# Minutes Item No 4.2

# The City of Edinburgh Council

## Edinburgh, Thursday 7 February 2019

**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
Mary Campbell
Maureen M Child
Nick Cook
Gavin Corbett
Cammy Day
Alison Dickie
Denis C Dixon
Phil Doggart
Karen Doran
Scott Douglas
Catherine Fullerton
Neil Gardiner
Gillian Gloyer
George Gordon
Ashley Graczyk
Joan Griffiths
Ricky Henderson
Derek Howie
David Key
Callum Laidlaw
Kevin Lang
Lesley Macinnes
Melanie Main
John McLellan
Amy McNeese-Mechan
Adam McVey
Claire Miller
Max Mitchell
Joanna Mowat
Gordon J Munro
Hal Osler
Ian Perry
Susan Rae
Alasdair Rankin
Lewis Ritchie
Cameron Rose
Neil Ross
Jason Rust
Stephanie Smith
Alex Staniforth
Mandy Watt
Susan Webber
Iain Whyte
Donald Wilson
Norman J Work
Louise Young

## 1 Edinburgh Transient Visitor Levy Consultation 2018

### a) Deputation from the Edinburgh Trade Union Council

The deputation indicated that they were in favour of the introduction of a tourist tax which was based on european examples and had been campaigning for the introduction of a tax for a number of years.

The Trade Union Council had submitted a response during the consultation period and felt that this should have been mentioned in the report as their views differed to those of the industry representatives who represented the employers and not the workforce.

The deputation felt that Trade Unions should be represented on the Implementation/Stakeholder Group as they would be able to contribute constructively. They were also concerned at the level at which the levy was to be set.

### b) Report by the Chief Executive

Details were provided on the findings from a consultation which had been carried out from 15 October to 10 December 2018 on the Edinburgh Transient Visitor Levy together with a copy of the evidence submitted to the Scottish Government's national conversation on the tourist tax which had closed on 25 January 2019.

**Motion**

1) To note the findings of the summary report on the Edinburgh Transient Visitor Levy Consultation.

2) To note the written evidence submitted to the Scottish Government National Conversation on a Tourist Tax.

3) To agree the amended Edinburgh TVL proposal, detailed in Paragraph 3.7 of the report by the Chief Executive.

4) To agree that, on the condition that the Scottish Government gives the City of Edinburgh the powers to raise revenues through a Transient Visitor Levy, the Council would take the next steps as detailed in the report.

5) To agree that the Leader and Deputy Leader formally write to the Scottish Government to share the Council's proposal for an Edinburgh scheme and the agreed ways of working to implement the Edinburgh TVL and to inform any ongoing consideration of this issue.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

**Amendment 1**

To delete 3) to 5) of the motion and replace with:

3) To note the significant U-turn by the Scottish Government as part of its tax raising budget agreement with the Green Party where it has indicated it will legislate to allow Councils to consider the implementation of a Transient Visitor levy but that the nature and scope of this proposed legislation remains unclear;

4) To consider that the scheme set out in paragraph 3.6 of the report by the Chief Executive remained deficient as it failed to:

- ensure that any revenues raised through a Transient Visitor Levy are additional and exempt from the calculation of local government block grants;
- detail how any new funding would replace current Council spend on tourist related matters such as spend on festivals and events, city dressing, additional cleaning and maintenance of the City centre public realm, policing, public transport and City and tourism promotion, thus failing to assure citizens that any funds raised would relieve mainstream Council budgets of these responsibilities and allow expansion of mainstream budgets;
- detail how any additional revenue over and above replacement funding might actually be spent;
- detail the administrative costs and burdens on the Council of implementing and ensuring compliance with any scheme, specifically in relation to each of the sectors involved;
- ensure full involvement of the tourism and other business sectors in determining how the proceeds might be used (for example through an empowered and independent Trust rather than an advisory “stakeholder group”);
- guarantee that the full cost of collection is met from proceeds and not borne by the accommodation provider both initially and in the longer term.

5) To agree that the Council hold decision making in abeyance on the introduction of a Transient Visitor Levy until a report was provided by the Chief Executive addressing the issues raised at 4) above AND until the nature and scope of legislation on the power in the Scottish Parliament became clear.

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Webber

**Amendment 2**

To add to the motion:

6) To further agree that the Leader and Deputy Leader would seek assurance from the Scottish Government that enabling legislation would be brought forward as a matter of priority with a view to the powers commencing as soon as was practicable; and seeking clarity on the principle highlighted in Paragraph 3.5.10 in the report that all income from a TVL would be treated as wholly additional to other forms of revenue support.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Lang

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) | - | 43 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 15 votes |

(For the Motion (as adusted): Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, 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, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.)

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

1) To note the findings of the summary report on the Edinburgh Transient Visitor Levy Consultation.

2) To note the written evidence submitted to the Scottish Government National Conversation on a Tourist Tax.

3) To agree the amended Edinburgh TVL proposal, detailed in Paragraph 3.7 of the report by the Chief Executive.

4) To agree that, on the condition that the Scottish Government gives the City of Edinburgh the powers to raise revenues through a Transient Visitor Levy, the Council would take the next steps as detailed in the report.

5) To agree that the Leader and Deputy Leader formally write to Scottish Government to share the Council proposal for an Edinburgh scheme and the agreed ways of working to implement the Edinburgh TVL and to inform any ongoing consideration of this issue.

6) To further agree that the Leader and Deputy Leader would seek assurance from the Scottish Government that enabling legislation would be brought forward as a matter of priority with a view to the powers commencing as soon as was practicable; and seeking clarity on the principle highlighted in Paragraph 3.5.10 in the report that all income from a TVL would be treated as wholly additional to other forms of revenue support.

(Reference: report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

## 2 Chair

**Decision**

The Lord Provost left the meeting during consideration of the foregoing item, and the Depute Convener assumed the chair.

## 3 Menstrual Conditions - Motion by Councillor Mary Campbell

**a) Deputation from Dionne McFarlane**

The deputation outlined the effect that having endemetriosis had on the ability to function on a day to day basis. She asked that more information be made available and discussion take place within schools to highlight the various menstrual conditions which can arise together with guidance notes for staff and where to find appropriate assistance to help with these conditions.

The deputation indicated that it was important to reach out to all sufferers and stressed that getting support was extremely important. She asked the Council to review the information available to GPs on menstrual conditions and to look into improving and developing resources in order to provide the best possible care for women in Ediburgh.

**b) Motion by Councillor Mary Campbell**

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

"Council commends the work of Dionne McFarlane, and her campaign to implement better menstrual education and endometriosis awareness in schools.

Council Notes:

That there are many people in Edinburgh who will be suffering from a variety of menstrual conditions.

That an estimated 3-8% of menstruators have Premenstrual dysphoric disorder (PMDD), which causes severe irritability, depression, or anxiety in the weeks before a period. An estimated 15% of people with this condition will commit suicide.

That around 10% of menstruators have Endometriosis, where the tissue that lines the womb is found outside the womb, such as in the ovaries and fallopian tubes, causing severe pain and can lead to difficulties getting pregnant. It is believed to take 7.5 years to get a diagnosis for the condition.

That there are many other serious conditions that affect menstruators, including abnormal uterine bleeding, dysmenorrhea, amenorrhea and menorrhagia, and that awareness of these conditions is generally very low, which can lead to people being undiagnosed for years and unable to get effective treatment and support.

Therefore Council:

1) Asks that the current review of guidance and resources for Living and Growing will include information on rarer menstrual conditions.

2) Requests that posters be designed with basic information on menstrual conditions like PMDD and Endometriosis for display in appropriate places in schools.

3) Requests a guidance note for all school staff about menstrual conditions and how they can support young people within education who have these conditions, which can often lead to time away from school.

4) Requests the Council Leader write to the Cabinet Secretary for Education and Skills to request that consideration is given to including more menstrual conditions in the PSE curriculum.

5) Requests that the Council Leader writes to the IJB to ask that there is a review of the awareness and training for staff, and the level of support available for the public in rarer menstrual conditions across Edinburgh's Health and Social Care Partnership.

6) Requests the Council Leader write to the Cabinet Secretary for Health and Sport to request that consideration is given to increasing awareness and training in rarer menstrual conditions among doctors, especially GPs."

**Decision**

To approve motion by Councillor Mary Campbell.

## 4 Ensuring Venues Follow the Fair Fringe Charter - Motion by Councillor Staniforth

### a) Deputation from the Fair Fringe Campaign

The deputation were delighted that the Council had signed up to the Fair Fringe Campaign. They stressed that in some cases the charter and standards were disregarded, staff were exploited and overworked, while others had been hospitalised due to stress, dehydration and exhaustion.

They indicated that staff were often provided with sub-standard living accommodation with no food provided and no transports costs covered. Although improvements were being made, some venues were still ignoring Council advice.

The deputation expressed concern at the limited powers the Council had to enforce the guidelines and invited the Council to collaborate with the campaign to help create a fair fringe.

### b) Motion by Councillor Staniforth

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

"Council:

1) Notes that the council has accepted the principles of the Fair Fringe Charter.

2) Notes the Fair Fringe's damning report of C Venues' apparent disregard for the Fair Fringe Charter.

3) Believes it should do everything it can to ensure venues engage in the good employment practices of the Fair Fringe Charter and the Festival Workers Welfare Commitment.

4) Therefore calls for a briefing to be sent to all members within two cycles detailing what enforcement practice the council could engage in to ensure good workers' welfare at the Fringe. This should include, but not be limited to, potential measures to avoid letting council premises to venues which fail to abide by the Fair Fringe Charter and potential measures to enforce good employment practice via licensing."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

**Amendment 1**

Council:

Accepts points 1 and 2 of the motion, replaces points 3 and 4 and adds point 5 as follows:

3) To note that Council developed its own Edinburgh Festivals Workers' Welfare Commitment, endorsed by Council on 31 May 2018. The Commitment promotes certainty for staff around work breaks, contracted hours, tips and trial shifts. It reminds employers of their legal responsibility to prevent harassment and discrimination.

4) To recognise that Council fulfils the terms of the Edinburgh Festivals Workers' Welfare Commitment in all its venues and continues to encourage others to follow the example set by the Council.

5) To note that licensing was a part of the Council which was strictly bound by legislation and the legislation which allowed the Council or the Licensing Sub-Committee to refuse to grant a licence had very specific grounds for refusal. Officers would report to the Culture and Communities Committee in two cycles, setting out the Council's powers and options in regard to the enforcement of the Edinburgh Festival Workers Welfare Commitment – including any potential to restrict lets to organisations that did not comply.

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

**Amendment 2**

To add to the motion:

To make plain a zero tolerance for any employer that break National Minimum or National Living Wage Regulations, including the accommodation offset provisions. Council recognises the importance of employees and employers understanding these regulations and urges workers at the fringe to report any potential breaches to the HMRC without delay.

- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Mowat

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Staniforth:

1) To note that the council had accepted the principles of the Fair Fringe Charter.

2) To note the Fair Fringe's damning report of C Venues' apparent disregard for the Fair Fringe Charter.

3) To note that Council developed its own Edinburgh Festivals Workers' Welfare Commitment, endorsed by Council on 31 May 2018. The Commitment promotes certainty for staff around work breaks, contracted hours, tips and trial shifts. It reminds employers of their legal responsibility to prevent harassment and discrimination.

4) To recognise that Council fulfils the terms of the Edinburgh Festivals Workers' Welfare Commitment in all its venues and continues to encourage others to follow the example set by the Council.

5) To note that licensing was a part of the Council which was strictly bound by legislation and the legislation which allowed the Council or the licensing sub committee to refuse to grant a licence had very specific grounds for refusal. Officers would report to the Culture and Communities Committee in two cycles, setting out the Council's powers and options in regard to the enforcement of the Edinburgh Festival Workers Welfare Commitment – including any potential to restrict lets to organisations that did not comply.

6) To make plain a zero tolerance for any employer that break National Minimum or National Living Wage Regulations, including the accommodation offset provisions. Council recognises the importance of employees and employers

understanding these regulations and urges workers at the fringe to report any potential breaches to the HMRC without delay.

**Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Mitchell declared a financial interest in the above item as an employee of a fringe venue.

## 5 Climate Emergency 2030 – Motion by Councillor Burgess

### a) Deputation from Divest Scotland

The deputation indicated that urgent and radical action was needed to prevent climate breakdown and urged the Council to take steps to cut off funding for fossil fuel industries.

The deputation outlined its three main demands and aked the Council to declare a climate emergency now, tell the truth and act as if the truth is real.

### b) Motion by Councillor Burgess

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

"Council;

1) Notes the recent United Nations IPCC report advising that climate-changing pollution must be very significantly reduced over the next 11 years to 2030, in order to prevent global average temperatures increasing beyond 1.5 degrees C and to reduce irreversible, catastrophic impacts of climate change;

2) Notes that other local authorities, including Bristol, Scarborough and the London Assembly, have responded to the UN report by declaring a Climate Emergency and setting targets and action plans in-line with the reduction of climate-changing pollution necessary;

3) Notes the draft Climate Bill going through the Scottish Parliament that will require local authorities to act in accordance with increased targets for reducing climate-changing pollution by at least 90% by 2050 and also the pressure to increase this target to zero carbon by 2050;

4) Further notes the first conclusion from the recent Sustainability Audit by of Professor Andy Kerr of the ECCI that:

'The City of Edinburgh Council has an unprecedented opportunity to set Edinburgh on a course that will deliver rapid improvements in social and

economic wellbeing for its citizens, as well as meeting stretching climate and environmental targets. This would put Edinburgh at the forefront of global cities'.

5) Therefore calls for a report to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee, within one cycle, on a Climate Emergency 2030 target for Edinburgh in-line with the latest UN IPCC advice on remaining within a global average temperature rise of 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial levels, including a detailed assessment of annual emissions from 1990 to date, interim targets consistent with the 1.5 degree limit, and an action plan setting out how this can be achieved."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Booth

**Amendment**

To accept points 1) – 4) of the motion by Councillor Burgess, delete paragraph 5) and replace with;

"Therefore calls Council to address these concerns within the Council's response to Professor Kerr's Audit due for consideration at the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee in May. This report should include a climate Emergency 2030 target in line with the latest UN IPCC advice on remaining within a global average temperature rise of 1.5 degress C above pre-industrial levels, an assessment of emissions from the 1990s to date and an action plan setting how this, and further ambitions, can be achieved. The issues raised by the Divest Scotland deputation will also be addressed in this report, or a separate report to the Pensions Committee, as appropriate."

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

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 Burgess:

Council;

1) Notes the recent United Nations IPCC report advising that climate-changing pollution must be very significantly reduced over the next 11 years to 2030, in order to prevent global average temperatures increasing beyond 1.5 degrees C and to reduce irreversible, catastrophic impacts of climate change;

2) Notes that other local authorities, including Bristol, Scarborough and the London Assembly, have responded to the UN report by declaring a Climate Emergency and setting targets and action plans in-line with the reduction of climate-changing pollution necessary;

3) Notes the draft Climate Bill going through the Scottish Parliament that will require local authorities to act in accordance with increased targets for reducing climate-changing pollution by at least 90% by 2050 and also the pressure to increase this target to zero carbon by 2050;

4) Further notes the first conclusion from the recent Sustainability Audit by of Professor Andy Kerr of the ECCI that:

'The City of Edinburgh Council has an unprecedented opportunity to set Edinburgh on a course that will deliver rapid improvements in social and economic wellbeing for its citizens, as well as meeting stretching climate and environmental targets. This would put Edinburgh at the forefront of global cities'.

5) Therefore calls Council to address these concerns within the Council's response to Professor Kerr's Audit due for consideration at the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee in May. This report should include a climate Emergency 2030 target in line with the latest UN IPCC advice on remaining within a global average temperature rise of 1.5 degress C above pre-industrial levels, an assessment of emissions from the 1990s to date and an action plan setting how this, and further ambitions, can be achieved. The issues raised by the Divest Scotland deputation will also be addressed in this report, or a separate report to the Pensions Committee, as appropriate.

## 6 Minutes

**Decision**

To approve the minute of the Council of 13 December 2018 as a correct record.

## 7 Questions

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

## 8 Chair

**Decision**

At this point in the proceedings the Lord Provost resumed the Chair.

## 9 Leader's Report

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

- Waste Collection Complaints
- Health and Social Care
- Delivery of Key Policies
- Unveiling of Mortonhall memorial statue
- Budget engagement
- Discretionary taxation

The following questions/comments were made:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Councillor Whyte | - | Edinburgh's economy – public sector workers parking levy |
| Councillor Booth | - | Workplace parking levy |
| Councillor Aldridge | - | Workplace parking levy |
| Councillor Day | - | Frank Donoghue – welcome back |
| | - | Scottish Government funding settlement |
| Councillor Work | - | Former Mayor of Contalmaison - condolences |
| | - | Muirhouse High Rise Flats |
| Councillor Rose | - | Disregard of rule of law |
| Councillor Rae | - | Housing shortage within Edinburgh |
| Councillor Lang | - | Muirhouse area housing – McGill Contactors - administration |
| Councillor Munro | - | Scottish Finance Minister meeting - case for Edinburgh |
| Councillor McNeese-Mechan | - | Success of winter festivals |
| Councillor McLellan | - | Transient Visitor Levy– Marketing Edinburgh |
| Councillor Smith | - | EICC – Economic Impact on Edinburgh |
| Councillor Miller | - | Lothian Buses – George Street |
| Councillor Laidlaw | - | Proposed workplace parking levy |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Councillor Key | - | Welcome report on Housing First |
| Councillor Cook | - | Workplace parking levy |
| Councillor Arthur | - | Former Councillor Donaldson |
| | - | Proposed workplace parking levy |

## 10 Resignation of Councillors/Appointments

Details were provided on the arrangements necessary for the resulting by-election for Ward 12, Leith Walk, following the resignation of Councillor Marion Donaldson as a councillor of the City of Edinburgh Council.

**Decision**

1) To note that arrangements would now be put in place for a by-election for the vacancy in Leith Walk ward (no 12), with polling on 11 April 2019.

2) To note that officers working on preparations for the by-election, the poll itself, postal vote processing and the count would require to be released from normal duties.

3) To authorise the Chief Executive to make any revisions to polling arrangements, including polling places, as might be required, in consultation with the remaining Leith Walk elected members.

4) To agree:

- the appointment of Councillor Munro to the vacancy on the Committee on the Jean F Watson Bequest.
- the appointment of Councillor Arthur to the vacancy on the board of Spartans Community Football Academy.

5) To appoint to the Labour Group vacancy on the Finance and Resources Committee at the March Council meeting, at which time the Committee's Vice-Convener wouild also be appointed. Meantime, to note that Councillor Maureen Child would serve as a substitute member on the committee.

(Reference - report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

## 11 Appointment to Outside Organisations/Joint Boards

The Council had agreed its political management arrangements and made appontments to a range of outside organisations. A number of Councillors had

resigned from their positons on various organisations and the Council was required to appoint members in their place.

**Decision**

1) To appoint Councillor Gordon in place of Councillor Ian Campbell on the Board of NHS Lothian.

2) To appoint Councillor Gordon in place of Councillor Ian Campbell on the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board.

3) To appoint Councillor McNeese-Mechan in place of Councillor Ian Campbell on the COSLA Community Wellbeing Policy Board.

4) To appoint Councillor Staniforth in place of Councillor Ian Campbell on the board of the Edinburgh International Science Festival Limited (Trading Company).

5) To appoint Councillor McNeese-Mechan in place of Councillor Ian Campbell as a member of the Edinburgh Partnership – Community Planning Partnerships – Community Safety.

6) To appoint Councillor Howie in place of Councillor Ian Campbell on Life Care (Edinburgh) Ltd as an observer.

7) To appoint Councillor Gordon in place of Councillor Kate Campbell as member and Chair of the Edinburgh International Conference Centre Board.

8) To appoint the Lord Provost to replace Councillor Kate Campbell as a member of the Capital City Partnership.

(References – Act of Council No 10 of 18 May 2017; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

## 12 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 Church of Scotland 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 Dr Rita Welsh as the Church of Scotland 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 Church of Scotland of Mrs Fiona Beveridge and to formally appoint her to the Education, Children and Families Committee.

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

## 13 Council Diary 2019/20

The draft Council diary for 2019-2020 was presented together with proposed dates for recess periods and Council meetings from August 2020 to August 2021.

**Motion**

1) To approve the Council diary for August 2019 to August 2020 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.

2) To authorise the Chief Executive to make minor adjustments to the Council diary as necessary.

3) To agree the recess and Council meeting dates for August 2020 to August 2021 as set out in Appendix 2 to the report by the Chief Executive.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

**Amendment 1**

At the end of recommendations insert:

To agree to explore options that would allow council recess periods to mirror the school calendar, reporting back to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee within two cycles.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Booth.

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

**Amendment 2**

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey as originally proposed.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Lang

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the Motion (as adjusted) | - | 35 votes |
| For Amendment 2 (the motion as originally proposed) | - | 22 votes |

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

For Amendment 2 (the motion as originally proposed): Councillors Aldridge, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Ritchie, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

1) To approve the Council diary for August 2019 to August 2020 as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.

2) To authorise the Chief Executive to make minor adjustments to the Council diary as necessary.

3) To agree the recess and Council meeting dates for August 2020 to August 2021 as set out in Appendix 2 to the report by the Chief Executive.

4) To agree to explore options that would realign the council recess periods so that they fell within the Local Authority school calendar, reporting back to Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee within two cycles.

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

## 14 Review of Locality Committees

The Council had agreed to a review of Locality committees taking place at the beginning of 2019. Details were provided on the results of the review together with options for the future of neighbourhood partnerships and proposed next steps.

**Motion**

1) To agree to implement option A in the report by the Chief Executive – to dissolve the Locality Committees on 1 April 2019 and to concentrate resources

on community engagement to the Edinburgh Partnership Community Planning Framework.

2) To formally dissolve Neighbourhood Partnerships from 1 April 2019 to allow for their successor Neighbourhood Networks.

3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to make any such changes to the Council's governance documentation to implement these changes.

4) To note that officer support to community planning and community councils was being reviewed to explore how community engagement with the Council's decisions could be better supported.

5) To note that Neighbourhood Partnerships had had notable success in promoting community influence in Council decision making, a key element being the delegation of powers such as the community grants fund and the Neighbourhood Environment Programme.

6) To note that a driving factor for the establishment of Locality Committees was to explore ways to increase local decision making.

7) To note that the neighbourhood networks were not Council committees and as a result Council powers could not be delegated directly to these groups.

8) Therefore, to ask that the Chief Executive reports to the Corporate, Policy and Strategy Committee within one cycle on how relevant powers could be delegated in such a way as to enable neighbourhood networks to significantly influence Council decision making.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

**Amendment 1**

1) To agree to implement option A in the report by the Chief Executive – to dissolve the Locality Committees on 1 April 2019 and to concentrate resources on community engagement to the Edinburgh Partnership Community Planning Framework.

2) To formally dissolve Neighbourhood Partnerships from 1 April 2019 to allow for their successor Neighbourhood Networks.

3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to make any such changes to the Council's governance documentation to implement these changes.

4) To note that officer support to community planning and community councils was being reviewed to explore how community engagement with the Council's decisions could be better supported.

5) To note the pressures on resources as a result of Locality Committees, and their ward sub-committees.

6) To acknowledge that there were further areas of improvement that could be made to the wider political management arrangements of the Council.

7) To recognise that scrutiny of Council services to drive service improvement was a key role for elected members and executive committees.

8) To request that the Chief Executive report to Council on a re-alignment of the political management arrangements which:

   a) Addressed the imbalances of workload between executive committees;

   b) Considered the use of working groups by committees;

   c) Addressed the lack of policy business at Council meetings;

   d) Created greater scope for scrutiny of key Council services by executive committees; and

   e) Should be capable of implementation by 1 August 2019.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

**Amendment 2**

To continue consideration of the Review for a maximum of three cycles for a further report to ensure that a fully worked through alternative governance structure could be implemented immediately on approval of any proposed change which would address both the need for democratic accountability of council services at local level and accountability of the council's input as partner to community planning structures, especially the Locality Improvement Plans.

The further report should include:

a) Clear proposals for the scrutiny of local services by elected members and the local community, statutory scrutiny of police and fire services by the council, scrutiny of the locality delivery of EIJB commissioned health and social care council services;

b) Clear proposals for decision making by local elected members informed by the local community in the distribution of local budgets, NEP and grants and other local funding;

c) The option of a full remit and structure for a strengthened role for Neighbourhood Networks with greater powers of scrutiny and influence over local budgets and including the option of reviewing the boundaries of

neighbourhood networks to ensure they make sense locally and support the efficient and effective conduct of business;

d) A process which would ensure that the Edinburgh Partnership would have a clear governance structure in place immediately on implementation of the recommendations of the Review for all relevant matters relating to the Edinburgh Partnership Community Planning Framework to ensure that the current work of neighbourhood partnerships could be transferred seamlessly.

- moved by Councillor Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Main

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

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the Motion (as adjusted) | - | 43 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 14 votes |

(For the Motion (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Laidlaw, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Rose, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Work.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Burgess, Corbett, Gloyer, Lang, Main, Miller, Osler, Rae, Ritchie, Neil Ross, Staniforth and Young.)

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

1) To agree to implement option A in the report by the Chief Executive – to dissolve the locality committees on 1 April 2019 and to concentrate resources on community engagement to the Edinburgh Partnership Community Planning Framework.

2) To formally dissolve Neighbourhood Partnerships from 1 April 2019 to allow for their successor Neighbourhood Networks.

3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to make any such changes to the Council's governance documentation to implement these changes.

4) To note that officer support to community planning and community councils was being reviewed to explore how community engagement with the Council's decisions could be better supported.

5) To note that Neighbourhood Partnerships had had notable success in promoting community influence in Council decision making, a key element being the delegation of powers such as the community grants fund and the Neighbourhood Environment Programme.

6) To note that a driving factor for the establishment of locality committees was to explore ways to increase local decision making.

7) To note that the neighbourhood networks were not Council committees and as a result Council powers could not be delegated directly to these groups.

8) Therefore, to ask that the Chief Executive reports to the Corporate, Policy and Strategy Committee within one cycle on how relevant powers could be delegated in such a way as to enable neighbourhood networks to significantly influence Council decision making.

9) To note the pressures on resources as a result of locality committees, and their ward sub-committees.

10) To acknowledge that there were further areas of improvement that could be made to the wider political management arrangements of the Council.

11) To recognise that scrutiny of Council services to drive service improvement was a key role for elected members and executive committees.

12) To request that the Chief Executive report to Council on a re-alignment of the political management arrangements which:

    a) Addressed the imbalances of workload between executive committees;

    b) Considered the use of working groups by committees;

    c) Addressed the lack of policy business at Council meetings;

    d) Created greater scope for scrutiny of key Council services by executive committees; and

    e) Should be capable of implementation by 1 August 2019.

(References – Act of Council No 4 of 22 November 2018; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

## 15 Planning Statutory Scheme of Delegation

The Council had agreed changes to the statutory scheme of delegation on planning applications to allow more delegated powers in respect of householder development and representations in support of local developments. The proposed changes had been approved by Scottish Ministers and were presented to Council for formal adoption.

**Motion**

1) To agree to adopt the amended Statutory Scheme of Delegation with immediate effect.

2) To agree to make the scheme available for inspection in accordance with the regulations and forward the link to the published version to Scottish Ministers.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

**Amendment 1**

1) To agree to adopt the amended Statutory Scheme of Delegation with immediate effect.

2) To agree to make the scheme available for inspection in accordance with the regulations and forward the link to the published version to Scottish Ministers.

3) Under Clause 16 of the Scheme of Delegation directs that an immediate review be started, to be completed and presented to the Planning Committee without delay, specifically to consider if objector and refusal numbers should be changed from 20 to 12 in clauses 9, 11 & 12 of the Scheme.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

**Amendment 2**

1) To note that since the draft scheme of delegation was discussed at Council on 23 August 2018, there has been some community concern expressed that the threshold of 20 objections on householder developments to be determined by officers may be too high.

2) To note that the decision at Council is either to adopt the previously approved scheme, or not to adopt it.

3) Therefore to agree not to adopt the proposed scheme, but rather to refer the matter to Planning Committee to consider whether the objection threshold for applications to be determined by officers is appropriate given previously

expressed community concerns, and to consider whether setting a lower threshold, such as 12 objections, would be more appropriate.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

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

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the motion (as adjusted) | - | 43 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 14 votes |

(For the Motion (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Laidlaw, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Rose, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Work.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Burgess, Corbett, Gloyer, Lang, Main, Miller, Osler, Rae, Rithie, Neil Ross, Staniforth and Young.)

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Gardiner:

1) To agree to adopt the amended Statutory Scheme of Delegation with immediate effect.

2) To agree to make the scheme available for inspection in accordance with the regulations and forward the link to the published version to Scottish Ministers.

3) Under Clause 16 of the Scheme of Delegation directs that an immediate review be started, to be completed and presented to the Planning Committee without delay, specifically to consider if objector and refusal numbers should be changed from 20 to 12 in clauses 9, 11 & 12 of the Scheme.

(References – Act of Council No 8 of 23 August 2018; report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## 16 Edinburgh Living LLPs – Acquisition of Homes – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the transfer of mid-market and market rent homes being constructed through the Housing Revenue

Account as part of the Council's mixed tenure housebuilding programme to Edinburgh Living on an annual basis to the Council for approval.

**Decision**

To approve the transfer of 222 homes to Edinburgh Living in 2019/20, with associated funding arrangements, all as set out in the report by the Executive Director of Place.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee 4 December 2018 (item 18); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

## 17 Care Inspectorate Progress Review Findings and Provision of Services for Older People – Motion by Councillor Doggart

Details were provided on the progress with implementation of the findings from the Care Inspectorate progress review that had been published on 4 December 2018.

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

"Council

1) Notes the publication on 4 December 2018 of the Care Inspectorate's progress review following a joint inspection into the provision of services for older people in the City of Edinburgh (originally published May 2017);

2) Is disappointed that the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership has been unable to "develop and deliver an overall programme of improvement";

3) Believes the failure to adopt a suitable strategic approach to an improvement plan has been detrimental to the care provision for older residents of Edinburgh;

4) Recognises the changes made in senior operational leadership to improve performance, even though the Inspectorate "found leadership weaknesses had continued following the inspection";

5) Has no confidence in the political leadership of Councillor Ricky Henderson to deliver the changes required to improve services."

**Motion**

1) To note the progress made to date by the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board and the Health and Social Care Partnership (the Partnership) to implement the recommendations made in the Care Inspectorate's progress review.

2) To note that the action plan in relation to the review report would come to the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board for approval following scrutiny by its Audit and Risk Committee.

- moved by Councillor Henderson, seconded by Councillor Ian Campbell

**Amendment 1**

Council

1) Notes the publication on 4 December 2018 of the Care Inspectorate's progress review following a joint inspection into the provision of services for older people in the City of Edinburgh (originally published May 2017);

2) Is disappointed that the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership has been unable to "develop and deliver an overall programme of improvement";

3) Believes the failure to adopt a suitable strategic approach to an improvement plan has been detrimental to the care provision for older residents of Edinburgh;

4) Recognises the changes made in senior operational leadership to improve performance, even though the Inspectorate "found leadership weaknesses had continued following the inspection";

5) Has no confidence in the political leadership of Councillor Ricky Henderson to deliver the changes required to improve services.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Whyte

**Amendment 2**

Delete all and insert,

Council notes:

1) The publication on 4th December 2018 of the Care Inspectorate's progress review conducted in June and July 2018, following a joint inspection by the Care Inspectorate and Healthcare Improvement Scotland of Services for Older People in the city of Edinburgh in 2016;

2) The appointment of a new Chief Officer and Operations Officer in May 2018;

3) The progress review findings that in the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership the pace of change had been slow, including an eight month delay in 2017 in beginning formal planning to address the original findings; that a strategic approach had not been taken to an improvement plan; and that there had not been enough progress in key strategic areas;

4) The review finding that, ‘The commitment of frontline staff and some managers had been a substantial strength at the time of the original inspection. This remained the case at the time of the review. Where we could see that improvements had been made these had been taken forward by front line staff and middle managers’;

5) The devasting effect that the failure to deliver the appropriate support when it is needed has, on the health and well-being of older people and their carers on a daily basis, and that in Edinburgh it is not uncommon for large numbers of older people to wait for lengthy periods to get the support they need;

Further notes;

6) The need for the EIJB and the Health and Social Care Partnership to develop strategic leadership and planning that will deliver suitable and timely care for Edinburgh’s older people;

7) The role and responsibility, including statutory duties, that the Council has in providing services commissioned by the EIJB for older people in Edinburgh, and the importance of scrutiny by members;

8) Therefore refers this report to the Corporate, Policy and Strategy Committee for discussion and scrutiny.

- moved by Councillor Main, seconded by Councillor Miller

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

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the Motion (as adjusted) | - | 35 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 21 votes |

(For the motion (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, 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, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Henderson:

Council notes:

1) The publication on 4th December 2018 of the Care Inspectorate's progress review conducted in June and July 2018, following a joint inspection by the Care Inspectorate and Healthcare Improvement Scotland of Services for Older People in the city of Edinburgh in 2016;

2) The appointment of a new Chief Officer and Operations Officer in May 2018;

3) The progress review findings that in the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership the pace of change had been slow, including an eight month delay in 2017 in beginning formal planning to address the original findings; that a strategic approach had not been taken to an improvement plan; and that there had not been enough progress in key strategic areas;

4) The review finding that, 'The commitment of frontline staff and some managers had been a substantial strength at the time of the original inspection. This remained the case at the time of the review. Where we could see that improvements had been made these had been taken forward by front line staff and middle managers.';

5) The devasting effect that the failure to deliver the appropriate support when it is needed has, on the health and well-being of older people and their carers on a daily basis, and that in Edinburgh it is not uncommon for large numbers of older people to wait for lengthy periods to get the support they need;

Further notes;

6) The need for the EIJB and the Health and Social Care Partnership to develop strategic leadership and planning that will deliver suitable and timely care for Edinburgh's older people;

7) The role and responsibility, including statutory duties, that the Council has in providing services commissioned by the EIJB for older people in Edinburgh, and the importance of scrutiny by members;

8) Therefore refers this report to the Corporate, Policy and Strategy Committee for discussion and scrutiny.

(Reference –report by the Chief Officer, Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership, submitted.)

## 18 Waste Collection Service Over the Festive Period 2018-19 – Motion by Councillor Corbett

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

"Council

1) Notes significant public concern regarding waste service collections over the festive period 2018-19 and the backlog since then.

2) Recognises the twin pressures of increased volumes during the festive period and ensuring staffing capacity at the same time.

3) Therefore calls for a report to the May 2019 Transport and Environment Committee:

- Reviewing key lessons from the festive period 2018-19
- Highlighting changes in volumes in each collection stream over that period
- Setting out recommendations for festive period 2019-20 and beyond
- Specifically, assessing options for dealing with christmas trees post festive period."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Corbett.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Burgess

**Amendment**

Replace 1) in the motion by Councillor Corbett with

Notes significant public concern regarding waste service collections over the festive period 2018-19, the backlog which arose, and how these issues came on top of the problems which followed the introduction of the new waste collection system in October".

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Gloyer

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 Corbett:

Council

1) Notes significant public concern regarding waste service collections over the festive period 2018-19, the backlog which arose, and how these issues came on top of the problems which followed the introduction of the new waste collection system in October.

2) Recognises the twin pressures of increased volumes during the festive period and ensuring staffing capacity at the same time.

3) Therefore calls for a report to the May 2019 Transport and Environment Committee:

- Reviewing key lessons from the festive period 2018-19;
- Highlighting changes in volumes in each collection stream over that period;
- Setting out recommendations for festive period 2019-20 and beyond;
- Specifically, assessing options for dealing with christmas trees post festive period.

## 19 Purchase of Land at Granton — Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council

1) Notes the Council’s purchase of the land at Granton and its aspirations, as stated in the press, for this land to create a world-class new place incorporating mixed-use development and supporting infrastructure.

2) Notes comments by the Council’s Depute Leader that Edinburgh should emulate Dundee’s significant achievements in waterfront regeneration, anchored by the addition of the new V&A museum and creation of a promenade.

3) Recognises the success of the competition of 1766 where the then Edinburgh Town Council, under Lord Provost George Drummond, instigated a public competition for architectural submissions for the scheme now known as the New Town.

4) Calls for a report in one cycle to the whole council detailing progress on the master plan to date and when and how Competitions and other forms of public submission such as Housing Expos; could be used for elements of the scheme to deliver Edinburgh's own world class waterfront."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

**Amendment**

Council:

Accepts points 1 and 2 of the motion by Councillor Mowat and replaces points 3 and 4 with:

3) Notes the governance, scrutiny and oversight arrangements in place for the Granton Waterfront programme, which had been agreed by committees of this Council.

4) Notes that progress reports had been scrutinised and agreed by Council committees, including updates on the masterplan and collaboration with local communities and key partners to set and achieve a shared vision, outcomes and objectives.

5) Agrees that a further report detailing progress so far and a clear timeline for a delivery plan be brought to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee within two cycles.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor McVey

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the motion | - | 22 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 34 votes |

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

For the amendment: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, , Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Macinnes,

McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

**Decision**

To approve the amendment by Councillor Day as follows:

1) To note the Council's purchase of the land at Granton and its aspirations, as stated in the press, for this land to create a world-class new place incorporating mixed-use development and supporting infrastructure.

2) To note comments by the Council's Depute Leader that Edinburgh should emulate Dundee's significant achievements in waterfront regeneration, anchored by the addition of the new V&A museum and creation of a promenade.

3) To note the governance, scrutiny and oversight arrangements in place for the Granton Waterfront programme, which had been agreed by committees of this Council.

4) To note that progress reports had been scrutinised and agreed by Council committees, including updates on the masterplan and collaboration with local communities and key partners to set and achieve a shared vision, outcomes and objectives.

5) To agree that a further report detailing progress so far and a clear timeline for a delivery plan be brought to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee within two cycles.

## 20 Sponsorship of Built Environment and Land Assets – Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

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

"Council

1) Notes the significant budget pressures that the City of Edinburgh Council faces, with anticipated cuts of over £41 million for 2019/2020.

2) Recognises that, while it has been proposed, the Council has not implemented, or formally reported, on sponsorship of built environment and land assets, such as roundabouts, hard and soft landscaping, parks and seasonal decorations, to help maintain, add and improve assets, provide benefit to communities and reduce capital and revenue costs to City of Edinburgh Council.

3) Notes the experience of the Head of Place Management at City of Edinburgh Council in delivering such projects, and asks the Director of Place to bring a report within two cycles to Full Council that outlines options available including cost modelling and specific examples."

**Decision**

To note that Councillor Laidlaw had withdrawn his motion.

## 21 Intelligent Traffic Signals – Motion by Councillor Whyte

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

"Council:

Notes the adoption of Pedestrian Countdown Timers in other UK Cities.

Further notes the effectiveness and advantages of such systems whereby pedestrians feel less rushed when crossing and have greater certainty to decide whether they have enough time to cross. This is particularly the case for those with mobility issues who may cross more slowly and can gain greater confidence from such systems. In addition, these road installations can allow a small reduction in delay to motorised vehicle traffic – a particular issue for public transport in Edinburgh.

Also notes that some traffic light installations in Edinburgh have been adjusted to show a red crossing signal to pedestrians some time before the green signal for vehicle traffic in order to deter pedestrians from starting to cross and that this can cause confusion and frustration for pedestrians that would be eliminated by the use of Intelligent Traffic Signals.

Acknowledges that Edinburgh, as a growing City, needs to maintain traffic flow whilst ensuring pedestrian safety.

Therefore, instructs the Director of Place to report within two cycles on the possibility of installing Intelligent Traffic Signals in Edinburgh as an initial pilot using at least one City Centre and one suburban test site. The report to outline desk research on the variant models operated by other UK local authorities, full costings involved, suitable junctions and pedestrian crossings as trial locations both within and outwith the city centre, a timeframe for installation and a timeline for collecting and analysing the pilot data."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Whyte.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Brown

**Amendment 1**

Council

Accepts the 1st paragraph and deletes paragraphs 2 – 5 to be replaced with:

Notes the effectiveness and advantages of systems which place greater emphasis and priority on pedestrian safety and sense of comfort in crossing roads, particularly in adding more time for those who may require longer than some to cross roads.

Acknowledges that any significant change to how pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle drivers interact should take place within the context of the City Centre Transformation project which is currently examining a comprehensive range of measures to enhance movement within the city centre and elsewhere in the city.

Instructs the Director of Place to report to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles (May 2019) on the possibility of installing Pedestrian Countdown at Traffic Signals in Edinburgh. The report, timed to coincide with the expected report on the City Centre Transformation, should outline the results of desk research into systems operated by other UK local authorities, an outline of potential costings, possible locations within Edinburgh, and a timeframe for installation and for collecting and analysing any appropriate data.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

**Amendment 2**

Add the following wording at the end of the motion:

and agrees this report will also consider other options for improving pedestrian convenience and safety, including, but not limited to, modern puffin crossings and adjustments to pedestrian crossing times, as previously discussed by the Transport and Environment Committee on 3 June 2014.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Burgess

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the Motion | - | 22 votes |
| For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) | - | 31 votes |

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

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted amendment by Councillor Macinnes:

1) To note the adoption of Pedestrian Countdown Timers in other UK Cities.

2) To note the effectiveness and advantages of systems which place greater emphasis and priority on pedestrian safety and sense of comfort in crossing roads, particularly in adding more time for those who may require longer than some to cross roads.

3) To acknowledge that any significant change to how pedestrians, cyclists and vehicle drivers interact should take place within the context of the City Centre Transformation project which is currently examining a comprehensive range of measures to enhance movement within the city centre and elsewhere in the city.

4) To instruct the Director of Place to report to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles (May 2019) on the possibility of installing Pedestrian Countdown at Traffic Signals in Edinburgh. The report, timed to coincide with the expected report on the City Centre Transformation, should outline the results of desk research into systems operated by other UK local authorities, an outline of potential costings, possible locations within Edinburgh, and a timeframe for installation and for collecting and analysing any appropriate data and agrees this report will also consider other options for improving pedestrian convenience and safety, including, but not limited to, modern puffin crossings and adjustments to pedestrian crossing times, as previously discussed by the Transport and Environment Committee on 3 June 2014.

## 22 EIJB (Health and Social Care Partnership) – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

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

"Council

Require an urgent report from the Chief Executive to detail:

1) Any discussions between Council Officers and the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board on the level of budget contributions from the Council to the Board for financial year 2019 / 2020;

2) The level of budget contributions that the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board has suggested it will require from the City of Edinburgh Council for the coming financial year;

3) The process by which any dispute over the required level of budget contribution from City of Edinburgh Council to the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board would be resolved;

4) An explanation of how the City of Edinburgh Council shall manage such a dispute over budget contributions, including details of any financial contingencies and temporal mismatches in the budget timelines of the Council and the Board.

5) An opinion from the Council's Section 95 Chief Financial Officer on the impact of Council setting a budget that may not include our best understanding of in year expenditure pressures."

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jim Campbell:

Council

Requires an urgent briefing from the Chief Executive to detail:

1) Any discussions between Council Officers and the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board on the level of budget contributions from the Council to the Board for financial year 2019 / 2020;

2) The level of budget contributions that the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board has suggested it would require from the City of Edinburgh Council for the coming financial year;

3) The process by which any dispute over the required level of budget contribution from City of Edinburgh Council to the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board would be resolved;

4) An explanation of how the City of Edinburgh Council shall manage such a dispute over budget contributions, including details of any financial contingencies and temporal mismatches in the budget timelines of the Council and the Board;

5) An opinion from the Council's Section 95 Chief Financial Officer on the impact of Council setting a budget that might not include our best understanding of in year expenditure pressures.

## 23 Budget Consultation – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

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

"Council

Notes the amendment Councillor Corbett placed before the Finance and Resources Committee on 27 September 2018, which received cross-party support and the Committee wisely agreed.

Thanks Officers for their efforts in trying to discharge the amendment.

But is disappointed that public feedback in the budget deliberations of Council this year has been significantly constrained by the lack of any effective choice. Requires future budget consultations to detail individual budget savings that the Edinburgh residents could support or oppose, where the sum of all the individual savings adds to at least 120% of the total saving that has been identified as being required.

Implores this Council Administration to issued budget consultation for public feedback in a way and in a timescale in which that feedback can influence the final budget decisions over the days, weeks and months ahead."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Rust

**Amendment 1**

Council:

1) Notes the Motion from Councillor Jim Campbell;

2) Supports the points raised in the first two sentences;

3) Notes that 'Feedback on the Change Strategy and Budget Proposals 2018' was reported to the Finance and Resources Committee on 1 February 2019.

4) Notes that the Council had engaged extensively since last October with both staff and the public on the Change Strategy 2019/2023. This has resulted in 1,597 responses to the consultation document, Planning for Change and Delivering Services.

5) Notes that the Council had been one of the first authorities in Scotland to publish detailed saving proposals for the next four years and a long-term change strategy – not just a one-year budget. The feedback from this consultation document and the specific budget proposals issued on 18 January 2019 for feedback until 11 February 2019 will be reported to Council on 21 February 2019 along with Integrated Impact Assessments; and

6) Commits to a Council-wide, cross-party, evaluation to improve future budget consultation

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Child

**Amendment 2**

Keep paras 1 and 2 of Councillor Jim Campbell's motion.

Delete paras 3 and 4 and replace with:

Recognises the value in the council seeking feedback on medium term budget strategy, particularly in light of the national budget agreement secured by Green MSPs which includes a commitment to 3 year budget settlements and a fiscal framework; however, equally recognises that people in the city expect to be able to offer views on specific budget options in a timely and meaningful way; and therefore agrees to a review of budget engagement process to be reported to Finance and Resources Committee before end of May 2019.

- 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, and adjusted and accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted) - 26 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) - 26 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): Councillors Aldridge, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Jim Campbell, Cook, Corbett, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Laidlaw, McLellan, Main, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rae, Neil Ross, Rose, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Webber, Whyte and Young.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

**Decision**

In the division, 26 members having voted for the motion (as adjusted) and 26 members for Amendment 1 (as adjusted), the Lord Provost gave his casting vote for Amendment 1 (as adjusted) and the Council resolved as follows:

Council:

1) Notes the amendment Councillor Corbett placed before the Finance and Resources Committee on 27 September 2018, which received cross-party support and the Committee wisely agreed.

2) Thanks Officers for their efforts in trying to discharge the amendment.

3) Notes that 'Feedback on the Change Strategy and Budget Proposals 2018' was reported to Finance and Resources Committee on 1 February 2019.

4) Notes that the Council had engaged extensively since last October with both staff and the public on the Change Strategy 2019/2023. This had resulted in 1,597 responses to the consultation document, Planning for Change and Delivering Services.

5) Notes that the Council had been one of the first authorities in Scotland to publish detailed saving proposals for the next four years and a long-term change strategy – not just a one-year budget. The feedback from this consultation document and the specific budget proposals issued on 18 January 2019 for feedback until 11 February 2019 would be reported to Council on 21 February 2019 along with Integrated Impact Assessments.

6) Commits to a Council-wide, cross-party, evaluation to improve future budget consultation.

## 24 Settled Status for EU Citizens – Motion by Councillor Booth

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

"Council:

1) Warmly welcomes the positive impact made by EU Nationals to the cultural, economic and social life of our city, agrees they should be made to feel welcome here, and is honoured and delighted that so many EU Nationals have chosen to make their home in Edinburgh;

2) Notes the settled status scheme run by the UK Government which requires 3.5 million EU nationals resident in the UK to apply for "settled status" or risk deportation;

3) Welcomes the U-turn announced by the UK Government in January 2019 that the proposed £65 for the settled status application has been withdrawn;

4) Nonetheless condemns the retrospective nature of any applications, which forces EU Nationals who have already made their homes in the UK to apply for a right that they already have; further condemns in the strongest terms the implication that those EU Nationals resident in the UK who do not apply may be subject to deportation;

5) Condemns the fact that a number of EU Nationals who have lived here for many years have been refused settled status by an online system for unspecified reasons and with no apparent appeal process;

6) Agrees the Council Leader will write to UK Home Secretary raising concerns about the settled status scheme & urging them to amend the scheme urgently to ensure that people who have chosen to make their lives here under the auspices of the EU's Freedom of Movement should be welcome to stay without any further documentation and should be entitled to retain the rights they currently have after the UK leaves the EU."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

**Amendment**

Council

Deletes clauses 4), 5), and 6) of the motion by Councillor Booth.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Smith

**Voting**

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For the motion | - | 36 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 14 votes |

(For the motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

**Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth.

## 25 LGBT History Month – Motion by Councillor Day

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

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

"That Council;

1) Recognises February as LGBT + History Month, both in 2019 and going forward.

2) Calls on elected members to do their part both locally and, where relevant, through the responsibility of their office, to stand up and champion LBGT + people and support LGBT + history month.

3) Marks this event accordingly by flying the pride flag from City Chambers for the duration of month of February as a gesture of support."

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

- moved by Councillor Day seconded by Councillor McVey

**Amendment**

Council adds to the motion by Councillor Day:-

4) Extends the Council's best wishes to all the organisers and participant of LGBT History Month since its UK launch at the Tait Modern in 2004.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

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 Day:

1) To recognise February as LGBT + History Month, both in 2019 and going forward.

2) To call on elected members to do their part both locally and, where relevant, through the responsibility of their office, to stand up and champion LBGT + people and support LGBT + history month.

3) To mark this event accordingly by flying the pride flag from City Chambers for the duration of month of February as a gesture of support.

4) To extend the Council's best wishes to all the organisers and participant of LGBT History Month since its UK launch at the Tait Modern in 2004.

# Appendix 1

**(As referred to in Act of Council No 7 of 7 February 2019)**

**QUESTION NO 1**

**By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question**

In light of the draft budget settlement for Edinburgh issued on 18 December 2018 which has increased the provisional budget gap faced by the city council in 2019-20 from £28m to £39m and, given the absence of any commitment in the draft budget for Scotland on greater fiscal flexibility for Scottish local authorities, what impact does the convener believe that he and senior colleagues have had in making the case for Scotland's capital to get a fair funding settlement?

**Answer**

Following Stage 1 consideration of the Budget bill on 31st January, and the announcements by the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, the estimated budget savings requirement for 2019/20 is now £33.1m.

The Council Leader and I have met or contacted the Cabinet Secretary for Finance, the Minister for Public Finance, their Special Advisers, MSPs and MPs to convey our views on the Financial Settlement for Edinburgh announced in December last year.

We emphasised the need for an increase in revenue funding, for greater relief on the £2.4m estimated Council share of the rise in teachers' superannuation costs and our view that the Council should have greater powers to raise its own revenue, identifying specifically the case for a Transient Visitor Levy and a Workplace Parking Levy.

As members will be aware, the Scottish Government has moved in a favourable direction on all these points. These

have all been notable successes, particularly in view of the very great competing demands on the Scottish budget from elsewhere in the public sector.

The administration's budget proposals will take account of these changes and what we have heard during public engagement on the draft budget proposals.

**Supplementary Question**

Yes thanks Depute Convener. Obviously I submitted the question well before Christmas and of course the picture has continued to change hence for clarification I'd like to pick up on that part of the answer which is about greater fiscal flexibility for councils. The budget agreement last week committed to reform in a number of ways, greater funding powers, some of which were discussed today, three-year budgets, fiscal framework and a replacement for Council Tax among others. So does the Finance Convener agree with the COSLA Finance lead, Conservative Councillor McGregor and COSLA President, Labour Councillor Evison, the Green MSPs have shown the value of constructive engagement on budget reform which produces actual results.

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you Depute Convener. I'm happy to acknowledge as I think everybody will be aware of the role of the Green Party MSPs in negotiating with the Scottish Government on the budget and we've seen the outcome of those negotiations and everything that's come out of that is something that I think the Administration warmly welcomes. We're happy to look in future at whatever other proposals may come forward about increasing the revenue raising ability of councils themselves.

**QUESTION NO 2**

**By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question**

In light of the £17.9m cut on like for like government revenue funding for Edinburgh in 2019-20, by how much would council tax have to rise to offset that reduction, both as a percentage rise and as an amount within each band?

**Answer**

Members received an update on the impact of the provisional Local Government Settlement for 2019/20 at the Finance and Resources Committee meeting on 1 February 2019. This level of settlement increased the overall in-year savings requirement by £8.9m, once account was taken of existing overall, and health and social care-specific, funding assumptions.

While there is a risk that increasing Council Tax levels by more than 3% would trigger a consequent loss of corresponding, or greater, amounts of grant funding, if this increased requirement were addressed solely by means of changes to Council Tax, it would result in a further rise of 3.2% (i.e. a total of 6.2% for the year), resulting in the following increases per band:

| Band | Existing Council Tax levels | Assumed Council Tax increase per budget framework (i.e. 3%) | Further required increase to address provisional level of grant funding relative to current framework assumptions (i.e. additional 3.2% increase) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 2018/19 | 2019/20 | 2019/20 |
| A | £826.79 | £24.80 | £26.46 |
| B | £964.60 | £28.94 | £30.87 |
| C | £1,102.39 | £33.07 | £35.28 |
| D | £1,240.19 | £37.21 | £39.69 |
| E | £1,629.47 | £48.88 | £52.14 |
| F | £2,015.31 | £60.46 | £64.49 |
| G | £2,428.71 | £72.86 | £77.72 |
| H | £3,038.47 | £91.15 | £97.23 |

**QUESTION NO 3**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

In November 2017 I asked a question of the Convener of Transport and Environment, regarding the number of pedestrian crossings in Edinburgh which had been fitted with a pedestrian signalling box with rotating cones underneath which enable partially sighted individuals to know when it is safe to cross. As a follow up I asked how many of these cones were actually functioning. The Convener was unsure at the time but assured me that she would come back to me in an individual basis and if necessary to the Chamber, with information about the working cones. In her words "If there is a problem, a widespread problem, we'll put in place a programme to make sure that those are fitted correctly."

**Question** **(1)** Has any further research been done on the 409 traffic signal installations in the city that have rotating cones to see if they are functioning?

**Answer** **(1)** There are currently no recorded faults with any of the rotating cones. Faults are actioned immediately when reported and an annual inspection is undertaken for all tactile rotating cones.

**Question** **(2)** Has a programme been put into place to make sure that they are fitted correctly?

**Answer** **(2)** All tactile rotating cones are fitted as per the manufacturers' recommendations.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you and I thank the Convener for her responses. Apologies again for labouring this points, because I know it has been raised previously by myself, just want to get a bit of clarity. So to be clear, of the 596 traffic installations in the city, the 409 had been fitted with rotating cones, all are functioning and have been checked in the last year, a simple yes or no will suffice.

**Supplementary Answer** I understand that to be the case Councillor Osler, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 4**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** Since the introduction of the new service last October there have been delays on a weekly basis to the Friday collection of waste, in particular food waste, right across the Inverleith Ward. Why is this happening?

**Answer** **(1)** It is clear that there have been occasions where there has been a delay in Friday collections in the west of the city. Friday is the last collection day of the week and analysis of the issues recently experienced would indicate that the impact of missed collections earlier in the week did impact on the collection schedule on a Friday.

**Question** **(2)** What is being done to improve the situation?

**Answer** **(2)** Resources have been realigned within Waste and Cleansing, as outlined in my note to elected members on 22 January, to address these issues in the short term and we are seeing a significant reduction in complaints as a result of this. Work is on-going to complete the development of the waste transfer station at Bankhead by summer 2019 which will also help to improve the service in the west of the city. The Transport and Environment Committee was invited to tour that facility, along with other strategic Waste development facilities, on 30th January.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much and thank you again Convener for your responses. It's now been 129 days since the new waste collection system came into effect yet it still not working. Now we've been provided with the revelation that the particular problem with collections on a Friday is because Friday comes towards the end of the week, if only we'd known this before. Is the Convener seriously suggesting to me and to my residents that it could take until the summer before everything is working as it should be if not when exactly will this problem be resolved.

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you Councillor Osler. I think though you've somewhat misinterpreted the information that's been provided to you in this answer. As far as I'm concerned I have been informed by the service and it's reflected in the missed bin figures that we are pretty much back on schedule. Now the answer that you were provided with here in the written answer related to your assertions in the question. The situation has now changed, it has changed quite dramatically over the last two weeks. We've seen a massive drop in problems, we are back fully on schedule in terms of collections, so there's no question about the Friday collection somehow continuing to be a problem until the summer. The second answer relates to the ongoing strategic work that we are doing within waste, where we have seen the opening of the Bankhead transfer station. That's going to be of immense importance to our ability to continue to drive down those missed bin complaints, it provides us with longer periods when people are actually collecting bins instead of having to travel to tip etc etc. So I think there is a question of a time delay really in both your question and the answer that has been given and the reality on the ground now.

**QUESTION NO 5**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** Over the Christmas period what contingencies were put in place to make sure that communal recycling units were emptied more frequently to reflect seasonal demand?

**Answer** **(1)** Over the Festive period, additional resources were deployed on Mondays to collect communal dry mix recycling. The collections for communal glass and paper collections are carried out by contractors on behalf of the Council:

- For glass, additional collections were planned to take account of the public holidays.
- For paper, collections were rescheduled to take account of the public holidays.

**Question** **(2)** What checks were done to make sure these uplifts were carried out by our contractors?

**Answer** **(2)** Missed bin service requests are automatically directed to the contractor on receipt. In addition, a monthly review of performance is carried out and any issues are followed up directly with the contractors.

**Question** **(3)** What sanctions were put in place or applied in the event of performance failures?

**Answer** **(3)** The Council can seek damages to recover costs incurred as a result of service failure. However, the contractor will always be asked to address the issues in the first instance and, on this occasion, the Council has not incurred any additional costs and therefore no damages have been claimed.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Supplementary Question** | Thank you and thank you again Convener for your responses. I wondered does the Convener think that the current contract is fit for purpose if the Council still ends up paying full price even when the contractor isn't performing as it should. I know of other local authorities which have clauses in their contracts that allow for reduced payments if the company does not meet its performance. Isn't this something we should be considering? |
| **Supplementary Answer** | Councillor Osler, it's quite clear that we are able to use that contract to seek damages to recover costs incurred as a result of service failure. I'm not quite sure what the basis of your question is but I think that it is there and available. I think is quite an interesting point though to look at the question of contracts when it comes to waste collection delivery. If we had proceeded under the alternative business model which of course at some point was quite fashionable two Administrations ago, if we were looking at our last complete year 2017-2018, on the basis of that year, we would have been looking at 0.3% missed bin collection levels as an acceptable level within that contract. Based on the scheduled collections for the year that would have allowed the contractor to have had 64,800 complaints against the total own waste service actually delivered in that year - we received only 39,000 at that point across the entire year. I think that gives you some indication of both the quality of the work that the waste service does in general and the fact that we made the right decision not to go with the ABM model. |

**QUESTION NO 6**

**By Councillor Johnston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

Could the Convener advise of the following:

**Question** **(1)** How many parking enforcement officers are deployed at any one time

**Answer** **(1)** 73 enforcement officers are deployed on each weekday.

**Question** **(2)** How many problem parking 'hot-spots' are currently designated?

**Answer** **(2)** There are currently seven streets on the Council's priority street list:

- Leith Walk;
- Annandale Street;
- Bellevue Gardens;
- North Clyde Street Lane;
- Piershill Place;
- Belford Gardens; and
- Nicolson Square.

In addition, the Council receives approximately 90 requests for ad hoc Parking Attendant visits per month. These requests are prioritised and managed and feedback is received from our enforcement contractor on each. Where streets appear regularly, these will be added to the priority street list for a period (the period a street is included on the list will depend on the nature of the issues).

**Question** **(3)** How many tickets were issued in 2018?

**Answer** **(3)** 184,570 parking tickets were issued in 2018.

**Question** **(4)** Can answers to 1 to 3 be provided on a ward by ward basis?

**Answer** **(4)** The information is not held in this way.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Supplementary Question (By Councillor Rust)** | Depute Convener with your permission I've been given the supplementary task on behalf of Councillor Johnston who's not here today. Firstly I thank the Convener for her answers but seek clarification in respect of answer 4, why is this information not held in this way ie in a ward to ward basis, thank you? |
| **Supplementary Answer** | The ward by ward basis is something that comes up regularly in the questions to me around core services. Inevitably in a council like this we have built up policy, we have built up reporting systems, we have built up methods of operating on an evolutionary basis. If I was to ask all of the core services to turn round and start providing them in exactly the way in which our opposition Councillors want them to be provided I think it is something of a waste of Council resources. Where possible I always provide them on a ward by ward basis. In other ways it's perfectly reasonable to provide them in a broader context. If you want to drill down with them please feel free to e-mail me. I receive a rare e-mail from my opposition Councillors. It would be helpful if he came to me directly instead of going straight into a Council question. |

**QUESTION NO 7**

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** Can the Convener confirm when the proposed clear-up of the A1 arterial route (within City of Edinburgh boundaries) will be complete and why this work which she stated at September Council "is anticipated that this work will be undertaken in October 2018." Is still outstanding?

**Answer** **(1)** As previously stated, the decision was taken to seek an external contractor to carry out maintenance on the arterial routes in the city due to the specialist nature of the work and the training and equipment required. No tenders were received for this work when advertised.

**Question** **(2)** Can the Convener please provide a broader update on the timescale procurement for routine grounds maintenance of arterial routes (identified at October Council as the A1, A199, A8, A70, A71, A90) following the meeting of officers with Transport Scotland to discuss the potential for collaborative working for these activities, confirmed at Full Council in October?

**Answer** **(2)** Officers are meeting with Transport Scotland on 5 February to discuss opportunities for collaborative working, including the maintenance of arterial routes.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Depute Convener and I thank Councillor Macinnes for the answers. It's good to know we can rely on the Convener to lead by example when it comes to recycling, but can I ask the Convener if it is in any way acceptable my constituents have waited over a year since first coming to me about the state of the A1 arterial routes through my ward, that we have seen in the news that some of them are now taking it into their own hands to clear up on the side of this fast moving and dangerous road, that today they are given a rehashed answer which actually contradicts

promises made in October Council, that the work in the absence of a private contractor would be handled by Council staff and that the answer suggests this is a trivial concern. The answer to the second part that dismisses maintenance of arterial roads is something so trifling that the Convener couldn't find time in her diary in the past four months to meet with Transport Scotland, but perhaps it is low in her priorities, when she's playing Baron Haussman with the city centre or promoting electrified bicycles like Sir Clive Sinclair, but it's to the detriment of ordinary residents in my Ward whose bins are not collected, whose roads are not maintained and whose verges on the A1 are allowed to get littered and overgrown. So perhaps today she will commit to a timescale for clearing the A1 and moving forward with arterial road maintenance.

**Supplementary Answer**

I hesitate to say thank you for that particularly personal approach, but thank you Councillor Laidlaw. In no way have I suggested that this is a trivial matter and the answer that I gave you on 20 September, much of it still pertains and the reason for that is about health and safety for our workers. We said at the time that we had put a contract out for tender, the fact that no private sector organisation came forward to answer those tenders is something that we have limited control over. The next step is to work with Transport Scotland to discover whether or not we can actually find some way of creating a more attractive framework agreement presumably across different local authorities that will allow those tenders to be met. There's no question about a trivial approach to it, there's certainly not a trivial approach to health and safety of our workers.

**QUESTION NO 8**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** Could the Convener provide a table showing:

a) the number of enforcement cases registered each month in 2018 regarding short term lets;

b) the number of enforcement actions taken;

c) the number of enforcement actions appealed and the outcome of the appeals?

**Answer** Please refer to the table below.

| **2018** | **Number of Enforcement Cases Registered** | **Number of Actions Taken** | **Number of Actions Appealed** | **Outcome at Appeal** |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| January | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| February | 4 | 1 | 1 | Notice upheld |
| March | 10 | 5 | 3 | 3 Notices upheld |
| April | 3 | 1 pending | 0 | 0 |
| May | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| June | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| July | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| August | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| September | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| October | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| November | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| December | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Totals** | 96 | 13 | 4 | 4 Notices upheld |

**QUESTION NO 9**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** Please list the number of cycle racks that have been installed by the Road Safety and Active Travel team since 1 January 2016, listed by

a) those installed on the roadway,

b) those installed on the footway, and

c) those installed elsewhere?

**Answer** **(1)** a) 5 cycle racks have been installed on the roadway.

b) 538 cycle racks have been installed on the footway.

c) 315 cycle racks have been installed elsewhere.

**Question** **(2)** Please list the number of cycle racks that have been installed by each locality since 1 January 2016, listed by

a) those installed on the roadway,

b) those installed on the footway, and

c) those installed elsewhere?

**Answer** **(2)** The installation of cycle racks is carried out by the Active Travel team, with support and input from locality transport officers.

**Question** **(3)** Please list the number of Edinburgh cycle hire docking points that have been installed, listed by

a) those installed on the roadway,

b) those installed on the footway, and

c) those installed elsewhere?

**Answer** **(3)** a) There have been no cycle hire docking points installed on the roadway.

b) 39 cycle hire docking points have been installed on the footway.

c) 11 cycle hire docking points have been installed elsewhere.

**Question** **(4)** Does the council consider that a TRO is required to install a cycle rack on

a) the roadway, and

b) the footway, and what is the reason in each case?

**Answer** **(4)** a) If the rack is installed within a marked cycle bay on the road, a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) is required to introduce an enforceable restriction on use of the bay by other vehicles. If changes to traffic, parking or loading restrictions are required to accommodate the bay, a TRO would also be required to alter the existing restrictions.

If the rack is installed on a new footway build-out and changes to traffic, parking or loading restrictions are required to accommodate the build-out, a TRO is required to alter the existing restrictions.

If the rack is installed on a new footway build-out and changes to traffic, parking or loading restrictions are not required to accommodate the build-out, a TRO would not be required. Vehicles are not permitted to use the footway, so no additional restrictions are required.

b) If the rack is installed on the existing footway, a TRO is not required. Vehicles are not permitted to use the footway, so no additional restrictions are required.

**Question** **(5)** What is the approximate cost of providing a build-out to accommodate on-road cycle racks, and are these required in every instance where a cycle rack is installed on the roadway?

**Answer** **(5)** The cost of providing a build-out will vary significantly according to various factors, including:

- the size of the build-out;
- the materials used (e.g. the use of natural stone materials will significantly increase costs);
- whether additional road or footway drainage apparatus is required;
- the location of the build-out and the consequent temporary traffic management arrangements and working restrictions during construction; and
- whether a TRO and/or a Redetermination Order (RSO) is required

Depending on the above, a budget estimate for a build-out to accommodate cycle racks could vary between £2,000 and £5,000, not including the cost of any TRO/RSO (see response to Question (6) below).

As an alternative to providing a new build-out, racks could be installed within a marked cycle bay on the road.

**Question** **(6)** What is the approximate budgeted cost of pursuing

a) a TRO;

b) an RSO for a cycle rack on the roadway?

**Answer** **(6)** A budget estimate for the cost of promoting either a TRO or an RSO for a cycle bay or build-out would be approximately £2,000. This could increase significantly if an objection led to a public hearing.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Depute Convener and I thank the Convener for her answer. It will be a concern to many in the cycling and walking community that the cost of putting a cycle rack on road could be up to £7,000 more than putting on the footway, if both the build out and a Traffic Regulation Order is required, and it will be a concern that less than 1% of the cycle racks that we've installed have been on roads, which would seem to complement and agree with the transport mode hierarchy which would suggest that we should be taking from unsustainable modes and giving it to active travel. Will she agree to write to the Cabinet Secretary urging him to make the Traffic Regulation Order more

streamlined as part of the current Transport Bill and will she also agree to discuss with officers whether a Traffic Regulation Order is actually needed for an on-road cycle rack since I understand that many London boroughs do it without and indeed in Edinburgh itself many waste and bin stations are provided without a Traffic Regulation Order.

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you Councillor Booth. I agree with you very much about our desire to be able to move much more quickly around these issues, to a resolution that is both less expensive and more easily justifiable in terms of where we take the space from to add these much-needed facilities into the city. I'm very happy to write to the Cabinet Secretary, the Council has in the past provided input in through the Active Travel Task Force, for example on exactly this topic and I'm happy to draw it to his attention again. Discussions with officers are ongoing. I share your dismay at the potentially large cost, I should stress that that is one end of the spectrum, it is possible somehow to deliver them on a much cheaper basis but of course every instance of a build out is very dependent on its precise location. I've also asked officers to look at how we can combine the cost of a possibility of build outs with other functions, so for example the electric vehicle infrastructure that were now looking at whether or not they can combine build outs for both bike parking and electric vehicle structure again presumably to get some degree of benefit around the cost and the time and the processes required to make that happen.

**QUESTION NO 10**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** How many press releases or press statements has he issued since 12 December 2018 criticising the Scottish Government's proposed reduction in the Council's revenue grant for 2019/20 and will he provide links to such statements?

**Answer** **(1)** This information is publicly available.

**Question** **(2)** How many blogs or opinion articles has he had published since 12 December 2018 criticising the Scottish Government's proposed reduction in the Council's revenue grant for 2019/20 and will he provide links to such articles?

**Answer** **(2)** This information is publicly available.

**Question** **(3)** How many tweets has he issued on Twitter since 12 December 2018 criticising the Scottish Government's proposed reduction in the Council's revenue grant for 2019/20 and will he provide the dates and times of any such tweets?

**Answer** **(3)** This information is publicly available.

**Question** **(4)** How many speeches has he made since 12 December 2018 criticising the Scottish Government's proposed reduction in the Council's revenue grant for 2019/20 and will he publish the text of any such speeches given?

**Answer** **(4)** This information is publicly available.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you very much. It's been a rather amusing 24 hours to have had such encouragement from Labour Councillors to tell me that I should submit a Freedom of Information request for the information that I had sought in this question. Depute Convener, isn't it clear that the Leader of the Council

has chosen to avoid answering these questions because the answer to question 1 is zero, to question 2 is zero, to question 3 is zero, and to question 4 is zero. He's made no public criticism of the Scottish Government for cutting tens of millions of pounds from the Council budget. So my question is this. When will he accept that his approach is part of the problem and that Ministers will continue to slash hundreds of millions of pounds from Council budgets like ours, in the full knowledge and confidence that it will always be met with such meek acquiescence from their colleagues in local government.

**Supplementary Answer**

I'm tempted to remind Councillor Lang that there are two, I think it's two, Liberal Democrat leaders or co leaders in the country. I'd like to know what either of them have managed to get for their communities out of the budget process because I certainly did a very clear ask in terms of the powers that we needed and in terms of the resource levels that we needed and some of the ring-fencing elements in particular that were causing us issues. It's worth reminding Councillor Lang, since the first budget was announced to the budget that was approved in parliament, the government took off £2.4 m worth of IJB ring-fencing that meant than budget assumptions we had, which we took to Finance and Resources Committee just last week, held without any threat whatsoever of sanction. It meant our budget was entirely compliant with the terms of the Scottish Government set outline. We also have got a well-publicised 2 elements of national policy that has been changed, complying with this Administration's programme. So Councillor Lang might think that my approach is the wrong approach, I would ask him to highlight maybe from one of his one and a half Council leaders that he's got elsewhere in his party or any other Council leader in this entire country, what have they got out of the budget that somehow I haven't.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Deputy Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

| | |
|---|---|
| **Question** | On 17 January, the Vice Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee said: “I cannot begin to describe how furious, frustrated, and let down I feel by the ineptitude of the SNP Edinburgh Council Leadership in relation to standing up for Edinburgh”. Does the deputy leader of the Council share this view? |
| **Answer** | No |
| **Supplementary Question** | Thank you Depute Convener. Can I firstly congratulate the Deputy Council Leader for giving what I thought was a refreshingly straight answer to a straight question. He's certainly encouraged me to ask him more questions in future. But can I just clarify, if he didn't feel furious, frustrated, and let down by the ineptitude of the SNP Council leadership as Councillor Cameron did, what emotions did he feel over the ineptitude of the SNP Council leadership? |
| **Supplementary Answer** | Thank you Depute Convener. I think Councillor Lang, every member of my party is entitled to have their own opinion and they freely express that. |

**QUESTION NO 12**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question**

What progress has been made to implement the actions which arose from the parking monitoring report provided to Almond ward councillors on 12 July 2018? (please note that this information has been sought from parking officials through repeated emails since 2 December but none have been answered or acknowledged).

**Answer**

It is not acceptable that you did not receive a response to your emails in respect of this matter and I have spoken to the Head of Service about it.

The following table provides an outline programme for taking forward the actions:

| | |
|---|---|
| Contact businesses to highlight parking issues | February 2019 |
| Conduct initial survey of streets within car village | February 2019 |
| Prepare outline design of possible restrictions and commence TRO process | March 2019 |
| Advertise draft TRO | May 2019 |
| Complete TRO process and implement yellow lines (this date assumes no objections.) | March 2020 |

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Depute Convener and I very much appreciate the answer which I've had back from the Convener and appreciate the other information I've had from officers in response. Depute Convener my follow-up is really just to ask for the Convener's support around this because I do recognise that we have a lot of very big projects that are happening around the city but she has heard before the degree to which small villages particularly in the west side of the city can feel the forgotten part of Edinburgh, and they may be small in geography but the issues that they face are big in size. So whilst we do have a timetable here, my follow-up is simply to ask for her support to try and make sure that these issues which have been around for a long time and which I personally am very frustrated that we've gone six months without any real progress on, that we can

at least keep the foot on the pedal to try and get progress during the course of this year, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you Councillor Lang. You mention there your personal frustration about this. One of the things that I find personally frustrating is when you give quotes to your local newspaper that imply very clearly that I treat the west of Edinburgh as a second-class citizen. Nothing could be further from the truth. I have a city wide remit, the west of Edinburgh is every bit as important as every other part of the city and I follow through on as much as I possibly can. This is now the second question where my ability to deliver beyond the bigger projects has been called into question. I would ask for evidence the next time that comes up again. In terms of the answer I gave to you in terms of your question number 12, you state in it, in your question, that you said that you'd sent repeated e-mails since 2 December and none had been answered or acknowledged. Now, as I've said in my answer it is not acceptable that you didn't receive a response of course it isn't, but I just checked to see how many of those repeated e-mails had actually come in, there are precisely 2, well that's what's on record. One went to the CPS mailbox and the second was also copied to an officer. I think it would be helpful if the questions I receive were perhaps slightly tighter in the language that they use, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 13**

**By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Housing and Economy Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

Can the Convener:

**Question** **(1)** Confirm the number and nature of events it undertook to promote Small Business Saturday on 1st December 2018?

**Answer** **(1)** In previous years the council has held events to promote SBS. Due to previous reductions in the economic development budget there is no longer a dedicated resource focussed on local high streets, who had previously led on promoting Small Business Saturday and would have organised any events.

**Question** **(2)** Confirm the number and nature of social media posts (including which platform) used to promote Small Business Saturday?

**Answer** **(2)** We recognise the role of social media to promote small businesses and specifically high streets. One example would be the *Pop into Porty* campaign which was in direct response to concerns from local businesses that a road closure for resurfacing would impact on local businesses. This has been effective, and we will continue to look for opportunities to support small businesses and encourage people to shop locally, including dovetailing into Small Business Saturday.

**Question** **(3)** Confirm the number and nature of other media and non-media activities used to promote Small Business Saturday?

**Answer** **(3)** We also recognise that we can use a range of a different tools to promote small businesses and support local high streets. Again, in the campaign Pop Into Porty we used lamp post wraps in a targeted area, alongside a targeted social media campaign, to make it clear that Portobello was still open for business despite a main road being closed. This seems to have been effective and was well received by many businesses. The budget proposals look like we will have to undertake a significant service redesign. This is a

good opportunity to look at how we embed support for small businesses and local town centres into the service within the wider economic context. This will include looking at what we can do next year to support our local shops, small businesses, and high streets.

**Supplementary Question**

Depute Convener, thanks in abstentia for her answer, however I think it's fair to say with hindsight she may well have wished to adopt the Deputy Leader's stance of brevity as he afforded to Councillor Lang's written question moments ago such as was the relative non-answer offered. By supplementary to the Vice-Convener if I may, is that with a proposed £1.5m budget reduction in economic development, and the economic strategy developed to be endorsed by all members what appears to be the lack of officer support certainly the likes of Small Business Saturday and the small business champion, what message does this send out to say that Edinburgh is open for business and investment and local high streets that are out there for the heartbeat of the city's economy?

**Supplementary Answer**

Thank you very much Councillor Brown. What message does it send, it certainly sends a message to me and others who care deeply about the economy and the success of the city and the Council's ability to support and promote the economy and allow access to participate in that economy for all of our citizens. Already we've heard in deputations earlier today around fair work etc and I have already quoted one of our strands of an economy strategy the one that I would also think is appropriate here is to establish Edinburgh as Scotland's leading city for fair work practices and socially responsible business and just on reflection to the previous motion about climate change another important aspect of our economy strategies is to support Edinburgh's transition to a lower carbon economy. So I worry about the message that if those cuts do happen, I worry that those came in the form of proposals to Councillors to consider in terms of going out for consideration, I think it does not reflect the view, the political view certainly of me and my experience in stewarding economic development in this city and it's not just myself and the current Convener, I know terms of going out for consideration, I think it does not reflect the view, the political view certainly of me and my

experience in stewarding economic development in this city and it's not just myself and the current Convener, I know that the Lord Provost has gone but we have five former Economic Conveners, sorry four plus the current one as a member in this chamber and all members of the Housing and Economy Committee should care about what happens in terms of the Council's ability to influence the economy because let's not forget, and as Councillor Brown alluded to in his question, this strategy was not something that came to us drafted by officers. The former Convener and I, Councillor Barrie, were very clear that we wanted this to be a Member led strategy, as ever it's as good a strategy. As it can get and I think it reflects the priorities that we would want to promote but I do deeply worry that given the proposed cuts that are coming are really going to send this city back enormously and we have fought hard as a city to become world class in the reasons that people come here to visit live, study and invest. Only yesterday when I was attending the Strategic Implementation Group around tourism, I was saddened to hear that on some areas we are second bottom, 13th out of 14 actually, in terms of what people rate trips around. So, whilst we are award-winning in many ways, I think examples around the fair fringe, around our climate change ambitions, the EICC is a brilliant fair fringe employer it has also hosted the first ever carbon neutral conference, so I think that indicates that through the work of economic development that this city can and should continue, and continue to be funded properly so that we could lift our citizens out of poverty so everyone could be economically active and we have a finer and fairer and forward-looking city. Thank you for your question.

**QUESTION NO 14**

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** Has the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board had any discussions on what it sees it budget requirements being for financial year 2019 / 2020?

**Answer** **(1)** Yes.

**Question** **(2)** As a result of any such discussions, what at this stage is the lowest level of expenditure the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board estimates is required to discharge its statutory duties in financial year 2019 / 2020?

**Answer** **(2)** The Edinburgh Integration Joint Board (EIJB) continues to have ongoing discussions but has not finalised next year's budget requirements.

**Question** **(3)** Given the range of any estimated expenditure that has been discussed, what are the minimum contributions that the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board would be minded to accept from both the City of Edinburgh Council, and from NHS Lothian, for the financial year 2019 / 2020?

**Answer** **(3)** This matter continues to be under discussion.

**Question** **(4)** On what date will the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board finalise its budget requirements for financial year 2019 / 2020?

**Answer** **(4)** The EIJB is meeting on 8 February and officers are working across NHS Lothian and the Council in relation to budget requirements. Further finance development sessions are planned before the EIJB meeting on 29 March where the 19/20 budget will be considered.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Supplementary Question** | Thank you Depute Convener and I thank the Chair for his answer. I do have a follow up on the answer he gave. Given that budget work is ongoing, did you approve the EIJB's Chief Officer's interview with the Edinburgh Evening News earlier this week in which she is quoted as saying, it would be and I quote "very difficult for her to recommend that the Council budget proposal is a budget we", assume by "we" she means the EIJB, could accept and secondly, did you also suggest to her it would be worth checking with the Chief Executive of this Council and NHS Lothian in her second role as Head of the Health and Social Care Partnership? |
| **Supplementary Answer** | Thanks to Councillor Campbell for his question and the supplementary. I think there may be a little misunderstanding about the article that appeared in the Evening News. I think what happened there was that the reporter quoted contributions that were made at the Finance and Resources Committee last Friday, I believe it wasn't an interview as such, Judith can clarify that if she needs to do so and it was an exchange of, a conversation at Finance and Resources that was then related into the Evening News and I think again you need to ask Judith Proctor herself. But when she says that "we" would not be in a position to recommend, I think she means of herself and the Finance Officer, when it comes to the EIJB considering its final budget, the discussion was taking place in the context of the budget that had been put out for consultation. Obviously those figures have altered slightly now since the Scottish Parliament decision, but it was based on the previous set of indicative figures that we were working on at that time. |

**QUESTION NO 15**

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** When was it first determined that the budget report would be published on Friday 18th January?

**Answer** **(1)** The decision to publish a budget report was taken at the Finance and Resources Committee on 27 September 2018.

Following receipt of the provisional settlement from the Scottish Government in December 2018, an assessment was made that 18 January 2019 would be the appropriate date to publish the budget report, to enable further consultation with the public.

**Question** **(2)** When were each of the opposition groups first contacted to arrange a meeting with the Chief Executive to review the budget report and what dates/times were offered?

**Answer** **(2)** Political Groups have been meeting with a number of Council officers, including the Chief Executive, on an ongoing basis. Specific meetings regarding the development of the Council budget have also taken place both before and after the publication of the budget report. Each Political Group has an aligned officer from the Finance Division to support them with their budget planning discussions.

The offer of detailed briefings on the budget was made by the Chief Executive's Office to both the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups on 17 January 2019. Council officers met with the Green Group on 15 January 2019, so a subsequent budget briefing was not offered.

**Question** **(3)** When was the press briefing with the Leader and Depute Leader which took place on Friday 18th January arranged?

**Answer** **(3)** The press briefing was arranged on the morning of Friday, 18 January 2019.

**Question** **(4)** Is there a budget process timetable and do opposition groups feature on this?

**Answer** **(4)** The budget process timetable, including engagement with opposition groups, was set out in the report to the Finance and Resources Committee on 27 September 2018.

**Question** **(5)** Why was it verbally indicated to elected members that the budget papers were embargoed, yet no embargo was included on issuing?

**Answer** **(5)** The press were advised during the press briefing that there was embargo in place until 4.00pm that day.

**Question** **(6)** Is the budget report the Administration's proposals?

**Answer** **(6)** The budget report is produced by Council officers, as is the normal practice for all reports to Council and Committee. The content of the report has the Administration's support as a draft series of proposals for public engagement.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Depute Convener, thank-you Convener for your answers. I've got a couple of clarifications on the specific answers I've got here. It says we asked about when the groups were first contacted and the briefings that took place were in the answer. You've stated that offers were made to have briefings on the 17th January, or that's when the briefings took place, in actual reality it was a phone call at 2 o'clock on the 17th of January whereby the Conservative Group were invited to attempt to get together for a briefing with the Chief Executive, which was scheduled for 21 January, so those in the room will notice that that was actually after the press briefing. So my question is, is it correct and should this not be much more considered in your approach on engagement with the largest group in the Council when matters of the budget are of such significance?

Then in your answer to Number 4 and I'm talking about the timetable that we were looking for, I scoured the papers for Finance and Resources Committee in the report for such a timetable, but I couldn't find anything so perhaps if there is something resembling a timetable that has been published or made available it can be circulated to our Group, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer**

Thanks Councillor Webber for your question. The answer to her second question is yes, if you don't have sufficient information if you don't have enough available to you if you find it rather than a please get in touch I'll be happy to provide it. On the first question about the contact between officers and the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Groups, I wasn't aware of the details of exactly what that approach was and if you thought that was insufficient well thank you for bringing that to my attention, but it certainly has been our intention as an Administration throughout to do our best to give every political group an opportunity to scrutinise the budget measures, to see what was after all what went out in public on 18th January was available was available for everybody to see, and everybody will be able to form their own views on what they think of that. So as I think we will come on to later with the motion on the budget consultation, you can be offered an early assurance, which I will probably repeat later on, when that motion comes up for debate, that we are happy to consider approaches from every political group on the budget consultation process which has changed year on year in the light of experience, and we fully intend to take on board what other political groups outside the Administration have to say on the subject as well.

**QUESTION NO 16**

**By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

At the 20 September 2018 Council meeting I asked the Convener about the pavement deterioration next to Kirkliston Primary school (Q5.16). This was the latest in a series of attempts at securing repairs:

- August 2017 - first raised with officers and advised it would be the new budget year
- February 2018 - pushed back to April school holidays
- April 2018 - pushed back to summer holidays
- September 2018 - advised now due spring 2019

At the September meeting I asked for this timescale to be reviewed considering the poor condition of the pavement and while October was not possible, I was to expect to hear back from officers on options for an escalated timescale. I have received no updates and it was not carried out during the Christmas recess.

**Question** **(1)** What discussions have taken place since September to try and bring the timescale forward?

**Answer** **(1)** This work was originally planned to be undertaken as a temporary revenue funded repair, pending the permanent repair being undertaken as part of the capital programme. Provision in the capital programme has now been made for the permanent works to be carried out in Spring 2019.

**Question** **(2)** Is this repair being done during the midterm break in February?

**Answer** **(2)** Unfortunately it is not possible to complete this work during the February mid-term.

**Question** **(3)** If not and it remains as ‘Spring’ can I get assurances that this will definitely go ahead?

**Answer** **(3)** We are planning go ahead in Spring 2019 and will be undertaking the necessary consultation with the school, local ward members and key stakeholders in the next few weeks. The design and procurement will also be undertaken.

**Question** **(4)** Why has it taken 17 months to secure a fairly straightforward pavement repair which is part of an established route to school, for one of the largest primary schools in the entire Edinburgh school estate?

**Answer** **(4)** It was initially proposed to carry out a temporary repair at this location. However, officers have been progressing discussions on the capital programme to enable the permanent repair to be completed rather than two periods of work being undertaken in a relatively short time frame.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much and thank you very much to the Convener for the response and also for the clarity around the permanent versus temporary repairs that were being proposed. Can I just therefore confirm as I referenced in the question about the fact that at the September meeting we had looked at whether or not to this could be escalated and brought forward earlier than the spring time table, can you confirm whether or not that was discussed with any officers and the reason why we were not able to do that, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you Councillor Young. If I remember correctly I did have a verbal discussion with officers but one of the most important things I imagine for your constituents will be whether or not they are getting a precise date for the work to start. I will ask officers to come back to you directly with a precise date, once the work that is currently going on, to arrange it, has taken place.

**QUESTION NO 17**

**By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

Can the Convener please provide an update on the current backlog of street lighting faults logged:

**Question** **(1)** How many individual lights have been outstanding for over 21 days? (City wide and by ward)

**Answer** **(1)**

| | Jobs Outstanding | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | More than 21 days | | More than 3 months | |
| Ward | Number of lights | % of lights in Ward | Number of lights | % of lights in Ward |
| 1 | 203 | 3% | 137 | 2% |
| 2 | 145 | 3% | 97 | 2% |
| 3 | 214 | 5% | 146 | 4% |
| 4 | 151 | 4% | 104 | 3% |
| 5 | 180 | 5% | 123 | 3% |
| 6 | 106 | 3% | 69 | 2% |
| 7 | 111 | 3% | 85 | 2% |
| 8 | 113 | 3% | 77 | 2% |
| 9 | 62 | 3% | 40 | 2% |
| 10 | 120 | 5% | 86 | 3% |
| 11 | 478 | 11% | 326 | 7% |
| 12 | 100 | 5% | 84 | 4% |
| 13 | 125 | 5% | 113 | 5% |
| 14 | 139 | 4% | 106 | 3% |
| 15 | 154 | 5% | 97 | 3% |
| 16 | 180 | 3% | 124 | 2% |
| 17 | 202 | 5% | 156 | 4% |
| | | | | |
| **City Wide** | 2,783 | 4% | 1,970 | 3% |

**Question** **(2)** How many individual lights have been outstanding for over 3 months?(city wide and by ward)

**Answer** **(2)** See the table above. It should be noted that some of this information was also requested by Councillor Lang and answered in the last Council meeting (Dec 2018). It should also be noted that the Council, as discussed previously, is undertaking an extensive 3 year street lighting LED renewal programme which will bring significant benefits in reducing and reporting of repairs.

**Question** **(3)** What efforts are in place to reduce this backlog?

**Answer** **(3)** Additional resources have been focused on increasing repair outputs to reduce the backlog of outstanding issues.

**Question** **(4)** Is the department still prioritising overdue faults where there are 2 or more lights out in the same location? If so, how long is this approach expected to continue?

**Answer** **(4)** The prioritisation of faults remains unchanged, with five or more consecutive dark lights prioritised as emergencies and resource then being focused on outstanding repairs that are not deemed to be an emergency.

**Question** **(5)** When is it anticipated that the backlog will be cleared?

**Answer** **(5)** The additional resources are in place for a period of three months and progress will be reviewed regularly. New reports will continue to be prioritised alongside outstanding repairs.

**QUESTION NO 18**

**By Councillor Rose for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question**

Please detail the total amount, in cash and resource, which has been spent in the last five years on tram extension, either directly or otherwise?

**Answer**

**Business Case/Land Acquisition**

£5,942,241 has been incurred on the line to Newhaven (1a) with £328,526 incurred on acquisition of land to complete the sections from Roseburn to Granton (1b) and Granton to Newhaven (1c). Therefore, £6,270,767 has been spent to date for this work.

This is against Council approved funding of £7.4m to fund the initial feasibility work, the outline and final business cases.

**Leith Walk Tram Depot**

£371,260 has been incurred to demolish the former tram depot on Leith Walk so that a substation can be constructed, and a work-site established should the project go ahead. If the project does not proceed, this work is likely to increase the capital receipt achievable from the site.

**QUESTION NO 19**

**By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** Any resident trying to contact you over the Festive Period received an out of office reply stating: “I will be away from the office over the Christmas recess and not answering emails from Fri 14/12/2018 until Mon 7/1/2019”.

What arrangements did you put in place for oversight of this service during its busiest time of year, and following the poorly implemented route changes in October 2018?

**Answer** **(1)** Before adding my out of office email I spoke with the Head of Service about my set of expectations over the festive period for service delivery. While I had acknowledged at both Council and committee meetings that we could expect to see some additional pressures over this period, the reality for residents was unacceptable.

In terms of providing response to those who contacted me, my email inbox is always accessed by support staff to allow responses to be made wherever possible when I am unable to do so myself. This was the case over the period when my out of office message was on.

Your question implies that my email inbox is my only way of interacting with the service or fellow councillors. That is not so and during the festive period I was in regular telephone and email contact with the Head of Service and others on this and other matters.

In addition, the Vice Convener was available throughout the period referenced by you.

The role of the Transport and Environment Convener is an exceptionally busy one and, as a result, I rarely allow myself to not be in touch with the office, either at weekends, during recesses or in the evenings, whenever required.

**Question** **(2)** Would you like to elaborate on your apology, published in the Edinburgh Evening News on 23 January, regarding the poor service that residents have received?

**Answer** **(2)** No.

**Question** **(3)** What lessons would you pass on to any other Convener of a Council Committee, in terms of overseeing a significant operation change in a Council Service?

**Answer** **(3)** To assess emerging problems and their causes; to work with the service to identify appropriate remedial actions; to state clearly the expectations of the administration and residents; to explain as clearly as possible what those actions are to other councillors and to Edinburgh residents; and to closely monitor a return to expected service standards – all of which I have undertaken on the matter of the waste service changes.

In addition, I have instructed the service to come forward with two reports at the May 2019 Transport and Environment Committee. These will be an investigation of what went wrong, and the actions taken, as well as an investigation of the festive period waste service and its added impact on a deeply unsatisfactory situation. Both reports will include recommendations for the future.

**Question** **(4)** For each week since 1 October till 1 February, please break down the number of uplifts recorded on route smart, failed uplifts and complaints by week and waste stream.

**Answer** **(4)** This breakdown of the number of uplifts recorded on Routesmart is not currently available to provide. This is being developed in line with the actions which will be set out in the report to Transport and Environment on 28 February 2019. A breakdown of missed collection reports by week and by collection stream for both kerbside and communal bins is provided.

## MISSED COLLECTION REPORTS

| ALL KERBSIDE MISSED BINS SERVICE REQUESTS | All Kerbside | Residual | Recycling | Food | Blue Box | Garden | Red Box | Gull Proof Sacks | Black Sacks | Christmas Trees |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Week 1 - 8 October 2018** | **1092** | 439 | 205 | 188 | 68 | 183 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| **Week 2 - 15 October 2018** | **2143** | 559 | 723 | 251 | 129 | 452 | 21 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| **Week 3 - 22 October 2018** | **1710** | 532 | 457 | 234 | 105 | 372 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| **Week 4 - 29 October 2018** | **1617** | 445 | 475 | 211 | 119 | 344 | 18 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 5 - 5 November 2018** | **1565** | 505 | 420 | 230 | 114 | 285 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 6 - 12 November 2018** | **1231** | 370 | 296 | 183 | 124 | 241 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 7 - 19 November 2018** | **1145** | 314 | 297 | 234 | 114 | 174 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 1 |
| **Week 8 - 26 November 2018** | **867** | 223 | 199 | 204 | 92 | 135 | 11 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| **Week 9 - 3 December 2018** | **817** | 232 | 224 | 124 | 92 | 139 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| **Week 10 - 10 December 2018** | **681** | 171 | 176 | 108 | 85 | 137 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 11 - 17 December 2018** | **799** | 222 | 206 | 136 | 95 | 133 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 12 - 24 December 2018** | **961** | 253 | 293 | 197 | 113 | 98 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| **Week 13 - 31 December 2018** | **1645** | 457 | 438 | 370 | 206 | 156 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 12 |
| **Week 14 - 7 January 2019** | **2404** | 528 | 407 | 680 | 423 | 276 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 86 |
| **Week 15 - 14 January 2019** | **1080** | 211 | 175 | 106 | 295 | 207 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 80 |
| **Week 16 - 21 January 2019** | **564** | 100 | 115 | 100 | 48 | 169 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 20 |

| ALL - COMMUNAL FULL/ OVERFLOWING BINS SERVICE REQUESTS | All Communal | Residual | Side Loading Residual | Packaging/ Recycling | Food | Glass | Paper | Bin Room | Bulk Room | Textile |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Week 1 - 8 October 2018** | **381** | 133 | 37 | 149 | 17 | 7 | 24 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 2 - 15 October 2018** | **420** | 134 | 21 | 159 | 22 | 34 | 30 | 20 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 3 - 22 October 2018** | **469** | 116 | 14 | 195 | 33 | 43 | 52 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 4 - 29 October 2018** | **666** | 169 | 33 | 292 | 41 | 49 | 53 | 28 | 0 | 1 |
| **Week 5 - 5 November 2018** | **706** | 211 | 35 | 279 | 62 | 46 | 57 | 16 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 6 - 12 November 2018** | **614** | 146 | 17 | 257 | 62 | 23 | 46 | 61 | 0 | 2 |
| **Week 7 - 19 November 2018** | **520** | 139 | 25 | 217 | 44 | 33 | 43 | 19 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 8 - 26 November 2018** | **498** | 178 | 19 | 184 | 49 | 20 | 25 | 23 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 9 - 3 December 2018** | **412** | 133 | 16 | 160 | 32 | 22 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 10 - 10 December 2018** | **515** | 180 | 25 | 163 | 45 | 41 | 29 | 31 | 0 | 1 |
| **Week 11 - 17 December 2018** | **659** | 182 | 14 | 287 | 57 | 54 | 41 | 24 | 0 | 0 |
| **Week 12 - 24 December 2018** | **464** | 146 | 17 | 192 | 20 | 41 | 30 | 16 | 2 | 0 |
| **Week 13 - 31 December 2018** | **732** | 150 | 26 | 312 | 38 | 144 | 33 | 28 | 1 | 0 |
| **Week 14 - 7 January 2019** | **883** | 193 | 25 | 361 | 90 | 128 | 65 | 20 | 0 | 1 |
| **Week 15 - 14 January 2019** | **617** | 148 | 14 | 237 | 84 | 71 | 38 | 24 | 0 | 1 |
| **Week 16 - 21 January 2019** | **451** | 90 | 28 | 175 | 64 | 37 | 42 | 14 | 0 | 1 |

**QUESTION NO 20**

**By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 7 February 2019**

**Question** **(1)** How many children have been refused entry into their catchment Primary school since 2016?

Please sort by Ward and name each school

**Answer** **(1)** Please see table below.

**Question** **(2)** How many children have been refused entry into their catchment Secondary school since 2016?

Please sort by Ward and name each school

**Answer** **(2)** Please see table below.

| WARD NAME | WARD NO | CONTAINS SCHOOL | School | Catchment Turned Down as at August 2016 | Catchment Turned Down as at August 2017 | Catchment Turned Down as at August 2018 | Grand Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Almond | 1 | Y | Cramond Primary School | | | 1 | 1 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | Dalmeny Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | Davidson's Mains Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | Echline Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | Hillwood Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | Kirkliston Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | Queensferry Primary School | | | 3 | 3 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | St Margaret's RC Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | Queensferry High School | | | | 0 |
| Almond | 1 | Y | The Royal High Secondary School | | | | 0 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Clovenstone Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Currie Primary School | | 1 | | 1 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Dean Park Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Juniper Green Primary School | | 1 | | 1 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Nether Currie Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Ratho Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Balerno Community High School | | | | 0 |
| Pentland Hills | 2 | Y | Currie High School | | | | 0 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | Clermiston Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | East Craigs Primary School | 3 | | | 3 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | Fox Covert Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | Gylemuir Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | St Andrew's Fox Covert RC Primary School | 3 | 2 | | 5 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | Craigmount High School | | | | 0 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | Forrester High School | | | | 0 |
| Drum Brae/Gyle | 3 | Y | St Augustine's RC High School | | | 1 | 1 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | Craigroyston Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | Forthview Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | Granton Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | Pirniehall Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | Trinity Primary School | | | 2 | 2 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | Wardie Primary School | | | | 0 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | Holy Cross RC Primary School | 4 | 10 | 7 | 21 |
| Forth | 4 | Y | St David's RC Primary School (Edin) | 12 | 7 | 9 | 28 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Forth** | **4** | **Y** | **Trinity Academy** | | | | **0** |
| **Forth** | **4** | **Y** | **Craigroyston Community High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Inverleith** | **5** | **Y** | **Blackhall Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Inverleith** | **5** | **Y** | **Ferryhill Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Inverleith** | **5** | **Y** | **Flora Stevenson Primary School** | | | 2 | **2** |
| **WARD NAME** | **WARD NO** | **CONTAINS SCHOOL** | **School** | **Catchment Turned Down as at August 2016** | **Catchment Turned Down as at August 2017** | **Catchment Turned Down as at August 2018** | **Grand Total** |
| **Inverleith** | **5** | **Y** | **Stockbridge Primary School** | | 1 | | **1** |
| **Inverleith** | **5** | **Y** | **Broughton High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Corstorphine/Murrayfield** | **6** | **Y** | **Carrick Knowe Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Corstorphine/Murrayfield** | **6** | **Y** | **Corstorphine Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Corstorphine/Murrayfield** | **6** | **Y** | **Roseburn Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Balgreen Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Broomhouse Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Canal View Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Dalry Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Longstone Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Murrayburn Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Sighthill Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Stenhouse Primary School** | | | 3 | **3** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **St Joseph's RC Primary School (Edin)** | 1 | 13 | | **14** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Tynecastle High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Sighthill/Gorgie** | **7** | **Y** | **Wester Hailes Education Centre** | | | | **0** |
| **Colinton/Fairmilehead** | **8** | **Y** | **Bonaly Primary School** | | 1 | | **1** |
| **Colinton/Fairmilehead** | **8** | **Y** | **Buckstone Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Colinton/Fairmilehead** | **8** | **Y** | **Colinton Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Colinton/Fairmilehead** | **8** | **Y** | **Oxgangs Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Colinton/Fairmilehead** | **8** | **Y** | **Pentland Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Colinton/Fairmilehead** | **8** | **Y** | **St Mark's RC Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart** | **9** | **Y** | **Craiglockhart Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart** | **9** | **Y** | **Tollcross Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart** | **9** | **Y** | **St Cuthbert's RC Primary School** | 5 | 8 | 6 | **19** |
| **Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart** | **9** | **Y** | **Firrhill High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Meadows/Morningside** | **10** | **Y** | **Bruntsfield Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Meadows/Morningside** | **10** | **Y** | **James Gillespie's Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Meadows/Morningside** | **10** | **Y** | **South Morningside Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Meadows/Morningside** | **10** | **Y** | **St Peter's RC Primary School** | 9 | 6 | 2 | **17** |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Meadows/Morningside** | **10** | **Y** | **Boroughmuir High School** | | 1 | 5 | **6** |
| **Meadows/Morningside** | **10** | **Y** | **James Gillespie's High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Meadows/Morningside** | **10** | **Y** | **St Thomas of Aquin's RC High School** | 1 | | 17 | **18** |
| **City Centre** | **11** | **Y** | **Abbeyhill Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **City Centre** | **11** | **Y** | **Royal Mile Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **City Centre** | **11** | **Y** | **St Mary's RC Primary School (Edin)** | 1 | 10 | 1 | **12** |
| **Leith Walk** | **12** | **Y** | **Broughton Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Leith Walk** | **12** | **Y** | **Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce** | | | | **0** |
| **Leith Walk** | **12** | **Y** | **Leith Walk Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **WARD NAME** | **WARD NO** | **CONTAINS SCHOOL** | **School** | **Catchment Turned Down as at August 2016** | **Catchment Turned Down as at August 2017** | **Catchment Turned Down as at August 2018** | **Grand Total** |
| **Leith Walk** | **12** | **Y** | **Lorne Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Leith Walk** | **12** | **Y** | **Drummond Community High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Leith** | **13** | **Y** | **Hermitage Park Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Leith** | **13** | **Y** | **Leith Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Leith** | **13** | **Y** | **Victoria Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Leith** | **13** | **Y** | **St Mary's RC Primary School (Leith)** | 5 | 8 | | **13** |
| **Leith** | **13** | **Y** | **Leith Academy** | | | | **0** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **Craigentinny Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **Duddingston Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **Parsons Green Primary School** | 1 | | | **1** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **The Royal High Primary School** | 2 | | | **2** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **St John's RC Primary School** | 2 | 10 | 3 | **15** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **St Ninian's RC Primary School (Edin)** | 4 | | | **4** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **Portobello High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Craigentinny/Duddingston** | **14** | **Y** | **Holy Rood RC High School** | | 14 | 11 | **25** |
| **Southside/Newington** | **15** | **Y** | **Preston Street Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Southside/Newington** | **15** | **Y** | **Prestonfield Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Southside/Newington** | **15** | **Y** | **Sciennes Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **Craigour Park Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **Gilmerton Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **Gracemount Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **Liberton Primary School** | 3 | | 4 | **7** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **St Catherine's RC Primary School** | 9 | 23 | 4 | **36** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **St John Vianney RC Primary School** | 1 | 5 | | **6** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **Gracemount High School** | | | | **0** |
| **Liberton/Gilmerton** | **16** | **Y** | **Liberton High School** | | | | **0** |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Portobello/Craigmillar** | **17** | **Y** | **Brunstane Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Portobello/Craigmillar** | **17** | **Y** | **Castleview Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Portobello/Craigmillar** | **17** | **Y** | **Newcraighall Primary School** | | 1 | | **1** |
| **Portobello/Craigmillar** | **17** | **Y** | **Niddrie Mill Primary School** | | | | **0** |
| **Portobello/Craigmillar** | **17** | **Y** | **Towerbank Primary School** | | 1 | 2 | **3** |
| **Portobello/Craigmillar** | **17** | **Y** | **St Francis' RC Primary School** | 16 | | 1 | **17** |
| **Portobello/Craigmillar** | **17** | **Y** | **Castlebrae High School** | | | | |
| **Total** | | | | **82** | **123** | **84** | **289** |