

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 30 May 2019

Present:-

DEPUTE CONVENER

Councillor Joan Griffiths

COUNCILLORS

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

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

1 City of Edinburgh Climate Emergency Partnership – Motion by Councillor Burgess

a) Deputation- Transition Edinburgh, Extinction Rebellion Edinburgh and Scottish Youth Climate Strike

The deputation stressed that a radical change in approach to climate change was required now. They supported the proposal to create a City of Edinburgh Climate Emergency Partnership which they felt was a positive action towards reducing carbon and other greenhouse gas emissions which needed to be prioritised across all sectors.

The deputation urged the Council to consider setting up working groups with residents to weigh up the issues and add individuals voices into the Climate Emergency Partnership. They felt that collaboration between all affected groups would be on an unprecedented scale and welcomed the opportunity to work with the Council on this issue.

b) Motion by Councillor Burgess

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

“This Council;

- 1) Notes the decision by the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee on 14 May 2019 to agree a Climate Emergency target of net-zero carbon by 2030;
- 2) Notes that for Edinburgh to achieve this target it will be beneficial for the City’s public bodies, businesses, institutions and organisations to work together and that this Council can play a key role in bringing these city-wide partners together;
- 3) Therefore agrees that the Council will approach potential partners with a view to establishing a City of Edinburgh Climate Emergency Partnership and requests a report back to the Corporate, Policy and Strategy Committee on the responses received and on taking this partnership forward.”

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Burgess:

- 1) To note the decision by the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee on 14 May 2019 to agree a Climate Emergency target of net-zero carbon by 2030.

- 2) To note that for Edinburgh to achieve this target it would be beneficial for the City's public bodies, businesses, institutions and organisations to work together and that this Council could play a key role in bringing these city-wide partners together.
- 3) To therefore agree that the Council would approach potential partners with a view to establishing a City of Edinburgh Climate Emergency Partnership as part of a range of potential mechanisms to deliver our climate target and request a report back to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee on the responses received and on taking this partnership forward.

2 Minutes

Decision

- 1) To approve the minute of the Special Meeting of Council of 12 May 2019 as a correct record.
- 2) To approve the minute of the Council of 12 May 2019 as a correct record.

3 Questions

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

4 Leader's Report

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

- Open streets initiative
- Climate change target
- Waste collections
- People's Survey result

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Councillor Whyte | - | Neighbourhood networks |
| Councillor Booth | - | Action to tackle air quality in the City – Euro 5 Taxis |
| Councillor Aldridge | - | Additional funding for the IJB |
| | - | Revenue Budget Framework 2019/24 – Options for further cuts |

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Councillor Doran | - | Welcome to Woodland Trust to the Chambers - support |
| Councillor Kate Campbell | - | Council approach to homelessness |
| Councillor Cook | - | Future charging for uplift of garden waste |
| Councillor Main | - | Four Seasons Health Care – Financial problems – unused care beds |
| Councillor Lang | - | Financial plans |
| Councillor Munro | - | Funding for Edinburgh – request to meet the finance minister to lobby for further funding for Edinburgh |
| Councillor Work | - | EU membership |
| Councillor Duggart | - | Carbon Emission – reduction in flights in and out of Edinburgh |
| Councillor Burgess | - | Net Zero Carbon Target - 2030 |
| Councillor Rankin | - | Shared repairs service – positive feedback – Government legislation |
| Councillor Hutchison | - | Council lets – condition of properties |
| Councillor Cameron | - | Gratitude to David Martin former Councillor, MSP and MEP |

5 Pensions Committee Appointments

Details were provided on the appointment of two non-councillor members to the Pensions Committee as required by the Local Government Pension Scheme.

Decision

To agree the appointment of John Anzani (member representative) and Richard Lamont (employer representative) as members of the Pensions Committee.

(Reference – report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

6 Review of Political Management Arrangements 2019

The Council had requested a further report on a re-alignment of its political management arrangement.

Details were provided on options for possible changes to the Council's political management arrangements.

Motion

- 1) Council agrees to change to Option A as the new political management arrangements to take effect from 5 August 2019.
- 2) Council notes that governance documentation will be submitted for approval to the next Council meeting on 27 June 2019.
- 3) Agrees the change to deputations included in paragraph 4.21 and delegate authority to the Chief Executive to make the required change in Procedural Standing Orders.
- 4) Agrees that a report be submitted to the next Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee (or successor) in August 2019 reviewing the number and nature of working groups.
- 5) Agrees to amend appointments and Senior Responsibility Allowances from existing arrangements as follows:
 - (i)
 - (a) To note the Regulatory Committee is a policy making committee and in addition to its workload requirements identified in the report, would justify the appointment of a Vice-Convener and therefore;
 - (b) introduces a new senior councillor position of Vice-Convener of the Regulatory Committee/Licensing Sub-Committee, at an allowance of £26,207 with effect from 31 May 2019 and appoint Councillor Dixon to that position.
 - (ii)
 - (a) notes the Licensing Board and Governance Risk and Best Value Committee are not currently policy making committees and therefore would not justify a Vice-Convener and therefore;
 - (b) does not appoint a new Licensing Board Vice-Convener and deletes the position of Governance Risk and Best Value Vice-Convener.

- (iii) Adjusts the Convener of Licensing Board's allowance to £32,758 with effect from 31 May 2019.
- (iv) Adjusts the Opposition Group Leader's allowances to £26,207 with effect from 31 May 2019.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

Council:

Agrees:

- 1) That the changes outlined in Option A with some adjustments as outlined below would be most likely to improve the delivery of core services and allow the efficient streamlined decision making and scrutiny that is required to improve performance and deliver the necessary savings whilst ensuring basic services are delivered efficiently and effectively.
- 2) That the poor outcomes demonstrated at Agenda items 8.4 and 8.5 are partly explained by the ineffectiveness of the current political management arrangements and failures to take account of views across the Council and therefore justifies the changes outlined below.
- 3) Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee to be renamed the Corporate Policy, Strategy and Economy Committee and its membership increased to 17 comprising: 5 SNP, 5 Conservative, 3 Labour, 2 Green and 2 Liberal Democrat Councillors with the following remit:
 - a) All cross cutting strategic policy decisions to be taken in principle at this Committee to ensure a joined-up, city wide approach for decision making in the areas of its current remit and additionally:
 - b) Economic strategy to include tourism strategy;
 - c) Sustainability to ensure that all areas of the Council contribute to delivering carbon reduction and decisions in one area do not undermine other areas;
 - d) Regeneration projects;
 - e) Approval of the citywide Police and Fire Plans;
 - f) IJB partnership oversight and Strategic Planning;

- g) Strategic Transport Projects which have citywide or regional impacts;
 - h) Any project over £10 million capital cost.
- 4) Makes no change to the membership of the Finance and Resources and Education, Children and Families Committees except as per the responsibilities outlined in the remit for the Corporate Policy, Strategy and Economy Committee.
 - 5) Alters the remit of the Transport and Environment Committee as per the changes to Corporate Policy and Committee.
 - 6) Renames the Housing and Economy Committee the Housing, Homelessness and Fairwork Committee.
 - 7) Adds scrutiny of the services the Council is responsible for as part of the Health and Social Care Partnership to the remit of the Culture and Communities Committee.
 - 8) Alters the role and remits of Committees to take into consideration the changes to the Corporate Policy, Strategy and Economy Committee under the value of £10 million, scrutinise the delivery and performance of the services within the Committee's remit as per the annex to these papers which will improve the accountability of officers and focus attention on delivery of core services.
 - 9) Makes no changes to the membership and remit of the Planning, Regulatory and Governance, Risk and Best Value Committees and their sub committees except to include the Convener of the Planning Committee as a member of a Local Review Body.
 - 10) Senior Councillor Allowances:
 - Lord Provost Set by statute
 - Deputy Convener 50%
 - Leader of the council: Set by statute
 - Deputy Leader of the Council 75%
 - Convener TEC 60%
 - Convener C&F 60%
 - Convener H&E 60%
 - Convener C&C 60%
 - Convener F&R 60%

 - Planning Convener 60%

Council representative on Integrated Joint Board when appointed as:
Convener, or 60%
Vice Convener 50%

Leader Conservative Group 50%
4 x Conservatives member 40%
(if not already in receipt of a Senior Councillor Allowance)

Leader Green Group 50%
1 x Green member 40%
(if not already in receipt of a Senior Councillor Allowance)

Leader Lib Dem Group 50%
1 x Lib Dem member 40%
(if not already in receipt of a Senior Councillor Allowance)

GRBV Convener (member of opposition) 60%
Regulatory Convener 60%
Licensing Board Convener

- 11) Agrees to limit the overall Senior Councillor Allowances budget to a level 1.5% below last years' spend, reflecting the efficiency savings target Council services are being asked to achieve. Furthermore, this self-imposed reduction in the Senior Councillor Allowance will track all future savings targets outlined in Council budgets.
- 12) Notes the arrangements above is a total spend of £670,898.70, which achieves a saving of more than 1.5%.
- 13) Accepts 4.21 and 4.22 on Deputations and Working Groups.
- 14) Agrees to discontinue the current practice of Agenda Planning Meetings and instead introduce regular briefings to group representatives and independent Councillors in advance of executive committee meetings by senior officers.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte.

Amendment 2

- 1) To agree to support Option A and to support the SRA changes as written except for the changes written below.
- 2) To note that governance documentation will be submitted for approval to the next Council meeting on 27 June 2019.

- 3) To agree the change to deputations included in paragraph 4.21 and delegate authority to the Chief Executive to make the required change in Procedural Standing Orders.
- 4) To agree that a report be submitted to the next Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee (or successor) in August 2019 reviewing the number and nature of working groups.
- 5) To note that
 - a) The Edinburgh Integration Joint Board was responsible for the strategy and budget for Health and Social Care for Edinburgh.
 - b) The NHSL Board had appointed Angus McCann, NHSL Board Member as convener of the EIJB for the next 2 years.
 - c) The workload, legal duties and the political leadership of the Board would fall to Mr McCann from the end of June.

Therefore removes the allowance for EIJB convener from the Senior Councillor Remuneration.

- 6) To note that Council had appointed Councillor Ricky Henderson, Vice Convener by the EIJB. Therefore add the EIJB Vice-Convener with a Vice-Convener allowance to the Senior Councillor Remuneration.
- 7) To note that -
 - a) There was no justification given for two new vice convener positions, a Vice-Convener of the Licensing Board and Vice-Convener of Regulatory Committee, describing the special responsibilities required the post for which they would receive their allowance.
 - b) The Licensing Board had not set up the position of a Vice-Convener.
 - c) In 2017 Council appointed a Vice Convener of Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee, and that the holder of this post had not received a Vice-Convener allowance to date.
- 8) To agree not to create any new Vice-Conveners and agree to receive a report with justifications for new Vice-Conveners and recommendations for parity of remuneration in one cycle.

- moved by Councillor Mary Campbell, seconded by Councillor Booth.

Amendment 3

- 1) To agree option A subject to a further review after 12 months.
- 2) Otherwise to agree the report subject to the following adjustments:
 - a) That the position of vice convener of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board be awarded an SRA at the same level as other vice conveners.
 - b) That the issue of potential SRAs for a Vice Convener of Regulatory, Vice Convener of Licensing Board and Vice Convener of Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee be continued for a report on the specific roles and responsibilities which would be expected of vice conveners in these positions to warrant the payment of any such special responsibility allowance, in line with the instructions of the Council meeting of 2 May 2019.
 - c) That, in considering SRAs at the next review in 2020, all vice convener positions be subject to evaluation of the role, workload and special responsibilities to ensure they reached a threshold to justify additional responsibility payments.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Lang

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 26 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 17 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 8 votes |
| For Amendment 3 | - | 6 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

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

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

Abstentions: Councillors Barrie, Bridgman and Graczyk.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 3 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendments 1 and 2.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 26 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 17 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 14 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

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

Abstentions: Councillors Barrie, Bridgman and Graczyk.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell and a third vote was taken between the Motion and Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 26 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 23 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

Abstentions: Councillors Barrie, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(References – Act of Council No 14 of 7 February 2019; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

7 Added Members and Voting Rights on the Education, Children and Families Committee

The Council had agreed to seek external counsel advice on added members and voting rights on the Education, Children and Families Committee. This had confirmed that it was competent for the Council to confer or remove voting rights from the added members.

Motion

- 1) To note the legal position that it was within the Council's powers to confer or remove voting rights of added members on the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 2) To delay determination of whether to add members and whether or not to remove voting rights of added members to the August sitting of Council, to allow time for a review of similar proposals being implemented by Perth and Kinross Council.
- 3) To ask officers to provide an update report for the meeting of the Council in August 2019 to include information on the outcomes of changes to voting rights of added members on the Education and Lifelong Learning Committee of Perth and Kinross Council.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dickie

Amendment

- 1) To note the legal position that it was within the Council's powers to confer or remove voting rights of added members on the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 2) To recognise the valuable contribution from all additional members on the committee but agree that these should be non-voting positions.

- 3) To offer the opportunity for young people to be represented on the Committee and ask Council officers to discuss with appropriate youth organisations what form this should take, and report back to the Education Children and Families Committee within two cycles.
- 4) To offer a second place on the Committee to a parent representative.
- 5) To note that if the parents or pupils accept the offered place on Committee, this would be subject to a further report to Full Council on any changes required to comply with the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973.

- moved by Councillor Mary Campbell, seconded by Councillor Young

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 46 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 14 votes |

(For the motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Rose, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Work

For the amendment: Councillors Aldridge, Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Gloyer, Lang, Main, Miller, Osler, Rae, Neil Ross, Staniforth and Young.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Perry.

(References – Act of Council No 4 of 2 May 2019; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

8 Report of Pre-Determination Hearing – 2 Eastfield Road, Edinburgh (At Land 160 Metres North of) – referral from the Development Management Sub-Committee

The Development Management Sub-Committee had referred a report on an application for planning permission in principle, which was the subject of a pre-determination hearing under the procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedures) (Scotland) Regulations 2008, for decision.

Motion

To grant planning permission in principle subject to the conditions, reasons, informatives and legal agreements and notification to Scottish Ministers.

Conditions

1) Following this grant of planning permission in principle the first application for the approval of matters specified in conditions submitted to the Council, shall obtain approval for all strategic site infrastructure including:

- Open Space and Landscaping outwith the Development Plots;
- Public Realm (Tram Square and Link to Eastfield Road);
- Site Access (Details of all access points, the upgrading of Eastfield Road and the A8 dumbbells junction);
- Primary Access Roads (including the Gogar Link Road);
- Strategic Cycle Routes (to north of A8, to the eastern edge of the site within the Central Parkland and Eastfield Road); and
- Common SUDS and Flood Management Infrastructure.

These details shall include all matters relating to the setting out, formation, layout and implementation and shall be substantially in accordance with the principles established through the following plans and documents, as approved as part of the planning permission in principle:-

- Plan 02 - Estate Infrastructure;
- Plan 08 - Conceptual Masterplan - Landscape Framework;
- Plan 10 - Conceptual Masterplan - Movement and Access;
- Plan 12 - Conceptual Masterplan - SUDS Strategy;
- Plan 14 - Conceptual Masterplan - Estate Infrastructure and Landscape;
- IBG Phase 1 Masterplan, Development Guidance February 2019;
- IBG Phase 1 Masterplan, Plot Principles, March 2019; and
- IBG Phase 1 Masterplan, Implementation Strategy, February 2019.

The submission of details for the Strategic Site Infrastructure as outlined in condition 1 above shall be accompanied by a detailed Phasing and Implementation Plan, this shall be substantially based upon the principles established through the Implementation Strategy. This information shall include:

- Finalised Site Levels;
- Site Wide Tree Survey and Tree Constraints Plan;
- Flooding and Drainage Information; and
- Land Contamination.

- 2) No development shall be undertaken on sites, and no applications for the approval of matters specified in conditions (as required by condition 8 below) shall be submitted, until the matters outlined in condition one have been submitted. Any subsequent applications for the approval of matters specified in condition shall be submitted in accordance with the detailed strategic matters and phasing approved under condition one.
- 3) Any application for approval of matters specified in conditions (AMC application) made to the Council for any subsequent plot, or plots, within the planning permission in principle application (PPP application) site shall include a suitably updated version of the masterplan [implementation strategy] that identifies all previous AMC application consents and maintains the primacy of the class 4 business uses across the entirety of the application site.

All AMC applications shall be substantially in accordance with the requirements of the following approved documents:-

- Plan 02 - Estate Infrastructure;
 - Plan 03B - Plot Parameters - Development Parameters;
 - Plan 04B - Plot Parameters - Maximum Building Heights;
 - Plan 05A - Plot Parameters – Uses;
 - Plan 08 - Conceptual Masterplan - Landscape Framework;
 - Plan 10 - Concept Masterplan - Movement and Access;
 - Plan 12 - Conceptual Masterplan - SUDS Strategy;
 - Plan 14 - Conceptual Masterplan - Estate Infrastructure and Landscape;
 - IBG Phase 1 Masterplan, Development Guidance, February 2019;
 - IBG Phase 1 Masterplan, Plot Principles, March 2019; and
 - IBG Phase 1 Masterplan, Implementation Strategy, February 2019.
- 4) All further applications for approval of matters specified in conditions (AMC application) shall ensure that the overall development of the site shall be comprised of:
 - a minimum overall floorspace of class 4, 'business' uses of 58% of that development;
 - a maximum floorspace of class 7, 'hotel' uses of 40,388 square metres;
 - a maximum of 396 residential units comprised of either, townhouses (class 9 residential) or flatted residential units (*sui-generis* use); and
 - other ancillary uses comprised of: class 1, 'retail'; class 2, 'financial and professional services'; class 3, 'food and drink'; class 10, 'non-residential institution'; and class 11, 'assembly and leisure'; of a maximum of 5,439 square metres or 2% of the overall development of the site.

- 5) Any proposed development of classes 1, 2 or 3 shall be limited to a maximum individual unit size of 250 square metres. Any proposals in excess of this size shall be required to demonstrate compliance with the retail policies of the relevant Local Development Plan, through the submission of supporting information.
- 6) Any proposed individual unit for use within classes 10 or 11 shall be limited in size to 1,500 square metres.
- 7) Each AMC relating to phased sub sections or individual plots, must be submitted to demonstrate; a) the relationship with the approved masterplan context and planning permission in principle; b) where the development plot is proposed to be phased, design proposals should demonstrate the relationship with the context of the wider plot; and c) proposed disposition of uses within the plot, as relevant to the particular submission.
- 8) Prior to the commencement of works on each site for each phases of development, the details of under-noted matters shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, in the form of a detailed layout of that phase of the site and include detailed plans, sections and elevations of the buildings and all other structures, including finished site levels. Each application for the development for phased sub sections or individual plots shall be supported by an updated Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) and shall demonstrate a range of building heights as per the principles outlined in the LDP and WESDF.

No building or structure shall exceed the maximum heights as depicted in Plan 04B - Plot Parameters - Maximum Building Heights. Buildings should be designed to achieve a range of heights from 4 storeys (12-22 metres AGL) to 8 storeys (24-38 metres AGL) to ensure a good quality townscape is created and that reasonable levels of sunlight and daylight are achieved, particularly to adjacent areas of public realm and open space. Visual impacts arising from building heights and the articulation of roofscape must also be considered.

Approval of Matters:

- (a) details of the siting, design and height of development, including design of all external features and glazing specifications (including acoustic capabilities);
- (b) design and configuration of public and open spaces, all external materials and finishes, and details of the play equipment associated with residential;
- (c) car, motorcycle and cycle parking, access, road layouts and alignment, including a Stage 2 Quality Audit, classification of streets, servicing

areas, street lighting and electric charging points, further transport information:

- (d) footpaths and cycle routes, including proposed multi-use paths and the signage of pedestrian and cycle access links, including lighting details;
- (e) waste management and recycling facilities;
- (f) surface water management plan and Sustainable Drainage Scheme (SuDS);
- (g) site investigation/decontamination arrangements;
- (h) full details of sustainability measures in accordance with Edinburgh

Standards for Sustainable Building;

- (l) hard and soft landscaping details, including:
 - (i) boundary treatments (overall site and individual plots);
 - (ii) walls, fences, gates and any other boundary treatments;
 - (iii) the location of new trees, shrubs and hedges;
 - (iv) a schedule of plants to comprise species, plant size and proposed number/density;
 - (v) programme of completion and subsequent maintenance;
 - (vi) existing and proposed services such as cables, pipelines, substations;
 - (vii) other artefacts and structures such as street furniture, including lighting columns and fittings, and play equipment;
 - (viii) details of phasing of these works; and
 - (ix) existing and finished ground levels in relation to Ordnance Datum.
- 9) No demolition or any other form of development shall take place on the site until the applicant has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work (including excavation, reporting and analysis, publication, interpretation, public engagement) in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has first been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.
- 10) No development shall take place on the site until the applicant has secured the preservation and/or conservation of the former RAF Turnhouse, World War II era pill box in accordance with a conservation design which has first been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.
- 11) No development shall take place until:
- (a) A site survey (including intrusive investigation where necessary) must be carried out to establish, either that the level of risk posed to human health and the wider environment by contaminants in, on or under the land is acceptable, or that remedial and/or protective measures could be undertaken to bring the risks to an acceptable level in relation to the development; and

- (b) Where necessary, a detailed schedule of any required remedial and/or protective measures, including their programming, must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

Any required remedial and/or protective measures, identified by the site survey shall be implemented in accordance with the approved schedule and documentary evidence to certify those works shall be provided, for the approval of the Planning Authority, before the commencement of any construction works on the site.

- 12) No development shall commence on any residential plot until an acoustic scheme for the protection of the proposed residential development from transport and commercial noise (proposed and existing) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. That acoustic scheme shall include full details of any proposed acoustic glazing or barrier(s) and, thereafter, all works, which form part of the approved acoustic scheme, shall be completed on site to the satisfaction of the Planning Authority before any part of the residential development is first occupied.
- 13) The applicant must prepare and identify all existing and proposed Surface Water Flow Paths on drawings, based upon the findings of the Flood Risk Assessment, including updated proposed site levels. By taking the post-development arrangement include runoff from outwith the site, from unpaved areas within the site, and from paved areas in events which would exceed the capacity of the drainage system.

The drainage strategy shall be designed in accordance with the following standards:-

- The construction industry research and information association (CIRIA), 'Sustainable Drainage System Manual', C753;
 - Scottish Water's, Sewers for Scotland, version 4; in terms of specification for the design, construction and vesting of new sewerage infrastructure assets; and
 - Micro drainage calculations to support the site showing no flooding during the 1:200 year, plus a 30% climate change event, when calculating attenuation storage on the site.
- 14) No development shall take place on the site until a Construction Environmental Management Plan: Biodiversity & Landscape (CEMP), has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. The CEMP should include mitigation as detailed in the Environmental Statement, Chapter 4. (Table 4-7 Summary of Effects Table Ecology and Nature Conservation) and including updates as appropriate, from the report: "Edinburgh International Business Gateway, Ecological Baseline Review, WSP, v2.0 November 2018".

It should also clearly link to the relevant elements of the proposed landscaping plans, which forms part of the proposed ecological mitigation. Thereafter, the CEMP shall be adhered to in full throughout the duration the construction phase of the proposed development.

- 15) All further applications for approval of matters specified in conditions (AMC application) shall comply with the provisions as set out associated in the Air Quality Assessment report (as amended) (March 2018) and to provide further plot specific details in order to suitably reduce air quality assessment levels changes to a minimum in accordance with the Council's Air Quality Action Plan.
- 16) Development shall not commence until a Bird Hazard Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by Edinburgh Airport and the Planning Authority. The submitted plan shall include details of:
 - Monitoring of any standing water within the site temporary or permanent; Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SuDS) - Such schemes shall comply with Advice Note 3 'Wildlife Hazards' (available at: <http://.aoa.org.uk/policy-campaigns/operations-safety/>) ;
 - Management of any flat/shallow pitched/green roofs on buildings within the site which may be attractive to nesting, roosting and "loafing" birds. The management plan shall comply with Advice note 3 'Wildlife Hazards';
 - Reinstatement of grass areas
 - Maintenance of planted and landscaped areas, particularly in terms of height and species of plants that are allowed to grow;
 - Which waste material can be brought onto the site/what if any exceptions, e.g. green waste;
 - Monitoring of waste imports (although this may be covered by the site licence);
 - Physical arrangements for the collection (including litter bins) and storage of putrescible waste, arrangements for and frequency of the removal of putrescible waste; and
 - Signs deterring people from feeding the birds.

The Bird Hazard Management Plan shall be implemented as approved by Edinburgh Airport and the Planning Authority, on completion of development and shall remain in force for the life of the development. No subsequent alterations to the plan are to take place unless first submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority.

- 17) No development shall take place until full details of soft and water landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority, details must comply with Advice Note 3 'Potential Bird Hazards from

Amenity Landscaping & Building Design' (available at: <http://www.aoa.org.uk/operationssafety/>). These details shall include:

- (i) any earthworks;
- (ii) grassed areas;
- (iii) the species, number and spacing of trees and shrubs;
- (iv) details of any water features;
- (v) drainage details including Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SuDS) – Such schemes must comply with Advice Note 6 'Potential Bird Hazards from SuDS (available at: <http://www.aoa.org.uk/policy-safeguarding.htm>) ; and
- (vi) others that the applicant or the Planning Authority may specify and having regard to Advice Note 3: Potential Bird Hazards from Amenity Landscaping and Building Design and Note 6 on SuDS].

No subsequent alterations to the approved landscaping scheme are to take place unless submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

- 18) Development shall not commence until details of the Sustainable Drainage Schemes (SuDS) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. Details must comply with Advice Note 6 'Potential Bird Hazards from SuDS'. The submitted Plan shall include details of:
- (i) attenuation times;
 - (ii) profiles & dimensions of water bodies; and
 - (iii) details of marginal planting.

No subsequent alterations to the approved SuDS scheme are to take place unless first submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority. The scheme shall be implemented as approved.

- 19) No development shall take place on the site until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP): relating to Noise, has been submitted to and approved by the Planning Authority. Thereafter, the CEMP shall be adhered to in full throughout the duration the construction phase of the proposed development.

Reasons:-

- 1) In order to enable the planning authority to consider this/these matter/s in detail.
- 2) In order to enable the planning authority to consider this/these matter/s in detail.

- 3) In order to enable the planning authority to consider this/these matter/s in detail.
- 4) In order to allow the planning authority to suitably control the future development of the site ensuring a primacy of class 4, 'business' uses.
- 5) In order to allow the planning authority to suitably control the future development of the site ensuring a primacy of class 4, 'business' uses.
- 6) In order to enable the Head of Planning to consider this/these matter/s in detail.
- 7) In order to enable the planning authority to consider this/these matter/s in detail.
- 8) In order to enable the Head of Planning to consider this/these matter/s in detail.
- 9) In order to accord with the statutory requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997 and to enable the Planning Authority to consider these matters in detail.
- 10) In order to safeguard the interests of archaeological heritage.
- 11) In order to safeguard the interests of archaeological heritage.
- 12) In order to ensure that the site is suitable for redevelopment, given the nature of previous uses/processes on the site.
- 13) In order to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and other occupiers.
- 14) To ensure sustainable flood risk management is adopted in the long term development of the site, so as to identify and prevent any significant re-direction of surface flows to surrounding land and surface water flow towards neighbouring property entrances.
- 15) In order to ensure that the construction and development phases of the site works are undertaken in so as to mitigate its impact on and to protect the existing biodiversity and landscape of the site and its immediate surroundings.
- 16) In order to suitably address air quality matters resulting from the proposed development, specifically on sensitive receptors and to reduce emissions generated by traffic generated by the development of the site.

- 17) It is necessary to manage the development in order to minimise its attractiveness to birds which could endanger the safe movement of aircraft and the operation of Edinburgh Airport.
- 18) To avoid endangering the safe movement of aircraft and the operation of Edinburgh Airport through the attraction of birds and an increase in the bird hazard risk of the site.
- 19) In order to safeguard the amenity of neighbouring residents and other occupiers.

Informatives

It should be noted that:

- 1) No development shall take place on the site until a 'Notice of Initiation of Development' has been submitted to the Council stating the intended date on which the development is to commence. Failure to do so constitutes a breach of planning control, under Section 123(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act 1997.
- 2) As soon as practicable upon the completion of each phase of the development of the site, as authorised in the associated grant of permission, a 'Notice of Completion of Development' must be given, in writing to the Council.
- 3) A legal agreement is required to cover the following matters:

A minimum 25% of the total units (99 homes) should be secured on-site as approved affordable housing tenures through legal agreement. The applicant is in agreement to this requirement. This aspect of the proposal would address the requirements of LDP Policy Hou 6, Affordable Housing.

Education

The required contribution should be based on established 'per house' and 'per flat' contribution figures set out below and secured through legal agreement:-

Flats £3,216 (infrastructure) £476 (land)

Houses £16,186 (infrastructure) £2,042 (land)

The infrastructure contribution element will be index linked and the land contribution will not.

Transport

The application is located within the West Edinburgh Transport Contribution Zone- the following mitigation measures to be delivered by the applicant:

- 1) Walking/cycling infrastructure - completing the missing link from IBG to the RBS junction
- 2) Public transport infrastructure - dedicated bus lanes around the Eastfield Road dumbbells;
- 3) Road infrastructure - dualling of Eastfield Road to the IBG Northern Access, improvements to the dumbbells and westbound off-slip; and
- 4) Intelligent transport systems - MOVA is a strategy for the control of traffic light systems, proposed to be implemented at Newbridge, Eastfield Road dumbbells, Gogar + Maybury in addition to Eastfield Road dualling works.

Edinburgh Tram

Transport have requested that a contribution to the Edinburgh Tram be sought in line with the LDP Supplementary Guidance. The calculated sum based on the current development proposals is £13,172,090.

The sum is to be indexed as appropriate and the use period to be 10 years from the date of final payment.

Health Care

The Supplementary Guidance identifies new practice accommodation as part of a Health Centre to mitigate impact of new residential development in West Edinburgh (this includes Maybury, South Gyle, Edinburgh Park and IBG).

A sum of £1,050 per dwelling (£4m/8,000 = £500 per patient) will be payable in relation to the residential development.

- 4) Should the applicant wish to construct greater than 1,000 car parking spaces then a 'Controlled Activities Regulation (CAR) Authorisation' will be required from the Scottish Environmental Protection Authority (SEPA). The applicant should seek the necessary authorisation at an appropriate time in the design process in order to accommodate SEPA's comments and potential requirements.
- 5) All car parking, where not controlled private off-street parking, will be subject to control as part of the West Edinburgh Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). Suitable Traffic Order(s) will require to be promoted and implemented at no cost to the Council.

- 6) All accesses must be open for use by the public in terms of the statutory definition of 'road' and require to be subject of applications for road construction consent. The extent of adoptable roads, including footways, footpaths, accesses, cycle tracks, verges and service strips to be agreed. The applicant should note that this will include details of lighting, drainage, Sustainable Urban Drainage, materials, structures, layout, car and cycle parking numbers including location, design and specification. Particular attention must be paid to ensuring that refuse collection vehicles are able to service the site. The applicant is recommended to contact the Council's waste management team to agree details. The Council will expect to adopt any road constructed under a road construction consent.
- 7) The applicant must be informed that any proposed on-street parking spaces cannot be allocated to individual properties, nor can they be subject of sale or rent. The spaces will form part of the road and as such will be available to all road users. Private enforcement is illegal and only the Council as roads authority has the legal right to control on-street spaces, whether the road has been adopted or not. The developer is expected to make this clear to prospective residents.
- 8) All disabled persons parking bays should comply with the Disabled Persons Parking Places (Scotland) Act 2009. The Act places a duty on the local authority to promote proper use of parking places for disabled persons' vehicles. The applicant should therefore advise the Council if he wishes the bays to be enforced under legislation. A contribution of £2,000 will be required to progress each necessary traffic order but this does not require to be included in any legal agreement. All disabled persons parking places must comply with Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 regulations of British Standards 8300:2009 as approved.
- 9) Electric vehicle charging outlets should be considered for this development including dedicated parking spaces with charging facilities to be readily accommodated in the future. For residential land uses, passive provision to be provided as a minimum, including ducting and infrastructure such that charging points can be readily accommodated in the future.
- 10) The proposed site is on or adjacent to the operational Edinburgh Tram. Therefore, the applicant shall consult with Edinburgh Trams regarding construction timing. This is due to the potential access implications of construction/delivery vehicles and likely traffic implications as a result of diversions in the area which could impact delivery to, and works at, the site. Tram power lines are over 5 metres above the tracks and do not pose a danger to pedestrians and motorists at ground level or to those living and working in the vicinity of the tramway. However, the applicant should be informed that there are potential dangers and, prior to commencing work near

the tramway, a safe method of working must be agreed with Edinburgh Trams and authorisation to work obtained. Authorisation is needed for any of the following works either on or near the tramway:

- Any work where part of the site such as tools, materials, machines, suspended loads of where people could enter the Edinburgh Tram Hazard Zone. For example, window cleaning or other work involving the use of ladders;
- Any work which could force pedestrians or road traffic to be diverted into the Edinburgh Trams Hazard Zone;
- Piling, using a crane, excavating more than 2 metres or erecting and dismantling scaffolding within 4 metres of the Edinburgh Tram Hazard Zone (depending upon the extent of the proposed works, a separate Asset Protection Agreement may be required to be agreed);
- Any excavation within 3 metres of any pole supporting overhead lines;
- Any work on sites near the tramway where vehicles fitted with cranes, tippers or skip loaders could come within the Edinburgh Trams Hazard Zone when equipment is in use;
- The Council and Edinburgh Trams has issued guidance to residents and businesses along the tram route and to other key organisations who may require access along the line. See the full guidance on how to get permission to work near a tram way:
<http://edinburghtrams.com/information/working-around-trams>

- 11) Cranes: Given the nature of the proposed development it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. We would, therefore, draw the applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. This is explained further in Advice Note 4, 'Cranes and Other Construction Issues' (available at: <http://www.aoa.org.uk/operations-safety/>)
- 12) Lighting: The development is close to the aerodrome and the approach to the runway. We draw attention to the need to carefully design lighting proposals. This is further explained in Advice Note 2, 'Lighting near Aerodromes' (available at: <http://www.aoa.org.uk/operations-safety/>). Please note that the Air Navigation Order 2005, Article 135 grants the Civil Aviation Authority power to serve notice to extinguish or screen lighting which may endanger aircraft.
- 13) The Bird Hazard Management Plan must ensure that flat/shallow pitched roofs be constructed to allow access to all areas by foot using permanent fixed access stairs, ladders or similar. The owner/occupier must not allow gulls, to nest, roost or loaf on the building. Checks must be made weekly or sooner if bird activity dictates, during the breeding season. Outside the breeding

season gull activity must be monitored and the roof checked regularly to ensure that gulls do not utilise the roof. Any gulls found nesting, roosting or loafing must be dispersed by the owner/occupier when detected or when requested by Edinburgh Airport Airside Operations staff. In some instances it may be necessary to contact Edinburgh Airport Airside Operations staff before the bird dispersal takes place. The owner/occupier must remove any nests or eggs found on the roof.

- 14) (a) All mobile plant introduced onto the site shall comply with the emission limits for off road vehicles as specified by EC Directive 97/68/EC. All mobile plant shall be maintained to prevent or minimise the release of dark smoke from vehicle exhausts. Details of vehicle maintenance shall be recorded.
- (b) The developer shall ensure that the risk of dust annoyance from the operations is assessed throughout the working day, taking account of wind speed, direction, and surface moisture levels. The developer shall ensure that the level of dust suppression implemented on site is adequate for the prevailing conditions. The assessment shall be recorded as part of the documented site management procedures.
- (c) Internal un-surfaced temporary roadways shall be sprayed with water at regular intervals as conditions require. The frequency of road spraying shall be recorded as part of documented site management procedures.
- (d) Surfaced roads and public road during all ground works shall be kept clean and swept at regular intervals using a road sweeper as conditions require. The frequency of road sweeping shall be recorded as part of documented site management procedure.
- (e) All vehicles operating within the site on un-surfaced roads shall not exceed 15mph to minimise the re-suspension of dust.
- (f) Where dust from the operations are likely to cause significant adverse impacts at sensitive receptors, then the operation(s) shall be suspended until the dust emissions have been abated. The time and duration of suspension of working and the reason shall be recorded.
- (g) The dust management plan shall be reviewed monthly during the construction project and the outcome of the review shall be recorded as part of the documented site management procedures.
- (h) No bonfires shall be permitted.
- 15) Applicant's attention is drawn to the EIA Noise Assessment report (sections 3.7.12 and 3.7.13) - regard shall be had to noise in the development of the residential layout - to ensure that noise issues are satisfactorily addressed. Noise assessment should be prepared on a per plot basis, this being prepared to take cognisance of the EIA findings. Regard shall be had to noise issues in the development of layouts for residential development. The applicants

attention is drawn to - Refer to EIA Addendum - Supplementary Environmental Information - Noise, March 2018 - 3.7.12 and 3.7.13) - Where such screening measures are incorporated, they will need to be imperforate, continuous, sealed at the base and selected to be compliant with B2 specification (or better) as defined within BS EN1793-2:2012: Road traffic noise reducing devices. Test Method for determining the acoustic performance. Intrinsic characteristics of airborne sound insulation under diffuse under sound field conditions.

- 16) No development shall take place in relation to Plot 8 until the Sustainable urban Drainage Scheme (SuDS) pond, situated to the north of the Park and Ride Site (also serving the Park and Ride Site), has been relocated at a position to be agreed with the Council. This is to ensure that the capacity of the existing SuDS scheme is maintained in a suitable location.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

Amendment

Council:

- 1) notes the recommendation of the Development Management Sub-Committee on a planning application, which was the subject of a pre-determination hearing under the procedures set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedures) (Scotland) Regulations 2008, to grant planning permission in principle for the reasons outlined in the report by the Chief Planning Officer;
- 2) nonetheless, agrees to refuse planning permission in principle for the following reasons:
 - 2.1) the application is contrary to policy Tra 1 Location of Major Travel Generating Development of the Local Development Plan, paragraphs a, b and c, in that the applicant has not demonstrated the suitability of the proposal regarding accessibility for modes other than car, has not demonstrated the contribution the proposal makes to achieving the Local Transport Strategy objectives, and has not given due regard to the impact of any travel demand generated by the new development on the existing road and public transport networks;
 - 2.2) the application is contrary to policy Tra 8 Provision of Transport Infrastructure, of the Local Development Plan, and paragraphs 10.5 and 11.3.1 of the West Edinburgh Transport Appraisal refresh (WETA), in that an appropriate transport assessment has not been carried out;

2.3) the application is contrary to policy Env 22 Pollution and Air, Water and Soil Quality, in that the application will contribute to the growth of Edinburgh Airport, and will therefore increase emissions of climate-changing pollution;

3) agrees to refer the decision to Scottish Ministers

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Work

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 49 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 9 votes |

(For the motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Lang, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rankin, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Young.

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

Abstentions: Councillors Jim Campbell and Howie.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Gardiner.

(References – Development Management Sub- Committee 8 May 2019 (item 2): referral from the Development Management Sub-Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

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

9 Revenue Budget Framework 2019/24 – Progress Update – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the update position on work being undertaken in regard to the revenue budget to address the action across four main areas, to the Council for ratification.

Motion

- 1) To agree the provisional 2018/19 outturn earmarking up to £5m from the Council Priorities Fund as an additional contribution to the 2019/20 budget, pending development of sustainable measures to address this savings requirement on a recurring basis.
- 2) To approve the changes to building fees for site inspections and completion of work certificates as set out in Appendix 7 with effect from 1 July 2019.
- 3) To approve use of Spend to Save funding of £0.153m to take forward the 3G pitch improvements at Leith Academy.

- moved by Councillor Rankin, seconded by Councillor Cameron

Amendment 1

- 1) To agree the provisional 2018/19 outturn earmarking up to £5m from the Council Priorities Fund as an additional contribution to the 2019/20 budget, pending development of sustainable measures to address this savings requirement on a recurring basis.
- 2) To reject the proposal to approve the increase in charges to building fees for site inspections and completion of work certificates as set out in Appendix 7 to the report by the Executive Director of Resources, with effect from 1 July 2019 and instruct the Executive Director of Resources to report back to Committee on fee charges.
- 3) To approve use of Spend to Save funding of £0.153m to take forward the 3G pitch improvements at Leith Academy.

- moved by Councillor Johnston, seconded Councillor Hutchison

Amendment 2

- 1) To agree the provisional 2018/19 outturn earmarking up to £5m from the Council Priorities Fund as an additional contribution to the 2019/20 budget, pending development of sustainable measures to address this savings requirement on a recurring basis.
- 2) To agree that Appendix 5 to the report by the Executive Director of Resources – listing examples of budget options in other councils – had no status in relation to approaches to be considered by this council and that budget options to address the revenue budget framework gap would be brought to Finance and Resources Committee on 15 August 2019.

- 3) To approve use of Spend to Save funding of £0.153m to take forward the 3G pitch improvements at Leith Academy.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Main

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 the amendment | - | 17 votes |

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rankin:

- 1) To agree the provisional 2018/19 outturn earmarking up to £5m from the Council Priorities Fund as an additional contribution to the 2019/20 budget, pending development of sustainable measures to address this savings requirement on a recurring basis.
- 2) To approve the changes to building fees for site inspections and completion of work certificates as set out in Appendix 7 with effect from 1 July 2019.
- 3) To approve use of Spend to Save funding of £0.153m to take forward the 3G pitch improvements at Leith Academy.
- 4) To agree that Appendix 5 to the report by the Executive Director of Resources – listing examples of budget options in other councils – had no status in relation to approaches to be considered by this council and that budget

options to address the revenue budget framework gap would be brought to Finance and Resources Committee on 15 August 2019.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee 23 May 2019; referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

10 2018 Edinburgh People Survey

The Corporate Policy and Resources Committee had referred a report on the 2018 Edinburgh People Survey to the Council for consideration.

Motion

- 1) To note the findings of the 2018 Edinburgh People Survey.
- 2) To note that briefings had taken place with the Corporate Leadership Team and results were being rolled out to Senior Management Teams. To also note that services were expected to mainstream any actions taken in response to the Edinburgh People Survey findings as part of the strategic planning framework.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

Council:

- 1) Notes the reports by the Chief Executive on the 2018 Edinburgh People Survey Headline Results and Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2017/2018 – Edinburgh Overview (see also item 11) and express concern that:
 - a) The 2018 People's Survey once again highlights increasing dissatisfaction amongst Edinburgh residents with core services provided to all residents and the results particularly:
 - (i) Road maintenance, pavements/footpaths, street cleaning, rubbish collection and recycling, vandalism and graffiti, antisocial behaviour and dog fouling have shown a downward trend and that this has been consistent over the last seven years of SNP/Labour run Administrations and that, most strikingly only 35% of participants felt the Council provided value for money and only 36% felt that they have a say on local issues and services.
 - b) Within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework the Council was in the bottom half of Scottish Council performance more than half of the indicators (44 of 75), that this is a worsening position over time

(36 of 75 in 2016/17) and that the number of indicators in the bottom half had increased across all the LGBF themes except Corporate services and that, once again, there are particularly poor scores on measures that relate to public satisfaction with services.

- 2) Considers that this was the result of a number of years where successive SNP/Labour Administrations had failed to properly prioritise service performance, improvement, benchmarking and Best Value to the detriment of Edinburgh citizens and the services they received.
- 3) Agrees that Edinburgh citizens deserved better and that as a large, City-based Council, Edinburgh should be using its scale and operational base to provide Scotland-leading services and further seeking to improve towards best practice on each service as measured in the UK and beyond.
- 4) To therefore instruct the Chief Executive to draw up a Comprehensive Improvement Plan setting out how the Council could achieve service standards across all services that met the Council's own SMART targets, achieved top half performance amongst Scottish Councils across all indicators and that identified measures of performance against recognised best practice.

The Comprehensive Improvement Plan should be presented to the Council within two cycles and must include specific timescales within which service improvements would be made along with plans to implement these which would be made available to be scrutinised at Council Executive Committees.

The plan should also clearly demonstrate how Council services will provide better value for money, anticipating improvement in that metric to at least 50% satisfaction by the time of the next survey.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Amendment 2

To delete the recommendations and insert:

- 1) Council is concerned that, whilst resident satisfaction with the City as a place to live and certain areas of Council performance was high, there were too many examples where resident's satisfaction with Council performance had declined significantly, for example:
 - a) 11% drop over 2 years in satisfaction with facilities for teenagers (p.137);
 - b) 10% drop in satisfaction with street cleaning (p.97);
 - c) 10% drop in satisfaction with refuse collection (p.102);

- d) 15% drop over 2 years in satisfaction with how vandalism and graffiti is dealt with (p.165);
 - e) 14% drop over 2 years in satisfaction with how antisocial behaviour is dealt with (p.170);
 - f) 10% drop over 2 years in satisfaction with the way dog fouling is dealt with (p.175);
- 2) Therefore requests that for these areas of Council performance, a further report be provided to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee within 2 cycles which includes;
- a) Further explanation of the possible reasons for the levels of satisfaction in each of these areas of Council performance
 - b) Actions that can be taken to improve performance in each of these areas of Council performance”

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

Amendment 3

Council notes with concern that increasing numbers of Edinburgh residents were dissatisfied with the way this administration was running the city.

Notes in particular their concerns about rubbish collection and recycling

Further notes that only 36 per cent of residents felt they had a say on local issues and services.

Notes that in many areas of the council's operation satisfaction with the council peaked in the final year of the Liberal Democrat led administration and that satisfaction levels had been on a decline since that time.

Given the long term downward trend in many of these areas council instructs officers to produce a consolidated action plan to address the problem areas identified by our citizens in the survey to ensure a focus on rectifying the problems.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Lang

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 27 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 16 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 8 votes |
| For Amendment 3 | - | 6 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

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

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

Abstentions: Councillors Bridgman and Graczyk.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 3 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendments 1 and 2.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 27 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 17 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 14 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

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

Abstentions: Councillors Bridgman and Graczyk.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell and a third vote was taken between the Motion and Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 27 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 22 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

Abstentions: Councillors Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(References – Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee 14 May 2019; referral from the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee, submitted.)

11 Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2017/2018 – Edinburgh Overview – referral from the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee

The Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee had referred a report on the Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2017/18 to the Council for consideration.

Motion

To note the Council's Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2017/18 analysis as presented in the Appendix to the report by the Chief Executive.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

Council:

- 1) Notes the reports by the Chief Executive on the 2018 Edinburgh People Survey Headline Results (see item 10) and Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2017/2018 – Edinburgh Overview and express concern that:
 - a) The 2018 People's Survey once again highlights increasing dissatisfaction amongst Edinburgh residents with core services provided to all residents and the results particularly:
 - (i) Road maintenance, pavements/footpaths, street cleaning, rubbish collection and recycling, vandalism and graffiti, antisocial behaviour and dog fouling have shown a downward trend and that this has been consistent over the last seven years of SNP/Labour run Administrations and that, most strikingly only 35% of participants felt the Council provided value for money and only 36% felt that they have a say on local issues and services.
 - b) Within the Local Government Benchmarking Framework the Council was in the bottom half of Scottish Council performance more than half of the indicators (44 of 75), that this is a worsening position over time (36 of 75 in 2016/17) and that the number of indicators in the bottom half had increased across all the LGBF themes except Corporate services and that, once again, there are particularly poor scores on measures that relate to public satisfaction with services.
- 2) Considers that this was the result of a number of years where successive SNP/Labour Administrations had failed to properly prioritise service performance, improvement, benchmarking and Best Value to the detriment of Edinburgh citizens and the services they received.
- 3) Agrees that Edinburgh citizens deserved better and that as a large, City-based Council, Edinburgh should be using its scale and operational base to provide Scotland-leading services and further seeking to improve towards best practice on each service as measured in the UK and beyond.

- 4) To therefore, instruct the Chief Executive to draw up a Comprehensive Improvement Plan setting out how the Council could achieve service standards across all services that met the Council's own SMART targets, achieved top half performance amongst Scottish Councils across all indicators and that identified measures of performance against recognised best practice.

The Comprehensive Improvement Plan should be presented to the Council within two cycles and must include specific timescales within which service improvements would be made along with plans to implement these which would be made available to be scrutinised at Council Executive Committees.

The plan should also clearly demonstrate how Council services will provide better value for money, anticipating improvement in that metric to at least 50% satisfaction by the time of the next survey.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the Council's Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2017/18 analysis as presented in the Appendix to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To note a number of service areas in Edinburgh which give cause for concern. These include:
 - That Edinburgh invests a third of the amount per 1,000 population on parks and greenspaces, compared to the Scottish average.
 - That Edinburgh spends less than half of the Scottish average on library services as measured by number of visitors.
 - That, despite having the highest council housing rents in Scotland, Edinburgh has poorer performance on repair response times and housing quality than most councils.
 - That Edinburgh is almost at the bottom of rankings in having council buildings which are suitable for current use.
 - That the household recycling rate in Edinburgh is lower than the national average with Edinburgh ranking 23rd out of 32 councils.
 - That Edinburgh ranks 30th out of 32 councils in satisfaction with schools.

3) Further notes

- That Edinburgh receives the lowest funding settlement per head of population from the Scottish Government of any Scottish council and, that this re-inforces the need for significant reform of local authority funding.
- That almost a decade of public sector funding cuts implemented by successive UK Governments has led to significant pressure on local government budgets; and that widely-criticised changes to welfare services have increased demands on local government services.

4) Agrees that the above issues, among many others, be taken into account in developing service improvement plans.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Booth

Amendment 3

Council welcomes the report.

Council notes with concern that the report shows satisfaction with refuse and cleansing is declining, street cleanliness scores are reducing and there is a deterioration in the condition of A, B and C class roads.

Council is concerned that recycling rates are not meeting targets, that non-emergency repairs to housing are taking too long to resolve and the percentage of housing meeting the Scottish Housing Quality Standard is poor.

Council is further concerned that staff sickness levels are increasing and are at unacceptable levels.

Council therefore calls for the production of a consolidated action plan to address these issues with timescales and targets to reverse the decline in these areas of the council's operation

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Lang

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 27 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 16 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 8 votes |
| For Amendment 3 | - | 6 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

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

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

Abstentions: Councillors Bridgman and Graczyk.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 3 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendments 1 and 2.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 27 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 16 votes |
| For Amendment 2 | - | 14 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

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

Abstentions: Councillors Bridgman and Graczyk.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell and a third vote was taken between the Motion and Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the Motion | - | 27 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 22 votes |

(For the Motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

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

Abstentions: Councillors Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(References – Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee 14 May 2019; referral from the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee, submitted.)

12 Albion Equity Ltd – Disposition of Council’s Preference Shares – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the disposition of the Council’s preference shares in Albion Equity Ltd to the Council for approval.

Decision

To approve the disposition of the Council’s preference shares in Albion Equity Ltd.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee 23 May 2019; referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Aldridge declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of his family was a Trustee of Albion Equity Ltd.

13 Homeless Rugby International - Motion by Councillor Doggart

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

“Council:

- 1) Recognises the great achievement in bringing Homeless Rugby International to Ainslie Park Edinburgh, the first venue outside England, on 15 June 2019;
- 2) Supports the value of Homeless Rugby International to “To transform the quality of life and opportunities of homeless people, using rugby as a catalyst to promote greater understanding, collaboration and support and by promoting lasting and life-enhancing relationships through clubs and charities”;
- 3) Wishes the officials, organisers and, most of all, players a successful tournament; and
- 4) Asks the Lord Provost to recognise the event in an appropriate manner.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Doggart.

14 Subject Choice in Schools - Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

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

“Council:

Acknowledges that serious concerns have emerged about whether the breadth of subject choice available as part of the Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) is sufficient to meet the needs of S4 pupils wishing to take a range of subjects to enable access to Higher or Further Education.

Notes:

- 1) The report by Reform Scotland to the Scottish Parliament that found, through Freedom of Information requests, that the minority of Scottish schools allow pupils to sit more than six National 4 and 5s with a minority offering only five subjects as standard.
- 2) Survey finding by the Scottish Parliament’s Education Committee in which 56% of the pupils who responded said they had not been able to take all of

the subjects they wanted to, while 76% of parents said this had been the case with their children.

- 3) That previously under the Standard Grade qualification pupils were routinely offered the opportunity to study and be qualified in seven or eight different subjects, with all City of Edinburgh High Schools offering eight subjects in 2016.
- 4) SCIS information that pupils attending independent schools (that use SQA qualifications) routinely offer pupils the opportunity to take eight or nine National 4 or 5 qualifications.
- 5) That Members of the Scottish Parliament have agreed an evaluation should be carried out over how Curriculum for Excellence (CfE) is being implemented in schools.

Requests a report within two cycles of the Education, Children and Families detailing:

- 1) The number of Nat 4/5 subjects available to be taken at S4 level at each City of Edinburgh high school.
- 2) The number of subjects allowed to be taken by each pupil at each City of Edinburgh high school.
- 3) The number offering the ability to take three sciences combined with Maths and English.
- 4) Information on which City of Edinburgh schools offer the ability to take Nat 5 qualifications in two or more languages.
- 5) The Council's response to the report to the Scottish Parliament's Education Committee in June, and its recommendations."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

Amendment

Council is asked

- 1) To replace the first paragraph with:
 - "1) To acknowledge the findings within the Reform Scotland Report and note this is a national report and therefore the conclusions are not

necessarily reflective of the situation in Edinburgh. To recognise that in Edinburgh it is schools, working with pupils and parents, who decide on subject choice and how many National 4s and 5s pupils sit.”

- 2) To delete the points 1 to 5 submitted for noting.
- 3) To request a report within two cycles to the Education, Children and Families Committee. This should cover the whole school experience, including subject choice, methods for gaining qualifications, including National Qualifications, Skills for Work, Vocational Qualifications, and opportunities for wider achievement. The report should detail any changes suggested by the Scottish Government after their review of the implementation of the Curriculum for Excellence and the potential impact on Edinburgh Council Schools. This will include information in relation to points 1 to 5 as identified in the final part of the motion.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dickie

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 22 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 36 votes |

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

For the amendment: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor Perry

15 Waste Collection Service - Motion by Councillor Webber

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

“Council

- a) Notes our kerbside waste collection service requests that residents present their bins on the pavement for uplift for their scheduled collection. Bins are presented with consideration of the space they use on many of the very narrow pavements.
- b) Notes visually impaired people find great difficulty negotiating the streets and pavements on scheduled collections days. With the new routes, increased collections and uptake in recycling these occurrences are now more frequent with the potential to increase risk to those affected and in particular those who are Guide Dog Owners.
- c) Recognises the challenges the visually impaired face are further exacerbated by bins that are not returned to the place they were originally presented by waste operatives who erroneously scatter them across the pavements.
- d) Calls for a report to be presented to the Transport and Environment Committee in 2 cycles to investigate the feasibility of:
 - 1) Enforcing the existing policy that states they must be returned to the place they were presented.
 - 2) Providing training to the waste crews so that they can understand the issues their actions are posing
 - a) A simple blindfold walk down a bin littered street is all that it may need for them to appreciate the difficulties.

And to

- 3) Confirm the cost and number of replacement bins that have been damaged due to being discarded in this manner.”

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Webber:

Council

- a) Notes our kerbside waste collection service requests that residents present their bins on the pavement for uplift for their scheduled collection. Bins are

presented with consideration of the space they use on many of the very narrow pavements.

- b) Notes visually impaired people find great difficulty negotiating the streets and pavements on scheduled collections days. With the new routes, increased collections and uptake in recycling these occurrences are now more frequent with the potential to increase risk to those affected and in particular those who are Guide Dog Owners.
- c) Recognises the challenges the visually impaired face are further exacerbated by bins that are not placed in the correct locations by either residents or operatives and notes the opportunity for both to be reminded of this, through internal training and public communications.
- d) Requests a report to be presented to Transport and Environment Committee in 2 cycles to update and investigate these issues and to include the feasibility of providing training to the waste crews so that they can understand the issues their actions are posing for example; a simple blindfold walk down a bin littered street is all that it may need for them to appreciate the difficulties.

And a report should also be presented to confirm the cost and number of replacement bins that have been damaged due to being discarded in this manner.

16 Full Council Does Not Welcome Donald Trump - Motion by Councillor Staniforth

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that Donald Trump is due to arrive in the UK on a state visit between 3rd and 5th of June.
- 2) Notes that it is not usual for an American President to be granted a state visit, only two previous presidents have been afforded the honour.
- 3) Notes that council has already agreed that Trump’s so-called ‘Muslim ban’ caused distress and chaos to US Muslim families, that his aim to build a wall between the US and Mexico is regressive and undesirable, that his tenure has been littered with misogynistic commentary and his ill-conceived ban on transgender people serving in the armed forces is deeply transphobic.
- 4) Notes that council has affirmed that Edinburgh is a welcoming and international city, which opens its arms to all ethnicities and religions; all sexualities and genders.

- 5) Therefore, as representatives of Scotland's capital, council does not welcome President Trump to Scotland and will not engage in any civic welcome extended to him.
- 6) Council notes that it cannot restrict the Lord Provost from fulfilling duties required of the Lord Lieutenant to the Queen and that no council staff or resources will be employed if he is required to attend a royal engagement with Donald Trump.
- 7) Council notes that in Scotland the monarch traditionally rules with the consent of the people and respectfully requests that the monarch respect the decision of Council, as representatives of the city's people, and not include Edinburgh in arrangements for Donald Trump's state visit."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Rae

Amendment 1

To agree the motion with the deletion of points 5, 6, and 7.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Doggart

In terms of Standing Order 22(3), the Depute Convener ruled that a first vote be taken for or against Amendment 2, for no action.

Voting

| | | |
|---------------------|---|----------|
| For Amendment 2 | - | 16 votes |
| Against Amendment 2 | - | 42 votes |

(For Amendment 2 - Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.

Against Amendment 2 – Councillor Griffiths (Depute Convener), Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main,

Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.)

As the vote for no action was lost, a second vote between the motion by Councillor Staniforth and Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey was then taken.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 8 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 34 votes |

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

For Amendment 1: Councillor Griffiths (Depute Convener), Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rankin, Neil Ross, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.)

Abstentions: Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Daggart, Douglas, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey as follows:

Council:

- 1) Notes that Donald Trump is due to arrive in the UK on a state visit between 3rd and 5th of June.
- 2) Notes that it is not usual for an American President to be granted a state visit, only two previous presidents have been afforded the honour.
- 3) Notes that council has already agreed that Trump's so-called 'Muslim ban' caused distress and chaos to US Muslim families, that his aim to build a wall between the US and Mexico is regressive and undesirable, that his tenure has been littered with misogynistic commentary and his ill-conceived ban on transgender people serving in the armed forces is deeply transphobic.
- 4) Notes that council has affirmed that Edinburgh is a welcoming and international city, which opens its arms to all ethnicities and religions; all sexualities and genders.

17 Stead's Place - Motion by Councillor McLellan

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

“Council:

Following the decision by Edinburgh University to withdraw from the Stead's Place proposal, council agrees:

- 1) To ask the Director of Place to organise a summit before the start of the next academic year at which the four universities can be invited to discuss future student accommodation plans and needs.
- 2) Further requests the Director of Place to produce a city-wide student masterplan in conjunction with the universities and Edinburgh College, on a timescale to be agreed with the sector, which both addresses the accommodation needs of an expanding higher and further education sector and local concerns.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor McLellan.

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment

Delete the motion and replace with:

- 1) Council notes the importance of universities in the city and the Planning Service continues to meet regularly with Universities and Colleges within the City looking at the full range of development aspirations they have including student accommodation and campus buildings. Council also notes the impact the over-dominance student housing can have on local communities.
- 2) Notes the City Plan 2030 process will continue to actively engage with the City's universities and colleges to ensure a planned approach is undertaken for the delivery of student accommodation and their longer term development aspirations. Progress will be reported to the Planning Committee on both City Plan 2030 and through the review of planning guidance on student housing.

- 3) Notes that Council will continue to encourage the universities and colleges and private sector partners to engage with their local communities as they prepare development proposals, in the context of Council commitments and policies delivering affordable housing and mixed communities.”

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

Voting

The voting was as follows

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 16 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 41 votes |

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

For the Amendment: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.

Abstention: Councillor Graczyk.)

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor Gardiner.

18 Dunard Concert Hall – Motion by Councillor McLellan

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

“Council:

- 1) Recognises the valuable contribution a new concert hall will bring to Edinburgh’s cultural and economy.
- 2) Recognises the unique circumstances of this application.
- 3) Further recognises the difficulties the project created for planning policy, in particular the use of exterior concrete in the World Heritage Site and traffic management in a pedestrianised environment at Multrees Walk and Elder Street.

- 4) Agrees the Director of Place should provide a report to the Planning Committee in two cycles to update and clarify the council's policies in the World Heritage Management Plan and the council's supplementary guidance."

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

Amendment

Council:

- 1) Agrees points 1 and 2.
- 2) Replaces points 3 and 4 with:
 - "3) Notes that each planning application is considered on its merits having regard to the development plan and material considerations. The applications for planning permission and listed building consent were considered by the Development Management Sub Committee on 24 April 2019 through a formal hearing process, with all matters, including the materials and traffic management given careful consideration in this sensitive context.
 - 4) Notes that there are existing procedures in place to review the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan and planning guidance. The Management Plan was approved December 2017 and is revised on a 5 yearly basis. The review of the Plan, and ongoing monitoring will consider the impacts of new development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site, including the use of materials and contribution to cultural life. The Edinburgh Design Guidance includes guidance to developers on the use of building materials. This guidance is reviewed annually and any need for amendment will be considered in this context."

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 22 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 26 votes |

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

For the amendment: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.

Decision

To approve the following amendment by Councillor Gardiner:

- 1) To recognise the valuable contribution a new concert hall would bring to Edinburgh's cultural and economy
- 2) To recognise the unique circumstances of this application.
- 3) To note that each planning application was considered on its merits having regard to the development plan and material considerations. The applications for planning permission and listed building consent were considered by the Development Management Sub Committee on 24 April 2019 through a formal hearing process, with all matters, including the materials and traffic management given careful consideration in this sensitive context.
- 4) To note that there were existing procedures in place to review the Old and New Towns of Edinburgh World Heritage Site Management Plan and planning guidance. The Management Plan was approved December 2017 and was revised on a 5 yearly basis. The review of the Plan, and ongoing monitoring would consider the impacts of new development on the Outstanding Universal Value of the Site, including the use of materials and contribution to cultural life. The Edinburgh Design Guidance includes guidance to developers on the use of building materials. This guidance was reviewed annually and any need for amendment would be considered in this context.

19 Watsonian Ladies Rugby Football Club - Motion by Councillor Brown

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

“Council:

- Congratulates the Watsonians Ladies Rugby Football Club on their recent Sarah Beaney Cup Final victory over Hillhead Jordanhill at Murrayfield Stadium.
- Celebrates the success under the stewardship of Watsonians Ladies coach David Flynn to secure the top Women's domestic cup trophy for the first time.

- Invites the Lord Provost to suitably mark the occasion in the appropriate manner.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Brown.

20 Legalisation of Same Sex Marriage in Taiwan - Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council acknowledges the historic decision of the Taiwanese government in being the first country in Asia to legalise same sex marriage.

Council joins the people of Taiwan in their celebrations and encourages other countries’ leaders to follow to ensure fairness and equality.

Council requests the Lord Provost celebrates this historic event in an appropriate manner.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

21 Screen Education Edinburgh Awards - Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council acknowledges the sterling work of the young people involved in the recent Screen Education Edinburgh awards.

Young people were involved in film making, theory exams, exploring creative and academic works and excellent quality films.

Council acknowledges the high standard of work from the young people which led to them achieving Moving Image Arts awards and British Film Institute awards with two being nominated for UK national awards.

Council requests that the Lord Provost celebrates the young people's success and achievements in an appropriate manner.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

22 International Fair Trade Charter - Motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan

The following motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

- 1) Pledges to support the International Fair Trade Charter, produced to establish a common reference point for all the organisations and networks that share a common vision of a world in which everyone, through their work, can maintain a decent and dignified livelihood and develop their full human potential.
- 2) Requests a report to the Corporate Policy and Strategy Committee in 2 cycles to recommend the undertakings that the Council can give in support of the Charter, and how it can best complement the Council’s own Fair Trade Policy.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan.

23 Hibernian Ladies Football Club - Motion by Councillor Munro

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

“Council congratulates Hibernian Ladies Football Club on winning the Scottish Cup for a 4th year in a row.

Council requests that the Lord Provost marks this significant achievement in the women’s game in Scotland with a Civic Reception in the City Chambers.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Munro.

24 SESplan2 - Motion by Councillor McLellan

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

“Council:

- 1) Regrets the decision by the Scottish Government to reject a plan which has been years in the making.

- 2) Recognises that the absence of a plan leaves the council vulnerable to “planning by appeal”.
- 3) Further recognises the decision has serious implications for the ongoing Cityplan 2030 process.
- 4) Calls for an urgent report from the Director of Place to the next Planning Committee which explains how this position arose.
- 5) Agrees the report should outline the steps necessary to provide a clear development framework for Edinburgh, and a timetable for delivery.
- 6) Given the Scottish Government specifically blamed transport issues, that a further report be brought back to the next meeting of the Council to detail the implications for Edinburgh.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor McLellan

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Cook

Amendment

Deletes motion and replaces with:

- 1) Notes the Scottish Government decision on the SESPlan2.
- 2) Notes a meeting of the SESplan Joint Committee is due to take place in June 2019 when relevant report(s) on this matter will be referred to the Planning Committee. The annual Development Plan Scheme is the statutory report which sets out the timetable for development plan preparation and will be reported to the 7 August 2019 Planning Committee.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

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 McLellan:

- 1) To note the Scottish Government decision on the SESPlan2.
- 2) To note a meeting of the SESplan Joint Committee was due to take place in June 2019 when relevant report(s) on this matter would be referred to the Planning Committee. The annual Development Plan Scheme was the

statutory report which set out the timetable for development plan preparation and would be reported to the 7 August 2019 Planning Committee.

25 Edinburgh Gateway- Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council:

- 1) Regrets the Edinburgh Gateway station only welcomed 58,386 passengers in 2016-17, according to the most up-to-date data available, despite costing over £40m.
- 2) Notes that this compares to the 2,780,004 who went through Haymarket and 869,978 who used Edinburgh Park.
- 3) Believes use of Gateway station could be increased by being directly linked to the main Glasgow-Edinburgh route.
- 4) Further regrets that the opportunity was lost when the Almond Chord project was cancelled by the Scottish Government in 2012.
- 5) Further notes that reinstating the Almond Chord could allow for a new station at Winchburgh where 5,000 homes are set to be built as part of the City Deal and could create more pressure on Edinburgh’s transport network.
- 6) Notes the potential for a new station serving Kirkliston and believes that the revival of the Almond Chord project would make a significant difference to transport choices in West Edinburgh and help address transport concerns raised by the Scottish Government in rejecting Sesplan 2.
- 7) Instructs the transport convener to open talks with the Scottish Government and Network Rail with a view to reviving the project and for a report to be provided to the Transport and Economy Committee within three cycles.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Cook

Amendment 1

Council:

- 1) Accepts points 1), 2) and 3) of the motion.

2) Removes points 4), 5), 6) and 7) of the motion and replaces with the following:

- “4) Notes that this project was considered as part of the Edinburgh Glasgow Improvement Programme (EGIP) which will have increased rail capacity between the cities by 30% this year and cut journey times to 43 minutes.
- 5) Notes that Scottish Ministers have instructed Transport Scotland to undertake a Strategic Review of Transport Projects (STPR2) and the Governance for this is through the City Deal Transport Board.
- 6) Agrees that the City of Edinburgh Council will make representations to STPR2 to ask for this matter to be included within the context of the Review.”

- moved by Councillor Doran, seconded by Councillor McVey

Amendment 2

To add to the motion:

- “8) agrees this work should also prioritise significant improvements to the capacity and access arrangements at Dalmeny Station, particularly in light of the major new housing developments at Scotstoun and Builyeon Road in Queensferry.”

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Young

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Points 5) and 6) of Amendment 1, and all of Amendment 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion (as adjusted) | - | 22 votes |
| For amendment 1 | - | 34 votes |

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

For the amendment: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Barrie, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gordon, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes,

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

Abstention – Councillor Graczyk.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Gardiner as follows:

- 1) To regret the Edinburgh Gateway station only welcomed 58,386 passengers in 2016-17, according to the most up-to-date data available, despite costing over £40m.
- 2) To note that this compared to the 2,780,004 who went through Haymarket and 869,978 who used Edinburgh Park.
- 3) Believes the use of Gateway station could be increased by being directly linked to the main Glasgow-Edinburgh route.
- 4) To note that this project was considered as part of the Edinburgh Glasgow Improvement Programme (EGIP) which would have increased rail capacity between the cities by 30% this year and cut journey times to 43 minutes.
- 5) To note that Scottish Ministers had instructed Transport Scotland to undertake a Strategic Review of Transport Projects (STPR2) and the Governance for this was through the City Deal Transport Board.
- 6) To agree that the City of Edinburgh Council would make representations to STPR2 to ask for this matter to be included within the context of the Review.

26 Equal Right of Appeal - Motion by Councillor Graczyk

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes, the planning bill is currently making its way to the Local Government and Communities committee at Holyrood and will soon be consulted upon;
- 2) Further notes that over the years a number of appeals by developers in the current planning system have been successful, while residents in local communities have had to live with the consequences of these decisions with no similar right of appeal;
- 3) Recognises, the planning system is unbalanced in the application of the right to appeal decisions;

- 4) Further recognises, Equal Right of Appeal balances out who can make appeals to include the people most affected by a decision to approve;
- 5) Acknowledges, Council believe that the interests of its residents would be best protected by supporting Equal Right of Appeal that brings communities to the heart of the decisions that they will have to live with;
- 6) Further acknowledges, the righting of this injustice would substantially increase the communities' confidence in our political leadership;
- 7) Calls, Council to:
 - a) Notes commitment 14 in the Programme for the Capital includes support for Community Right of Appeal;
 - b) Request the Council Leader to write to the Committee Convener, committee members, the Minister for Local Government and Housing and the Scottish Government's Chief Planner restating the Council's position."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Graczyk

- moved by Councillor Graczyk, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

Amendment 1

- 1) To note points 1-6 of the motion.
- 2) To replace points 7a) and 7b) with:

"The commitment by this Council to give communities the right to appeal remains in place with submissions already made to Scottish Government through the Planning Bill process on that basis. Elected members and Council officials will continue to engage in this process and acknowledge the importance of communities being involved earlier in the preparation of development plans which impact on their area."

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

Amendment 2

Delete paragraph 1 and replace with,

"Notes the Planning (Scotland) Bill will be considered at Stage 3 in the Scottish Parliament in June;"

Insert new paragraph 6 as follows, and renumber the existing paragraph 6 as paragraph 7:

- "6) acknowledges the work of Andy Wightman MSP who tabled an amendment on equalising right of appeal at Stage 2 of the Planning (Scotland) Bill, which would have given communities the same right as developers to appeal planning decisions, had it passed."

Delete paragraph 7b) and replace with:

- "7b) Request the Council Leader write to MSPs, the Minister for Local Government, Housing and Planning, and the Scottish Government's Chief Planner restating the Council's position and urging them to support community right of appeal in planning."

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

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) | - | 9 votes |
| For Amendment 1 | - | 46 votes |

(For the motion (as adjusted): Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth

For Amendment 1: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Doran, Douglas, Gardiner, Gloyer, Henderson, Howie, Johnston, Key, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rankin, Neil ross, Rust, Rose, Smith, Watt, Webber, Wilson, Work and Young.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Gardiner as follows:

- 1) To note, the planning bill was currently making its way to the Local Government and Communities Committee at Holyrood and would soon be consulted upon.
- 2) To further note, over the years a number of appeals by developers in the current planning system had been successful, while residents in local

communities have had to live with the consequences of these decisions with no similar right of appeal.

- 3) To recognise, the planning system was unbalanced in the application of the right to appeal decisions.
- 4) To further recognise, Equal Right of Appeal balanced out who could make appeals to include the people most affected by a decision to approve.
- 5) To acknowledge, Council believed that the interests of its residents would be best protected by supporting Equal Right of Appeal that brought communities to the heart of the decisions that they would have to live with.
- 6) To further acknowledge, the righting of this injustice would substantially increase the communities' confidence in our political leadership.
- 7) The commitment by this Council to give communities the right to appeal remained in place with submissions already made to Scottish Government through the Planning Bill process on that basis. Elected members and Council officials would continue to engage in this process and acknowledge the importance of communities being involved earlier in the preparation of development plans which impact on their area.

27 Funding for Action on Poverty - Motion by Councillor Rae

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

“Council

- 1) Notes:
 - 1.1 The European Aid to the Most Deprived fund makes £3.5m available to the UK for “lifting at least 20 million people out of the risk of poverty and social exclusion” by the end of 2020;
 - 1.2 The failure of the Home Secretary to meet the deadline to secure £600,000 of funding this year, and that all other EU members met the deadline to secure their share;
- 2) Welcomes the progress of the Edinburgh Poverty Commission towards addressing poverty, affecting an estimated 82,000 people in Edinburgh, including a fifth of children in the city;

- 3) Agrees the Council Leader will ask the Home Secretary what alternative sources of funding will be provided by the Home Office to fund recommendations made by the Edinburgh Poverty Commission.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rae

- moved by Councillor Rae, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment

Council:

Delete all of the motion and replace with:

Council notes:

- 1) that the European Aid to the Most Deprived fund makes £3.5m available to the UK for “lifting at least 20 million people out of the risk of poverty and social exclusion” by the end of 2020 and that this scheme was specifically intended to assist asylum seekers;
- 2) that although the deadline to secure funding this year has passed Edinburgh’s share of a UK sum of £600,000 would be approximately £6,000;
- 3) the ongoing work of the Edinburgh Poverty Commission towards addressing poverty and that considerable efforts still need to be made to improve the outcomes achieved with the large sums of public funding spent by a number of partner agencies on this work in Edinburgh;
- 4) that the UK Government has decided to use the Fund to support vulnerable 16-24 year olds who have entered the UK through a resettlement schemes, been granted refugee status, or identified as victims of modern slavery; and notes that the fund will still provide £2.9 million for this cause.

Council therefore considers that the UK Government’s proposed use for the fund is the correct one and, while Edinburgh should receive any funding directly resulting from this objective, diverting money from vulnerable young people to other purposes is not appropriate.

Council further notes the wider context that the Scottish Government now has substantive responsibility for welfare, including the power to create new benefits and top-up reserved benefits, and has the tax powers to fund any spending accordingly and that poverty alleviation should be considered in this devolved policy context.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Rust

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 38 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 15 votes |

(For the motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gloyer, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Rae.

28 Threatening Behaviour Towards Councillors - Motion by Councillor Watt

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

“This Council

- Recognises that politicians are working in a febrile atmosphere which could lead to open hostility, verbal abuse and threats of physical violence;
- Deplores all such instances of verbal or physical intimidation;
- Advocates a zero tolerance approach to any such behaviour in our city; and
- Asks that a protocol be developed for Councillors to report incidents to the Council so that they can receive appropriate support.”

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Watt.

29 European Elections - Motion by Councillor Munro

The Depute Convener 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 Munro was submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

“Council:

- 1) Thanks the election team and Lothian Valuation Joint Board staff for their work in delivering the European elections.
- 2) Notes the issues reported across the UK of many EU nationals being unable to vote.
- 3) Condemns the lack of support given to Council by the UK government in the circumstances of failing to confirm the UK’s participation in the EU elections earlier in the process to enable EU citizens resident in Edinburgh to take part locally in the elections to the European Parliament.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Munro.

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor McVey

Amendment

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Webber

Voting

The voting was as follows:

| | | |
|-------------------|---|----------|
| For the motion | - | 38 votes |
| For the amendment | - | 15 votes |

(For the motion: Councillors Griffiths (Depute Convener), Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Cameron, Ian Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Gardiner, Gloyer, Graczyk, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Munro.

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 3 of 30 May 2019)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

Question

For each project in this local authority which is receiving funding through the City Region Deal, what will the measurable contribution be towards meeting climate targets?

Answer

On May 14th the Council set an ambitious climate change target to achieve a net zero carbon position in Edinburgh by 2030. In relation to city deal projects at this stage it is too early to say. Project leads (across the entire Deal) have been asked to assess their projects in terms of environmental sustainability. This will form a key part of the Progress Report to each meeting of the Joint Committee for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Deputy Provost and thank you to the Leader for his answer to my written question. It's heartening to hear that project leads have been asked to assess environmental sustainability and I thank the Leader for confirming this. However can I ask the Leader please to clarify this statement, just because environmental sustainability is one thing, but positively contributing to the challenging carbon target that this Council has quite rightly set might be quite another thing, especially as the latest information that elected Members have received on the City Region Deal is somewhat lightweight in regards to that.

I wondered can the Leader please tell me, is it his expectation that the project leads in that work that he's confirmed, will be assessing ways in which the projects can identify improvements that will take us, with step-changes, towards our carbon goals for the city and he mentioned during the last event item about transport heat and energy, and therefore use the City Region Deal as an opportunity to deliver the urgent change that people in Edinburgh need?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Can I thank you for your supplementary. In terms of the City Deal, it's worth saying that the City Deal Board isn't subordinate to the Council and our governance structures and therefore it is difficult for us to instruct. However it is worth saying a couple of ongoing examples, Sheriffhall Roundabout being a good one, where the initial project from Transport Scotland did, as project lead, get engagement from Spokes and us as a Council and certainly Midlothian Council and as a result that has had a change in the project, a multimillion pound element of it being cycling improvement to that roundabout. Now the consequence of that is to put pressure on both Edinburgh and Midlothian to respond to that, work with Transport Scotland and find the right ways of financing safe cycling routes to that roundabout, to that junction in the first place, but it is a good example of where the iterative process has already started within the City Deal to drive forward that more sustainable agenda. In terms of the representations I'll be making, as Chair of the City Deal Partnership, I've got a few months left I think as chair of the partnership before it goes to our friends in East Lothian, we will be making sure that every project across the board whether it is led by Transport Scotland or Edinburgh Council or anyone else in the measurement at least, when it comes to that Partnership, will consider these things and that will put pressure on the delivery vehicles, namely the constituent authorities, to be able to take that into consideration as their driving forward those individual projects.

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

Question (1) Are records kept of the number of plant failures at Council Recycling Centres across the city?

Answer (1) Yes, records are kept of reported defects, breakdowns and faults for Council owned plant. For plant which is leased or on long term hire, records are kept in line with health and safety criteria

Question (2) Over the last five years, by year, how often has each centre had to cease normal public service due to:

- a. plant failure?
- b. staff shortages?
- c. any other reason?

Answer (2) Manual diary records are held at each centre to indicate when a facility has been closed and these diaries are not currently retained for more than one year. These diary entries may not always record the reason for closure or the length of the closure.

There are occasions when the sites have been closed due adverse weather conditions (high winds) and at Sighthill, during the construction phase of the new Depot and Waste Transfer Station for health and safety reasons, the site has closed for short periods. These are planned as far as possible, however short notice closures have taken place where there has been an immediate health and safety concern.

I have asked officers to investigate the potential to create a central record of closures to include the reason and duration of closure. This will assist in maximising opportunities to learn lessons going forward and will be retained for five years.

- Question** (3) What communication strategy is in place to inform the public when the recycling centre becomes inoperative?
- Answer** (3) All closures are advised on social media and on the Council's web site. The Contact Centre is also informed to ensure customers calling the Council are kept up to date. On site, Council staff are located at the entrance of sites where a closure is taking place at short notice to advise customers of the closure, and to direct customers to alternative sites or likely reopening times.
- Question** (4) Is there a plant servicing agreement for all three recycling centres and can you confirm servicing is carried out in-line with this agreement?
- Answer** (4) Servicing and safety inspections for Council owned plant is planned and carried out by the Fleet and Workshops team according to manufacture and health and safety standards. The servicing and safety of hired or leased plant is the responsibility of the owner but is maintained to the Council's specified standards.
- Question** (5) What contingency arrangements are in place in the event of plant failures?
- Answer** (5) The Council has a reactive repair service in place to respond to any plant failure within and outwith the operating hours of the centres. If there is a failure which requires urgent repair and could potentially impact on the operation of the centre, a network of plant hire options are available.
- Question** (6) What changes have there been to Council Recycling Centre opening hours, if any, over the last year?
- Answer** (6) As approved at the Transport and Environment Committee on 5 March 2019 new opening and closing times were introduced from 1 April 2019.
- Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday, Saturday and Sunday 0900-1700; Thursday 0900-1830.
- Question** (7) What is the Convener doing to ensure Recycling Centres are available to residents in the most accessible way to aid recycling?

Answer

- (7) The report approved by Transport and Environment Committee on 5 March 2019 outlined the activities in place for the operations of recycling centres in the city - [http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/60144/item_79 -
_household_waste_recycling_centre_opening_hours](http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/download/meetings/id/60144/item_79_-_household_waste_recycling_centre_opening_hours)

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Rose for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

Question

In wards with high numbers of residential students, at times of the year when the volume of waste is increased as students are

- a) settling into and furnishing their accommodation
- b) leaving and clearing their accommodation:

What arrangements are in place to increase collections of waste?

Answer

In addition to the normal collection service, additional waste and cleansing collections are in place in May/June and in September each year in Southside, Fountainbridge and Newington. The additional services from 27 May to 10 June 2019 are:

- Additional waste vehicle: Tuesday (pm), Wednesday (pm), Thursday (pm), Saturday and Sunday.
- Additional cleansing vehicle: daily.

In addition, Council officers work with Edinburgh University to put in place additional collections at their student halls of residence.

We have also been working with Zero Waste Edinburgh to support reuse projects in the area.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Deputy Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for her answer. I do appreciate that the additional service will now be under way for a couple of weeks from the beginning of this week to collect from the overflowing bins caused by students decamping and leaving the residencies, so that's very helpful to have that and I appreciate that. It doesn't

however answer Part A of my question, which is the issue of getting overflowing bins in the period when students arrive, and that is also a problem in student areas at that period. So I wonder if I could perhaps re-submit the question for next month and have the first part of my question answered?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for that supplementary, please do.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Leader of the Council
at a meeting of the Council on 30
May 2019**

Question

The Leader may be aware of some disquiet in the development community regarding what they perceive as a lack of precision when contrasting advice given to them and subsequent commentary contained in reports or made in person to the Development Management Sub Committee.

If any such concern were evidenced through appeals to the Scottish Reporter, would the Leader agree that it would reflect poorly on the culture of the Planning Service?

Answer

It would obviously be completely inappropriate to speculate on planning appeals. Any recommendations or issues raised through planning appeals will be responded to appropriately.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Deputy Convener and I thank the Leader for his answer. I apologise if he feels the question was inappropriate. It is about the broad performance of our Planning Service and I'm sure the Leader and other members will receive many representations from individuals, from community groups, from applicants and from large developers all registering concern with the quality of our Planning Service. Does he believe that's a sign of success?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Usually I say thank you for the supplementary, I'm not sure on this occasion. What that statement that was just given to the Council is, is frankly nothing more than speculation and gossip and I'm not going to stand here and respond to that in any kind of meaningful way. If we want to talk about planning performance ie the targets of performance, ie how quickly applications are turned around, how many we're turning around the Department, we can have that conversation, are more than happy to have that conversation, and that is how these things should be debated. They shouldn't be debated and questioned on the basis of I've heard from Jimmy down the pub, it should be debated on the basis of the facts and the information in the

statistics on which we assess our planning performance. If there are individual aspects of planning appeals in terms of consistency of information that's another thing we can talk about, but I have to say Deputy Lord Provost, we are more than two years into this, we are all a little bit long in the tooth to be bringing things in this form to this Council.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 30 May 2019**

Question (1) What is the book value of private number plates owned by Lothian Buses, or any subsidiary organisations?

Answer (1) This information is not available to the Council.

Question (2) What is the estimated market value of these private number plates?

Answer (2) This information is not available to the Council.

Question (3) Are the purchase of private number plates subject to any oversight by Transport for Edinburgh?

Answer (3) No.

Supplementary Question Thank you Deputy Convener and I thank the Convener for her answer. Do private number plates have any use in a publicly owned bus service?

Supplementary Answer Thank you for your supplementary. I don't necessarily believe they do, so I don't think I have any other comments to make other than I agree.

QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 30 May 2019**

Question (1) How many on-street public waste bins are there in the city, broken down by ward.?

Answer (1) The list of on-street waste bins by ward is provided below. These are dedicated litter bins and do not include on-street communal bins which can also be used for street litter.

| ALL LITTER BINS (EXCLUDING PARKS) | |
|--|--------------------|
| Ward | Litter Bins |
| 01-Almond | 363 |
| 02-Pentland Hills | 176 |
| 03-Drum Brae/Gyle | 145 |
| 04-Forth | 205 |
| 05-Inverleith | 150 |
| 06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield | 135 |
| 07-Sighthill/Gorgie | 242 |
| 08-Colinton/Fairmilehead | 123 |
| 09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart | 134 |
| 10-Meadows/Morningside | 167 |
| 11-City Centre | 567 |
| 12-Leith Walk | 82 |
| 13-Leith | 108 |
| 14-Craigtinny/Duddingston | 170 |
| 15-Southside/Newington | 169 |
| 16-Liberton/Gilmerton | 223 |
| 17-Portobello/Craigmillar | 221 |
| No code allocated | 7 |
| Grand Total | 3,387 |

Question (2) How does this number compare to:

(a) 2014; and

(b) 2009?

Answer (2) There are no records held for 2009 or 2014. Records were established in 2015 and are regularly updated.

Question (3) How many Council maintained waste bins are located in public parks, broken down by ward?

Answer (3) The table below shows the number of waste bins recorded as being located in a park:

| LITTER BINS THAT CONTAIN "PARK" IN THE LOCATION DETAILS | |
|--|--------------------|
| Ward | Litter Bins |
| 01-Almond | 45 |
| 02-Pentland Hills | 43 |
| 03-Drum Brae/Gyle | 7 |
| 04-Forth | 19 |
| 05-Inverleith | 24 |
| 06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield | 12 |
| 07-Sighthill/Gorgie | 52 |
| 08-Colinton/Fairmilehead | 17 |
| 09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart | 19 |
| 10-Meadows/Morningside | 19 |
| 11-City Centre | 14 |
| 12-Leith Walk | 37 |
| 13-Leith | 14 |
| 14-Craigentiny/Duddingston | 24 |
| 15-Southside/Newington | 22 |
| 16-Liberton/Gilmerton | 25 |
| 17-Portobello/Craigmillar | 55 |
| No code allocated | 5 |
| Grand Total | 453 |

Question (4) How does this number compare to:

(a) 2014; and

(b) 2009?

Answer (4) There are no records held for 2009 or 2014.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you very much Deputy Provost and I'm very grateful for the answers that have been provided. Perhaps you can indulge me. I am very grateful to the fact that the Vice-Convener is going to be answering my supplementary but I hope I can speak on behalf of the whole Council when I wish best wishes to Councillor Macinnes and say how much we're looking forward to her returning to her full responsibilities. Deputy Provost, the answer that was provided said that there were no figures for 2014 or 2009 but that records started in 2015, so would it be possible for the Vice Convener to write to me with those figures for 2015 and I'm presuming that there must be similar statistics available then for the number of waste bins recorded in or located in parks and if those figures are available than it would be very helpful if I could get that information as well?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary. Happy to do so, I will add though that litter bins are set against the old ward boundaries of the information we have but that that is now being updated as part of the confirmed review project.

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

Question

Further to question 5.2 at the 14 March 2019 meeting of the Council, has she received a response from the Cabinet Secretary for Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity to her letter of 18 December 2018 on fixed penalty notices against utility companies?

Answer

As set out in the response to question 5.2 at the 14 March 2019 meeting, the matter was raised as part of a broader discussion with the Cabinet Secretary for Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity at the meeting on 9th January. Feedback is awaited from Scottish Government on where this matter sits in relation to the progression of the Transport Bill.

It should be noted that the Transport Bill will not contain the fine amounts for Fixed Penalty Notices – this is a matter of detail which will be set out in Codes of Practice/Specifications, to be determined as part of the final stages of the Transport Bill process.

Supplementary Question

Again very grateful for the answer that was provided. I'm not sure if the Vice Convener was present at the meeting which is referred to, but ultimately what I'm trying to understand Deputy Provost is really whether the Administration has picked up an appetite from the Scottish Government to do something about this. So far I have not sensed any recognition from the Scottish Government that we do have an issue over the poor fining powers that we have against utility companies when they don't carry out work properly or things significantly overrun and I am very keen that we keep up the pressure on that and so my supplementary is simply, is the Vice Convener aware of any appetite from the Scottish Government to do something about this?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Lang. No I wasn't at that meeting and so I can't really make any comment on that, but I certainly do agree that pressure needs to remain on this subject.

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

Question

Homework tracking apps such as 'Show My Homework' have been successfully introduced by a number of Scottish local authorities.

This web based initiative ensures that all pupils, staff and particularly parents / carers can become more involved with homework issued by the school.

Can the Convener confirm what current progress is being made with regards to the introduction of a Homework App, either 'Show My Homework' or equivalent across all CEC secondary schools?

Answer

The Council is currently reviewing the use of Show My Homework as an online system to support the management of homework. In line with Council policy and to ensure appropriate security and governance is in place, the Digital Learning Team has conducted a Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA) which is being assessed by the Information Governance Unit (IGU).

As part of the assessment, officers are working to ensure appropriate contractual arrangements and an information sharing agreement is in place to achieve compliance with data protection legislation. This work is being led by City of Edinburgh Council, and is recognised by other Scottish Local Authorities wishing to adopt Show My Homework as an opportunity to achieve and share best practice.

At the request of a school who wished to use the app, an initial DPIA was carried out. At the time, the assessment highlighted aspects that were not in line with council standards. After engaging with the Head Teacher on the

benefits of the app, officers are now working to address these concerns.

Should all be deemed in line with council policy, the Information Asset Owner will grant approval for use of Show My Homework in CEC schools. At this point the use of Show My Homework will become an available option for schools that feel it would provide appropriate support to their school community.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Deputy Provost. To ask the Convener what is the likely timescale for these concerns to be resolved so that the Show My Homework App can be used in schools?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary question. I'm just studying it, it doesn't have a date on it you're correct and what I will do is have a word with the Executive Director again. He has given me a date but I've just forgotten it to be honest with you, but I'll get that sent to you.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Miller for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 30 May 2019**

- Question** **(1)** What is the estimated cost to
- a) City of Edinburgh Council,
 - b) Lothian Buses and
 - c) local businesses due to the unexpected closure of Leith Street at the request of Edinburgh St James development?
- Answer** **(1)** a) Approximately £1500.
b) Council does not have this information.
c) Council does not have this information.
- Question** **(2)** What is the mechanism for
- a) City of Edinburgh Council,
 - b) Lothian Buses and
 - c) local businesses to recover direct costs and appropriate compensation related to the closure?
- Answer** **(2)** The Council managed the closure of this street by issuing a Roads Occupation Permit in line with the relevant Section of The Roads (Scotland) Act 1984. The Council has an agreed schedule of rates for charging for issuing Roads Occupation Permits. The Council is not aware of any mechanism for third parties to be reimbursed costs or to be awarded compensation.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Gloyer for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

- Question** (1) Over the last 12 months, how many times has permission been granted for commercial vehicles selling food, drink or merchandise to operate in the city's parks?
- Answer** (1) Six new let permissions have been granted in the last 12 months. These permissions are for 12 months unless shown below.
- Question** (2) Please list the parks where such permission was granted and the dates when the vehicles operated there.
- Answer** (2)
- West Princes Street Gardens (one, effective from May and another effective from June 2019);
 - Inverleith Park (effective from April 2019);
 - Meadows (effective July 2019);
 - Roseburn Park (set dates only 8 June, 24 August, 6 September 2019); and
 - Cramond (effective April 2019).
- Question** (3) What is the process for consultation with the respective community council, Friends of the Park (where such a group has been constituted) and other users and neighbours of the park, in advance of a catering concession being granted?
- Answer** (3) As these let arrangements are renewals, there was no consultation undertaken. When new concessions are considered, local ward members, community councils, friends of parks and park users are consulted as appropriate.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Deputy Lord Provost and thanks for the answers. I wanted to ask for clarification of what constitutes a renewal of a let engagement, in the specific case of Roseburn Park in my own ward and I don't have knowledge of the others but with Roseburn Park it's true that the business concerned previously had a catering van in the park for BT Murrayfield fixtures but this was several years ago and since then there's been massive flood prevention work in the park, the conditions are completely different, there's new grass, there's newly replanted trees, the access points to the park have been changed and the Friends of Roseburn Parks had legitimate concerns about potential damage to the park and these were brushed aside to such an extent that a site visit took place without the Friends even being informed of it. So could I ask please what is the definition of a renewal as opposed to a new let?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary Councillor Gloyer. You've spoken specifically about a park within your ward and I think it would be more worthwhile if we perhaps have a meeting and go over that with the officers to discuss in details your concerns.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

Question When will the consultation be launched on extending bus lane hours to 7am-7pm, 7 days a week, as agreed at Transport and Environment Committee on 9 August 2018?

Answer The consultation will be held between September and October 2019.

Supplementary Question I thank the Vice Convener for her reply. Please could she clarify the wider timetable for rolling out the extension to bus lane hours that was agreed at Transport and Environment Committee in August of last year?

Supplementary Answer Thank you for your supplementary. A consultation plan and programme has been prepared with the intention of seeking the views of interested parties and members of the public on the introduction of all day bus lanes operating seven days a week.

The consultation format will include an online survey for members of the public and stakeholders hosted on the Council's consultation hub, accompanied by hard copy surveys available in Edinburgh libraries, stakeholder workshops for more detailed discussions and engagement with the groups of stakeholders and briefings and discussions with the Transport Forum and Edinburgh Access Panel. The consultation results will be analysed with the findings reported back to Committee early 2020.

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 30 May 2019

Question

Further to the answer to question 28 on 23 August 2018, will the council publish the waiting times for pedestrians at key pedestrian crossings in the city centre?

Answer

Yes, the waiting times for pedestrians at key crossings in the city will be published shortly on the Council's website. A dedicated page will be setup and a link added to:-

http://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/info/20016/roads_travel_and_parking

The analysis will cover the nine sets of traffic signals along Princes Street, from North Bridge to Queensferry Street.

Should there be any major changes be made to the signal timings in the future, the information will be re-calculated and updated on the website.

Supplementary Question

Again I thank the Vice Convener for her reply. Please could she clarify the meaning of published shortly in the answer, does that mean this month this year or this decade?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Booth for your supplementary, the end of July 2019.