the survey

including a Guidance on Good Employment on the Fringe document; posters in venues to ensure workers know their rights; and a series of one to one meetings with all venues referenced in the survey. The Society is also committed to developing a Guidance on Volunteering Best Practice ahead of the 2019 Fringe.

Venues and employers across the Fringe have embraced these steps and have welcomed the help, advice and constructive approach taken by the Society.

**Supplementary
Question**

I'm afraid I won't get cheers because I do have a supplementary. What's being done to specifically inform performers whether the venues they're considering performing in are behaving in an ethical manner to their employees?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I thank Councillor Staniforth for the question and I think you have identified a serious problem and that is when you have guidelines that you're trying to enforce and of course we can't actually enforce them we can only lead by example and encourage and communicate effectively and I think you'll see there in the answer that that's been done through posters and leaflets but also through individual interviews. When its volunteers you're talking about they have chosen to do this it's quite difficult sometimes to get them to come forward with information but we are actively talking to the Fringe Society and also with the Fair Fringe about sharing information on what venues or groups might be offending these guidelines. So things as they come forward have to be directly investigated that's why I would thank you for bringing this forward. But again it's quite difficult to get the information on which to act. So part of that is to make it public and to publish it so widely that everybody knows what the rights are and expectations are and we can do that particularly effectively of course in our own venues.

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 October 2018**

Question (1) Can the Convener provide an update on plans for routine grounds maintenance of arterial routes in the city which was confirmed in September 2018 as not in place but currently being investigated?

Answer (1) Procurement for routine grounds maintenance was advertised earlier this year however there were no tenders submitted. Officers are arranging to meet with Transport Scotland to discuss the potential for collaborative working for these activities.

Question (2) Could the Convener provide the following details in her answer?

- a) Scope of work being considered.
- b) Routes deemed 'arterial' under these considerations.
- c) If the work would be delivered by contractors or council employees.
- d) Timescale for proposals and if these will come to Transport and Environment or Finance and Resources Committee.
- e) If commercial sponsorship for landscaping and/or public art has been considered.

Answer

- (2) a) The focus will be on removal of litter in line with legislative standards and to manage vegetation where required.
- b) The routes being considered are the areas of the A1, A199, A8, A70, A71, A90, which are the responsibility of the City of Edinburgh Council.
- c) This work requires special qualification and equipment to carry out work alongside high speed roads. It has therefore been determined that the use of an external contractor is most appropriate in this case.
- d) It is intended to have management arrangements in place as soon as practically possible. The total cost of this contract is expected to be within delegated authority as set out in the Council's contract standing orders.
- e) A procurement exercise is underway to appoint a contractor who will be responsible for roundabout and gateway signage.

Public art has not been considered at this stage. However, it could be included within existing contracts for advertising within the urban environment on a project by project basis, if appropriate.

Supplementary Question

I thank you Lord Provost, I have a supplementary, I thank the Convener for the answer. I just want to ask for some clarity on question 2(e) so I asked if commercial sponsorship for landscaping or public art had been considered as anyone who has driven through Fife or West Lothian would see a lot of their roundabouts and verges are sponsored by private entities. It's a good way in these times are tight budgets to have some pretty public areas. Now the answer was, a procurement exercise is underway to appoint a contractor who will be responsible for roundabout and gateway signage. It's good to know, it doesn't answer the question and public art has not been considered at this stage, however it could be included within existing contracts to advertising within the urban environment on a

project-by-project basis. So I'd just like some clarity if that means that the Council is considering commercial sponsorship of roundabouts and verges and if not why not? Thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for the supplementary Councillor Laidlaw. I am in the midst of discussing with officials exactly how we might go forward on this and I will be happy to return both to you and indeed to full Council of necessary at a later date.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Housing and
Economy Committee at a meeting of
the Council on 25 October 2018**

From 1st December 2015, private landlords are responsible for ensuring that an electrical safety inspection of their property is carried out by a registered electrician at least every five years.

As of 1st December 2015, under sections 13(4A) and 19B(4) of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2006, private landlords in Scotland are required by law to ensure that their properties are electrically safe.

This covers:

- Any installations in the property for the supply of electricity
- Electrical fixtures and fittings
- Any appliances provided by the landlord under the tenancy.

Landlords must be able to prove that all of the above are in a reasonable state of repair and in proper working order.

Can the Convener please confirm;

Question (1) What proportion of our Council Housing stock has received an Electrical Installation Condition Report in the last 5 years?

- a) Across the city
- b) Broken down by ward

Answer (1) a) Since the legislation was introduced in 2015, 83% or 16,530 of all council homes have already received an electrical installation condition report and electrical installation certificate. Based on the current programme we estimate that the remaining 17% of homes will be assessed by the end of 2019, ahead of the 2020 deadline.

b) The table below shows this broken down by ward, except for the capital programme which is not recorded by ward.

Ward	Electrical Installation Condition Reports
Almond	199
City Centre	70
Colinton/Fairmilehead	310
Corstorphine/Murrayfield	55
Craigtinny/Duddingston	873
Drumbrae/Gyle	279
Forth	1,735
Fountainbridge/ Craiglockhart	219
Inverleith	254
Leith	734
Leith Walk	177
Liberton/Gilmerton	1,244
Morningside	34
Pentland Hills	522
Portobello/Craigmillar	985
Sighthill/Gorgie	2,167
Southside/Newington	378
Capital Programme	6,295
Total	16,530

Question (2) Does the Council routinely carry out Electrical Installation Condition Reports on a change of tenancy?

- Answer** (2) Yes.
- Question** (3) Of the Council Housing stock inspected under the Electrical Installation Condition Report regime, how many properties have been found to be electrically unsafe?
- a) Across the city
- b) Broken down by ward
- Answer** (3) This information is not recorded as repairs are carried out at the point of inspection or the individual circuit is isolated until a full repair can be carried out.
- Question** (4) Of the Council Housing stock inspected under the Electrical Installation Condition Report regime, how many properties have been found to be uninhabitable?
- a) Across the city
- b) Broken down by ward
- Answer** (4) No properties had been found uninhabitable after an inspection as repairs are carried out at the point of inspection or the individual circuit is isolated until a full repair can be carried out.
- Question** (5) What arrangements the Council has in place to ensure all Council Houses have an Electrical Installation Condition Report?
- Answer** (5) The Council will ensure that all homes will receive an electrical inspection by the end of 2019, a year ahead of the 2020 deadline. Electrical inspections are carried out as part of the Council's capital programme to modernise, repair and maintain homes.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her answer. I am pleased to see that such a high percentage of electrical installation condition reports have been completed across the city as a whole. I would just ask, obviously we are still 17% outstanding, we do have a plan for that. Residents in my ward have come to me with mushrooms growing out of light switches and water pouring through

ceiling light fittings. These problems have been tended to quickly when I have raised them, however, there's clearly Council properties which have electrics which aren't in a safe condition and I would just ask the Convener if she could possibly explore our options for accelerating the remainder of these checks.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Just to thank Councillor Hutchison for his question. As he pointed out the answer does show that since the change of legislation in 2015, 83% of electrical safety inspections have been carried out and we're on track to have 100% carried out by the end of 2019, so that's a full year ahead of the deadline. There are specific concerns that he has, then I would obviously ask that he would raise them with me and with senior officers and we'll look into those. In terms of speeding up the process I think we are doing it as quickly as possible but I will certainly look into how we can do it as fast as we can.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Whyte for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 25 October
2018**

The “research paper” produced by the Council indicated that, were the Council to have the power and were it to choose to use it, the likely rate of TVL would be £1 per night bringing in £11m per annum less costs. It also indicated there would be strong pressure to spend any funding raised on tourism/events marketing.

Question

In these circumstances can the Council Leader indicate how he would prioritise the spending allocation of his hypothetical £11m per annum?

Answer

The Council this month launched a consultation to gather views from stakeholders on the best possible arrangements for introducing a Transient Visitor Levy (TVL) in the city.

This consultation asks residents, businesses, industry stakeholders, and visitors themselves how they would wish the revenue raised to be utilised.

Any decision on the allocation of funding will as usual be determined at full Council.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. I'm sure the public will be surprised that an opinionated person like the Council Leader can't say where he would spend the proceeds of what he obviously considers his flagship future policy of a tourist tax. However, isn't the truth of the matter that Janus-like he wants to face both ways, suggesting manna for key services and money for tourist promotion, because to be honest he would either have to alienate the public or the tourist industry if he says where the money be spent when he needs both for his consultation.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you very much Lord Provost. I don't think that's a particularly fair characterisation of the process we've gone through or the detail. I appreciate Councillor Whyte wasn't at the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee when we approved this consultation document, his fourth such meeting that he's missed this side of the election, and maybe that's a matter he can explain to his own electorate, not a matter for me. In terms of the governance and how we have structured our consultation, I had a very meaningful and helpful engagement with one of the business representative bodies. When this was passed to him for comment before it went out, he was invited to look at it with understandably a critical eye, going from page to page. The representative was unable to find those niggly points that he was so desperate to raise because the process we have engaged in and the consultation we've put out is robust and does cater for a whole multitude of opinions. Now, the report we passed at the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee does lay out the options and these are options, and what we are asking for people through the consultation is which would they want to prioritise in terms of the individual spend. But there is another point that Councillor Whyte has frankly missed and it's far bigger, it's on the governance and the mechanism of how that's decided year on year once we have this levy, because it's not just for us to stand here, implement a policy if we're given the powers to do so, and then set in perpetuity what this money is going to be spent on, because this city may have changing priorities and it's for us to create a governance mechanism that engages the industry, that engages key stakeholders and residents to make sure we are meeting those priorities year on year. So the consultation which I'm implying from the tone of the question Councillor Whyte's asked, he's not filled in the consultation to better his understanding of it, maybe he should, but that consultation gives us an absolute way for people to submit their views and other better way of shaping not only the parameters of what that money should be spent on but the governance of how these decisions are taken year on year post implementation.

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 October 2018

Question (1) In the light of severe traffic disruption caused in East Edinburgh this month by the repeated over-run of gas mains repairs at the major Duddingston Road West-Milton Road junction, what contact has she had with Scotland Gas Networks (SGN) about their programme?

Answer (1) Throughout these works there has been regular liaison between Council Officers and SGN.

Question (2) In view of the resultant disruption to Council road resurfacing projects and considerable inconvenience to road users, will she be reporting this matter to the Scottish Road Works Commissioner?

Answer (2) I have asked officers to review SGN's performance across the city. If this review identifies performance concerns Officers will raise these concerns at the next Area Roads Authorities and Utilities Committee meeting, which is attended by representatives of the Scottish Road Works Commissioners Office.

Supplementary Question Thank you very much Lord Provost and I'm extremely grateful to the Convener for agreeing to a review of SGN's performance because whilst there has indeed been regular liaison between officers and the company my understanding from our officers is that in the case of Duddingston Cross, it has resulted in broken promises from SGN to complete the work by agreed deadlines, which has resulted first in delays and then a highly undesirable overlap with the Council's essential resurfacing programme. It seems to me that SGN and others have very little consideration for the disruption once work starts, and does she agree with me that as the public often blames the Council for disruption which is not of its making, it's essential for the Council to be seen to be bringing due pressure on utility companies to up their game and I just wonder what further action she'll be able to take to continue the process beyond this review, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor McLellan for your supplementary. I do agree with you that it's deeply frustrating not only for this Council but obviously for the residents of Edinburgh when we do have overruns like this, particularly when other carefully planned works are then thrown off by those overruns. As you'll have seen from my answer we do have continual liaison with organisations like the Scottish Gas Networks about how they're performing. The review will throw up some evidence there and I think we'll be taking that forward at that point. You asked though whether or not I'd be reporting it to the Scottish Roadworks Commissioner. In actual fact that's not how the process works, that's not what the Roadworks Commissioner is set up to do, and in fact states quite clearly on the second page of the website that it's not set up to inspect individual roadworks. It's got a much more strategic monitoring overview and so although they are aware of it, they are the data holder on all sorts of aspects of it that's not a precise route for us at this point. I agree with you however, that Edinburgh residents have a right to expect an ease of passage around some of these works but roadworks are an inevitable part of city living and we do our best to try to minimise the disruption that's caused by those as much as possible, thank you.

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 October 2018

Question (1) How much it will cost to replace the minibuses which are currently used on Lothian Buses' 69 service through Willowbrae and the Lady Nairne estate?

Answer (1) The Council does not hold this information.

Question (2) What subsidy has Lothian Buses asked the Council to provide to maintain this service?

Answer (2) Lothian Buses has not asked the Council to provide any subsidy to maintain the service.

Question (3) How much the temporary replacement service to be provided by Prentice Coaches will cost per year?

Answer (3) The Council does not hold this information.

Supplementary Question Thank you very much. The 69 minibus service is a vital link for possibly the hilliest community in the city and it's now under threat because Lothian Buses decided not to replace the buses which are now 10 years old. They've come to a temporary arrangement with Prentice of Haddington and they've asked the Council's help to encourage its use. So given the enormous public transport investment the Administration is planning to make, can she outline what support the Council can give to this particular service, thank you.

Supplementary Answer We are monitoring closely what will be happening in the course of the next 12 months when Prentice will have an opportunity and indeed I believe have a belief that they can increase patronage in this area. Lothian Buses have an issue with this particular route because in order to service it, the requirements of that particular route are for minibuses rather than full scale buses. As a result they have to retain two buses of that size which is completely contrary to anything

else that sits in the fleet and there are some certain issues attached to that. We'll be keeping a very close liaison with Prentice to make sure that the service continues to work well in the course of the 12 months and during that course of 12 months we are monitoring very carefully what is likely to happen afterwards. I can assure you that it's not a forgotten case and that we will be looking very carefully at what might be required at the end of that 12 month period.

**Comments by
the Lord
Provost**

Just before we move on to the next question, the last few questions have deviated somewhat from the supplementaries asking clarification of the written answer and have introduced new topics. Can I just ask members to stick to asking for clarification only, thank you.

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 25 October 2018

Question (1) If the First Minister has agreed to his request of October 4 that the Scottish Government's national consultation with the Scottish tourism industry on the Transient Visitor Levy will be completed by the end of December?

Answer (1) Attached is the letter sent to the First Minister following the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee meeting on October 4th. I'm happy to share the formal response with Councillors when I receive it.

Question (2) If not, what indication of a timescale for the completion of the national consultation has he received?

Answer (2) At COSLA's conference in October, the First Minister and the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, Economy and Fair Work outlined a timescale which would indicate conclusion of the national conversation before the Council's consultation has concluded.

Supplementary Question Thank you. Given the Council expects the city's hospitality industry to become tax gatherers for the Administration, I think it's only fair that they get as accurate a picture as possible of when this is likely to start. So my question is straightforward, is the national conversation expected to be the sum total of the Scottish Government's pre-legislative consultation and if not when does the Council Leader expect that national consultation to be completed and legislation framed?

Supplementary Answer Can I thank Councillor McLellan for the question. We won't know the answer to that until the Committee has reported through the Committee process that's ongoing on this issue and any recommendations they have for Government will then need to be responded to. So right now the Government's position is a national conversation in terms

of round tables that they're setting up similar actually to the process that we started off with in terms of this. Any other action points in terms of further consultation on engagement will either come directly from the Government or post the recommendations made by the Parliament's Sub-Committee on this matter.

**First Minister
The Scottish Parliament
Edinburgh
EH99 1SP**

Date: 4 October 2018

Dear First Minister

I am writing to welcome your announcement that the Scottish Government will be progressing with a national consultation on the Tourist Tax. A balanced national consultation exercise will add an important dimension to this debate.

I am pleased to share that the Council Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee today agreed that the City of Edinburgh Council would also embark on a local consultation in order to inform a proposal for a viable Edinburgh TVL Scheme.

This process is due to complete by the end of December and I look forward to sharing the findings with you. I am also happy to share the research and analysis that the council has done to date so that it can be used to support the national consultation.

In discussing this matter, the Committee asked that in writing to you, I also seek assurances that the national consultation would be done to a similar timescale as our own consultation with a view to reaching a decision on this matter as soon as practicable.

I look forward to hearing from you around your proposed timescales and to continued engagement on this issue.

Yours sincerely

Adam McVey
SNP Councillor, Leith
Leader of the City of Edinburgh Council
0131 529 3279

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Cook for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 October 2018**

- Question** **(1)** Can the Convener confirm if the target completion date is March 2019 or March 2020, by property, for all overdue maintenance work included as part of the Tranche 1 programme, as listed in the attached Table?
- Answer** **(1)** The attached table has been updated to reflect targeted completion dates for ongoing and future works.
- Question** **(2)** If the target completion date is no longer March 2019 or March 2020 for the Tranche 1 works, can the Convener provide the amended target completion date, as well as the original target completion date?
- Answer** **(2)** The attached table has been updated to reflect existing and revised targeted completion dates. Any change has been highlighted by a (R).
- Question** **(3)** Add any other works commissioned since February 2018 as part of the essential overdue maintenance catch up programme, including the new Tranche number / property reference, property name, description of overdue maintenance works, commission budget and target completion date?
- Answer** **(3)** One further project has been commissioned since February 2018 for Tranche 1 works (shown on the attached table as 1.36).
- Question** **(4)** For each property, can the Convener provide an estimate of how much of the work identified has now been completed?

Answer (4) The table has been updated to reflect the percentage complete of each project. For guidance, the following assumptions should be noted;

- The percentage shown relates to the overall project timescale which includes design, tender, construction and the 12-month defects and liability period post completion on site. Some projects will also span a 2-year period.
- Projects shown as 95% are considered to have the construction phase complete on site and are now in the 12-month defects & liability period.
- Projects shown as 40% or below are still within the pre-construction phase (design & tender).

Question (5) Would the Convener agree that this is a helpful format for reporting progress on overdue School's Maintenance as agreed by Council, and therefore agree to provide this information to all Members in May and September each year, until all works in Tranche 1 and subsequent tranches have been completed?

Answer (5) An update briefing note will be provided to all members in May and September each year.

Comments by Councillor Cook Thank Lord Provost – no formal supplementary but if you can indulge me I'd just like to thank the Convener for the comprehensive nature of the answer that he's provided. Too often we're given very superficial answers to a number of questions that opposition Councillors ask, that's not the case in this instance so thank you.

Table 1: Capital Works Programme Commissions issued at 20 February 2018

	Property	Proposed work	Budget ('000)	Target End Date	% Work Done
1	Tranche 1	35 Buildings in Tranche 1 Capital works overdue maintenance programme	£20,488		
1.1	Balgreen PS/Nursery	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, window renewal, mechanical & electrical installation improvements, fire alarm and intruder alarm upgrade, internal and external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£1,470	Mar-20	20
1.2	Bonnington Centre	Commission for fire Alarm upgrade	£35	Mar-19	95
1.3	Broughton PS	Commission for mechanical and electrical upgrade including fire alarm, windows upgrade /repair rooflight and external fabric enhancement. Upgrade drainage to pool.	£836	Mar-20	40
1.4	Brunstane PS & Nursery	Commission for external fabric enhancement, including concrete sills and lintels.	£70	Mar-20 (R)	30
1.5	Buckstone PS	Commission for the water supply separation from the school	£60	Mar-19	95
1.6	Clermiston PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, internal and external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings, heating and boiler upgrade, repair tarmac, railings and handrails.	£1,315	Mar-20	50
1.7	Clovestone Gdns HOP	Commission for boiler and heating upgrade	£115	Oct-18 (R)	95
1.8	Corstorphine PS	Commission for upgrade radiators, heaters and fans to gym hall.	£90	Oct-18 (R)	95
1.9	Craiglockhart PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including window upgrade, mechanical and electrical improvements, heating den boiler upgrade, internal & external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floor coverings. Repair tarmac.	£626	Mar-20	21
1.10	Davidsons Mains PS	Commission to replace rooflights	£17	Mar-19	95
1.11	Duddingston PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including window upgrade, mechanical and electrical improvements, heating and boiler upgrade, internal & external fabric improvements, decoration and	£900	Mar-20	10

		replacement floor coverings. Repair tarmac.			
1.12	East Craigs PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, internal and external fabric improvements, replacement / upgrade of pipework, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£601	Mar-19	95
1.13	Echline PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, external fabric enhancement, pipework upgrade, boiler and heating upgrade, mechanical & electrical improvements.	£655	Mar-19 (R)	50
1.14	Ferrylee HOP	Commission for boiler and heating upgrade	£130	Oct-18 (R)	95
1.15	Fox Covert PS/ St Andrew's Fox Covert PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, windows and doors upgrade, decoration and replacement of floorcoverings, electrical installation improvements, renew bounding fencing and replacement of gates.	£1,000	Mar-20	43
1.16	Gracemount PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, window and doors renewal, toilet replacement, mechanical and electrical installation improvements, sanitary improvements, internal & external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£710	Mar-20	38
1.17	James Gillespies PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, window renewal, toilet replacement, mechanical and electrical installation improvements, sanitary improvements, internal and external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£685	Mar-20	70
1.18	Jewel House HOP	Commission for boiler and heating upgrade	£131	Oct-18 (R)	95
1.19	Leith PS & Nursery	Commission for boiler upgrade and staff toilet improvements	£191	Mar-19	95
1.20	Lorne PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, window and doors renewal, mechanical and electrical installation improvements, internal and external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£451	Mar-20	70
1.21	Murrayburn PS	Commission for boiler and heating upgrade, windows and external doors upgrade, mechanical and electrical installation works, internal and external fabric improvements and	£1,385	Mar-20	50

		tarmac repair in playground.			
1.22	Queensferry PS/Early Years Centre	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, ceilings renewal, windows and doors upgrade, mechanical and electrical installation upgrade, Internal & external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£1,300	Mar-19	28
1.23	Ratho PS	Commission for playground upgrades, sanitary facilities renewal, small power and lighting upgrade works including decoration and replacement of floorcoverings.	£405	Mar-20	30
1.24	Sciennes PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, windows and doors upgrade, sanitary improvements, fire alarm upgrade, decoration and replacement of floorcoverings, electrical installation improvements and heating system upgrade.	£676	Mar-19	30
1.25	Seafield Laboratory	commission to upgrade fire alarm system	£20	Mar-19	95
1.26	St Catherine's	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, heating and pipework upgrade and decoration and floorcovering replacement.	£478	Mar-19	95
1.27	St Marys (Leith)	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing, windows and doors upgrade, toilet replacement, pipework replacement, mechanical and electrical installation improvements, internal and external fabric improvements, decoration and floorcoverings replacement.	£1,321	Mar-20	50
1.28	St Ninians PS	Commission to upgrade asphalt roof, upgrade boiler and heating system, mechanical & electrical installation improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£1,000	Mar-20	49
1.29	Stockbridge Library	Commission to upgrade heating and boiler.	£40	Mar-20	30
1.30	St Thomas of Aquins	Commission to upgrade lighting installation	£210	Oct-18	95
1.31	Trinity PS	Commission for refurbishment of the school including roofing replacement, window renewal, boiler and heating upgrade, toilet replacement, mechanical and electrical improvements, internal and external fabric improvements, decoration and replacement floorcoverings.	£1,800	Mar-20	50
1.32	Usher Hall	commission for Boiler and heating upgrade	£820	Jun-19 (R)	30

1.33	Viewforth Children's Centre	Commission for mechanical and electrical upgrade of distribution boards.	£45	Mar-19	95
1.34	Wardie PS	Commission for installation of fire alarm system, upgrade roofing, windows renewal, internal & external fabric improvements, decoration and replace floor coverings.	£865	Mar-20	30
1.35	Waverley Court	Commission to re balance heating and upgrade staff sanitary facilities.	£35	Mar-19	20
1.36	Craigentenny PS	Masonry and roofing upgrade	£502	Mar-19	30

QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 October 2018**

As we approach the 6th birthday of the inception of new plans to replace the Salvesen Steps following the failure of previous plans due to inter-departmental difficulties.

Can the Convener please advise;

Question (1) Whether she believes that this lengthy and ongoing delay is acceptable?

Answer (1) The delays in progressing the replacement of the Salvesen Steps are regrettable but I believe these have been for acceptable reasons. I appreciate the importance of these steps to the local community and I understand that officers are working closely with partners and funding organisations to progress the replacement as quickly as possible.

Question (2) What the reasons are for the ongoing delay?

Answer (2) It has proved difficult to develop the conceptual design to a more detailed plan as this needs to take into account the complex geological location, funder requirements, and community preferences.

Question (3) Why stakeholders were told at a meeting in August 2017 that concerns regarding flood levels had been resolved only to then be told in June 2018 that this was in fact not the case?

Answer (3) The original flood modelling was undertaken in 2016/7, as part of the option studies. To take account of the preferred changes to the walkway design in 2018, further modelling has now been undertaken

Question (4) What the current timeline is for the advancement of this project?

Answer (4) It is currently anticipated that if the programme for replacement goes well the earliest the walkway would open is in 2020. However, the timeline is currently difficult to estimate as the detailed designs need to be developed and funding confirmed, including the involvement of other stakeholders.

Question (5) What she has done personally to advance the commencement of works on this vital link in the River Almond walkway?

Answer (5) I have reinforced the importance of this project with officers and I am reassured that it is being treated as a priority and forms part of the list of key strategic priorities for the Parks, Greenspace and Cemeteries team.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost, thank you to the Convener for her answer. I'd just like to point out that under the answer to Part 1, the Convener mentions the importance of the steps to the local community, I'd like to point out the importance stretches well beyond the local community, it's well used for wild life, for people looking at the sites of historical interest along the River Almond and also for fishing, walking and cycling. It attracts people from a wide area. In terms of a supplementary question, I just like to ask the Convener what action she's now taken off the back of this to try and move things forward?

Supplementary Answer Thank you for your supplementary question Councillor Hutchison. First of all I am of course aware of the fact that the use and the advantage of this area goes well beyond the local community. I think however, I have answered the supplementary question under answer 5 and I've reinforced the importance of this project with officers and I'm working continually with officers about strategic priorities. In fact I'm meeting next week with the Head of Parks, Green Spaces and Cemeteries to look at all of the key strategic priorities in that area and of course Salvesen steps will form part of it. I think however it is worth revisiting since I'm on my feet about the design development delays there have been there. I think it is very important that we recognise why this has occurred and that it's very much about getting the best

possible solution for both that local community and the wider use of that area. I don't think either Councillor Hutchison or the local communities or indeed the wider groups would prefer us to push through this design, end up with a sub-par option and please no-one. I think it's vitally important that the community are furnished with a fit for purpose amenity which provides all that they want and they expect. That's what we would be endeavouring to do and that's why we're taking so much effort around this to ensure that for example, further modelling is taking place around the flood issues and that we make sure that we end up with a design which minimises the length of the access ramps while enabling two-way access for all and set the walkway at a level where it won't be impacted by flooding and thus be either a maintenance burden for the Council or indeed a river hazard more importantly in the future, thank you.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 October 2018

Question

Given the introduction of new bin collection days on October 8th could the Convener of Transport and Environment Committee provide details of missed bin collections for each of the weeks since introduction; by collection stream and the number of missed bin collections reported for each type of waste stream and complaints received?

Answer

Please find below a table showing the service requests for missed and full bins for the two weeks from 8 October to 21 October 2018. This is broken down by collection stream. For context, it is anticipated that there would be in the region of 850,000 collections in the same period.

For comparison, I have also attached a summary of the total missed and full bin collection information for the year to date and the total full or missed bin collections from 2015 – 2018 (for the period January – September).

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for her response. Has the service been able to determine which complaints are service request due to service failure on the Council side and which were user error and when this information will be reported to a future Committee so we can better understand how the success or otherwise of the implementation of the changes to the services?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Mowat. In fact the service is currently working on trying to rectify a problem that has occurred and you correctly identify the fact that sometimes it's down to service users presenting bins on the wrong day for example and there are lots of reasons for that. Where that's being identified in fact there's quite a lot of remedial work being undertaken at the moment. So for example, fresh calendars are being delivered to the doorsteps of those that they are able to identify, have had that as an issue etc. Clearly you'll understand that we're right in the midst of that process and at some point we will presumably be able to review on that.

I think though I'd like to take this opportunity to talk about what has occurred in the last couple of weeks around this and I thank you for the opportunity to do so in this situation. I don't think anyone, least of all me, would be happy with the negative impact that some aspects of the waste collection changes have had on some parts of the city and I welcome this opportunity to apologise directly to those affected.

I have asked officers to work extremely hard and they are doing so to rectify the situation and get us to a position where people can begin to see the benefits of the changes to a four-day collection week. The move to a four-day collection model is the largest service change since 2012 and we cannot underestimate the complexity and the challenge that sits within this for both officers and indeed for residents as highlighted by Councillor Mowat's supplementary question. So let's look at why these issues have occurred. In implementing the new collection model we've identified that some properties would experience gaps in their service delivery and so we decided to offer additional collections across two weekends for properties that would have had a change of more than seven days between the collection date on their old and their new collection calendars. I expect that if we hadn't made that decision we would also be receiving complaints about a perceived break in service. An error in the original letter sent to residents along with delays in completing the additional collections on time has resulted in these additional missed bin complaints.

We can however expect to see a reduction in problems and complaints over the next short while, in fact we've already seen these levels drop. One of the issues has been the number of bins presented on the wrong day as we go through this change process and the service is currently monitoring this. This I may add from my point of view is not any attempt to shift responsibilities but it's simply an observation. We are tackling this through, for example, the direct posting of calendars through the letterboxes of those homeowners and this appears to be having a positive effect already. I would however like to offer some context here. Across the two weeks referred to in Councillor Mowat's question since the introduction of the new service on the 8th,

we have undertaken approximately 830,000 waste uplifts. From among those we saw a rise in requests from missed bin collection of approximately 2,800 above our normal level. We're already seeing this level drop as the interruptions to service I described are being ironed out.

This follows a pattern seen in many other local authorities and is not unique to Edinburgh. When we introduce a change of this magnitude we can expect to see a sharp rise in complaints and indeed screaming headlines followed by a relatively swift reversion back to normal levels we've seen elsewhere in the country and we accept that that's the case. We've also seen a consistent lowering of complaints and requests across the service in the last year, we have the waste improvement plan to thank for that. This change in approach has produced a consistently better position than we've seen in some years, a fact that presumably has been reflected in the fewer waste related Council questions in recent months. But let us be clear, no one's happy with the temporary difficulties caused by this complex set of changes. If we'd followed some of our colleagues down the alternative business models route that was pushed by other parts of this Chamber....

**Comment by
Councillor
Rust**

Sorry, on a point of order Lord Provost

**Comment by
the Lord
Provost**

Which point of order Councillor Rust?

**Councillor
Rust**

In relation to questions and answers, number 14 I think, it's a question and answer point that you have made in the past, rightly, in terms of our supplementaries, but you've also made the point in terms of answers and it feels to me that this is becoming like a speech or statement rather than an answer to the question which I've now actually forgotten.

**Comment by
the Lord
Provost**

As you will be aware having read Standing Order 14, it is very specific that the question should be related to clarification, the only restriction there is in terms of an answer is time. The total time to ask the question and answer is limited to five minutes of which there are still approximately 45 seconds left.

**Councillor
Macinnes**

I wonder if that 45 seconds has been caused by the intervention, I hope not, I'll speak very quickly.

If we had gone down the alternative business model route we would have been in a much worse position than we are at the moment. Under those proposed arrangements we have seen our private sector partners allowed to have a running rate of approximately 57,000 complaints in the 2018-19 period. That's in marked contrast to the position that we're in at the moment. In the first year the contractor allowed more than three times the amount of complaints that they deemed justified - in other words removing what they deem all unjustified requests. We on the other hand are running at a much much lower level than that. This year to date had 29,000 missed bin requests, a figure much lower than that allowed under the ABM and much lower than we've seen in previous years.

So to round off, and I will round off, it's clear that some residents have been negatively affected on a temporary basis as we meet this complex and wide set of changes across our entire city, for that I apologise. Officers are working extremely hard to rectify the situation and it would appear are making significant inroads in doing so, thank you.

Domestic Missed and Full Bin Service Requests for the 2 weeks
08/10/18 to 21/10/18

Bin Type	08/10/2018 - 14/10/2018	15/10/2018 - 21/10/2018	Grand Total
Bin Room / Cham	14	20	34
Communal	133	133	266
Food Communal	17	23	40
Food Individual	188	248	436
Garden Individual	182	449	631
Glass	7	35	42
Packaging / DMR	146	156	302
Paper Bank	25	31	56
Rec Ind Green Bin	204	725	929
Recy Ind Blue Box	69	129	198
Recy Ind Red Box	5	21	26
Residual Ind.	439	559	998
Residual Sacks - Black Sacks	1	2	3
Residual Sacks - Gull Proof Sacks	3	7	10
Side Loading Bin	37	21	58
Grand Total	1,470	2,559	4,029

Domestic Missed and Full Bin Service Requests by month January – September from 2015 – 2018

	2018	2017	2016	2015
January	4,728	6,258	8,383	4,120
February	1,955	3,336	5,289	2,706
March	3,402	3,422	3,715	2,428
April	2,680	2,934	3,466	2,860
May	3,292	3,063	4,016	2,491
June	3,003	3,272	3,988	5,027
July	3,582	4,270	3,755	3,896
August	3,202	3,124	4,857	3,485
September	3,092	3,111	4,292	3,681
Total	28,936	32,790	41,761	30,694

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 October 2018**

The Hawes Pier at Queensferry is used for the landing of tenders from cruise liners visiting Edinburgh and as such the infrastructure there is critical to the city's growing cruise liner business and the revenue this brings.

Can the Convener please confirm;

Question (1) When the channel and harbour around the Pier were last dredged?

Answer (1) The City of Edinburgh Council undertook substantial improvement works on the structure of Hawes Pier in 2011/12. This included dredging works.

Question (2) When dredging is next due to be carried out?

Answer (2) There are no current plans for dredging at Hawes Pier. Initial discussions have, however, been held on the possibility of dredging in the near future and a feasibility study will be undertaken to establish the exact scope of the works and the funding required.

Question (3) If she is aware that Pier users believe that the channel to the Pier could become unnavigable within 2 years if dredging is not carried out?

Answer (3) I am aware that Pier users requested dredging; however detailed investigations would be required to determine if the channel would become unnavigable. Bathymetric (underwater contour) surveys are carried out every 2/3 years and the most recent study has not identified this issue (still to be checked).

Question (4) If she is aware that the consequences of (3) above would be a loss of all cruise liner business and its associated revenue to the City of Edinburgh Council?

Answer (4) The Bathymetric survey reports have been sent to shipping agents and no concerns have been raised to date.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, after that last response I'm a bit wary asking a supplementary, I certainly wouldn't want Councillor Work's school lunch getting cold.

Thank you Convener for your answer and I just like to ask if you would like to join Councillor Work and I at the next meeting of the Hawes/Longcraig Piers Users Committee to discuss some of the issues raised, there will be biscuits.

**Supplementary
Answer**

The biscuits if you add in some chocolate will do it, but obviously it will be dependent on diaries, but yes I would be happy to.

QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 October 2018**

Question **(1)** Please confirm all costs (to date or anticipated) associated with implementation of the new charging system for garden waste collection, including:

- a) postage;
- b) production of stickers;
- c) advertising/promotion;
- d) registration;
- e) collection/removal of brown bins from nonparticipants;
- f) any other known costs.

Answer **(1)** a) postage;

The cost of postage to date (including printing and fulfilment) has been £90,205.

- b) production of stickers; £3,555
- c) advertising/promotion; £18,286
- d) registration; The registration system is part of a wider project and it is not possible to calculate the cost of setting up this part of the system.
- e) collection/removal of brown bins from non-participants; This will be dependent on the number of residents who do not register for the new collection service and do not wish to keep their brown bin.
- f) any other known costs;

Costs in the region of £18,000 have been incurred to date.

Question (2) What additional staffing resource has been put in place by the Council and are any appointments permanent or temporary?

Answer (2) Four additional call centre agents have been brought in for the duration of the registration period. An additional six call centre agents are currently employed on a temporary basis to help manage the transition to the new household waste collection schedules as opposed to the Garden Waste collection charges. A permanent Technical Officer position has been recruited to focus on the creation and maintenance of garden waste routes.

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 October 2018**

Question (1) How many agency staff are being employed by the Council between 4pm and midnight in respect of waste collection?

Answer (1) There are nine agency staff who have been retained by the Waste and Cleansing service as a contingency to support the first four weeks of the new kerbside waste collection routes.

Question (2) For how long is this arrangement anticipated to last?

Answer (2) The requirement for these staff is anticipated to last until 4 November 2018 at the latest.

Question (3) What is the cost to the Council?

Answer (3) £11,292

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Bridgman for answer
by the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 25 October
2018**

Question (1) Can the Convener please provide details of why the Management Committee of the Community Wing at Craigmount High School have now been told that they cannot have a lease for their accommodation, when they had previously been told that they must take on a lease and they have been putting some effort into getting themselves in a position to be able to do so?

Answer (1) Discussions took place this year involving Lifelong Learning Council Officers and the Management Committee (MC) about the possibility of a lease: this does not exist at present and the MC office bearers are vulnerable in having unprotected legal liability.

The following factors influenced the decision not to proceed:

- The Council is looking to review all existing leasing arrangements with Management Committees citywide.
- The Craigmount Wing is unique, being the only School Community Wing with a Management Committee.
- Indications from the Management Committee in discussions were that they would struggle in terms of their capacity to take on a lease.

Lifelong Learning Officers met with the MC office bearers on 1st October 2018 to communicate the decision and to discuss next steps. Officers stressed that they wish to collaborate with the MC in shaping the Community Wing programme and promised to continue with free or low cost lets for MC generated activity until March 2019, pending the development of a new management model for the Wing.

While this will take time to work out with the school, Lifelong Learning and the MC itself, initial indications are that the MC is mostly reassured by the decision on the lease and by the approach being adopted. As agreed with the MC Chair, Lifelong Learning Officers will meet the MC and its members once the working model has been further defined with the School.

We appreciate that this is a significant change for the MC and want to work closely with them in order to develop a governance model for the wing which incorporates MC input to ideas and programming, as a long established and committed community organisation.

Question (2) The Community Wing at Craigmount is quite unusual in the respect that the accommodation they are in is part of the school building, rather than a separate unit on the school grounds. With this in mind, can the Convener categorically state that his department's current activity regarding the Community Wing will not result in the Community Wing ceasing to exist, their valuable work stopped and the space that they use handed over to the high school for use as classrooms etc?

Answer (2) Our most recent school roll projections were published last December. You can view them here:

http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20256/school_places/1551/school_roll_projections.

Craigmount High School is projected to face accommodation pressures from 2023 – partly due to the significant new housing developments that are planned for within its catchment area e.g. the Maybury housing site which is expected to deliver approx. 1700 new homes over the next 10 years.

The Council recently carried out an [informal consultation](#) to consider establishing a new secondary school in West Edinburgh as a way of alleviating the accommodation pressures on the local high schools. This will be considered further as part of the Council's next Local Development Plan.

In this context it is difficult to categorically state that the department's activity will not result in the Community Wing ceasing to exist. However, the view from both the present School Management and from Lifelong Learning management is that with some creative thinking, the wing has the potential to become a great community and school resource.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener for your answers. Just for quick clarification, the Management Committee were informed on 14 September that they could have a lease and within two weeks there was a complete turnaround and this offer was withdrawn. Having spoken to the Management Committee last night, I can assure you that the affected groups in themselves do not feel at all reassured about what's happening, but getting to my supplementary and it relates to the first part of my question, as the Management Committee has been successfully running the Community Wing since 2002, and over the last five years there has been very little involvement from the school within the wing, why is the working model being defined by the officers and the school and not the officers and the Management Committee, and I look forward to your five minute response.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you very much for that supplementary, I can't answer your question just now but what I will do is agree to meet with you and to discuss this further.

QUESTION NO 16

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 25 October 2018**

Question

Given that many households may still have the old red recycling boxes, can the Convener confirm that householders are now welcome to use red or blue boxes for glass recycling?

Answer

Householders can use either red or blue boxes for the collection of glass, small electrical items and textiles.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for her answer and I just have a supplementary for clarification. I wonder if the Convener could just indicate how she would plan to communicate this information, because I'm not sure if it's widely known in the community that either bin could be used.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary Councillor Campbell. In fact everybody who had red and blue services were actually written to at the end of September, so they've already received that information.

QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 25 October
2018**

Question (1) What is the education spend per pupil at James Gillespie's High School (JGHS)?

Answer (1) £4,033/pupil, this figure excludes utilities, facilities management and rates.

Question (2) What is the number and proportion of students at JGHS who are Gaelic Medium Education (GME) students?

Answer (2) There are 107 GME Students representing 8.5% of students.

Apart from the Gaelic language, no subject is presented in the medium of Gaelic at SQA level. There are a small number of syllabus inserts with Broad General Education.

In 2018, 14 students presented for Higher Gaelic language.

Question (3) What is the number and proportion of teachers at JGHS who teach in GME?

Answer (3) There are approximately 5 teachers, including the Head Teacher, who are able to teach in the medium of Gaelic representing 4.09 FTE teachers.

Question (4) What proportion of their lessons do each of the GME teachers at JGHS teach in a) Gaelic, and b) English?

Answer

- (4) With the exception of the syllabus inserts at BGE and Higher Gaelic teaching in the school is in the medium of English. In addition to this Gaelic culture is also celebrated through music arts and other cultural pursuits. The teacher proportion is as follows:

Teacher A = 100% GME, 0% English

Teacher B = 33% GME, 67% English *

Teacher C = 6.7% GME, 93.3% English *

Teacher D = 100% GME, 0% English

Teacher E = 100% GME, 0% English

*Classes are not exclusively GME Students, but may be taught bi-lingually.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for his answer. Please could he clarify when he says in his answer that there are five teachers teaching Gaelic Medium Education at James Gillespie's, what proportion of the teaching staff is this, and of the five teaching posts how many of them are externally funded, and finally how many teachers are employed in Gaelic specific teaching posts?

Supplementary Answer

Right, thank you very much for your supplementary and you kindly sent it to me earlier, so I've actually got an answer for you which is, to the first question is 6%, to the second question it's 1.5% and 3 teachers.

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Vice-Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 October 2018

Question

What funding has the Council received from the Scottish Government in each of the last three years for the promotion of Gaelic, and what has it been spent on?

Answer

In terms of the ring-fenced funding, the following sums have been provided in each of the last three years:

2016/17 - £0.300m;

2017/18 - £0.330m; and

2018/19 - £0.305m.

The precise allocations depend on both (i) the overall available funding quantum and (ii) Edinburgh's share of Scotland-wide pupils educated in the Gaelic medium as recorded in the Pupil Census.

The funds have been spent on staffing and resources.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Gaelic Champion for her answer to my question on what the Council has spent the Gaelic funding that we receive from the Scottish Government on. However, the one line answer that has been spent on "staffing and resources" is to put it mildly less than illuminating. Will she provide further detail on what our Gaelic funding is spent on and specifically when will the Council's Gaelic Development Officer who retired earlier this year be replaced?

Supplementary Answer

I thank Councillor Booth for his supplementary. Absolutely Councillor Booth I will send the breakdown to you which is more than was obvious in that answer and that will be with you shortly. In regard to the Gaelic Development Officer, you'll know the long term strategic plan that was recently passed referred to the Quality Improvement Manager that

will be in place, but it also referenced a strategic Gaelic Development Officer that was dependent on funding. We're currently exploring that with Bòrd na Gàidhlig funding that's been suggested and the Scottish Government have also been in touch to offer funding for this, so we will report back to that into the next GIG meeting.

**Comments by
the Lord
Provost**

Can I just ask that that additional information is circulated to all elected members not just Councillor Booth please.

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 October 2018

Question (1) Please list by month the number of requests received since 1 November 2017 to clear leaves from footpaths and cycle paths and in each month listing the requests received by phone; email; web; twitter; in person, and by letter.

Answer

(1)

Month	Service Requests for Footway and Cycleway Leaves Removal
November 2017	115
December 2017	71
January 2018	43
February 2018	22
March 2018	4
April 2018	6
May 2018	6
June 2018	15
July 2018	10
August 2018	2
September 2018	7
October (part month)	9
Total	310

Question (2) Please list the dates since 1 November 2017 when large mechanical sweepers have swept the off-road cycle paths, including but not limited to the Roseburn, Warriston, Water of Leith and Ferry Road paths.

- Answer** (2) There is currently no recording of mechanical sweeping of cycleways. However due to the design of our cycleways many of them are inaccessible to large mechanical sweepers.
- Question** (3) Please provide the URL on the council's website where concerns with
- a) footpaths
 - b) off-road cyclepaths
- can be reported
- Answer** (3) All concerns can be recorded on the web page - https://my.edinburgh.gov.uk/app/report_it_forms/litter
- Question** (4) What action has been taken since 1 November 2017 to implement a proactive approach to the sweeping of leaves from footpaths and cyclepaths?
- Answer** (4) Leaves are removed as part of regular street cleaning activities annually from September through to January. The Council operates nine larger mechanical sweepers that can lift significant loads from streets. These are supplemented by nine smaller pedestrian sweepers which can remove leaves from pavements and cycle paths.
- Areas are targeted based on local knowledge, site inspections and through service requests and enquiries and include areas of high footfall, cycle paths, and proximity to sheltered accommodation. This prioritised approach has led to a reduction in service requests from 452 down to 310 for the same period last year.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her reply to my annual question about the clearing of leaves from foot and cycle paths and I'd like to thank Council officers who worked so hard to clear our paths of leaves to ensure that they are safe and accessible for all pedestrians and cyclists.

In her reply there does appear to be a slight contradiction and I'd be grateful if she could clarify, part of the answer says that leaves are removed as part of regular street cleaning activities annually from September through to January but another part of the reply says there is currently no recording of mechanical sweeping of cycle ways. Could she clarify which of those is correct and will she also commit to ensure that there is regular mechanical sweeping of the wider paths including the north Edinburgh path network as has happened in previous years.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Booth, sorry, I actually missed the second part of your supplementary, my apologies, could I ask you to repeat it?

**Councillor
Booth**

Will you commit to ensure that the wider paths which are suitable for mechanical clearing will be mechanically cleared as has happened in previous years?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you very much for the clarification on it. Yes is the answer to that. I will work with officers to ensure that where possible we will use them as shown in the answer here there are some paths that are not suitable for the larger ones. I think though your confusion on the first part really is saying there's no recording of mechanical sweeping but of course street-cleaning covers more than just mechanical sweeping of cycle ways and I suspect that that's where that anomaly appears. If we need to get further clarification on it I'll do so after this Council and come back to you on it, thank you.