

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 19 November 2020

Present:-

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

COUNCILLORS

Robert C Aldridge
Scott Arthur
Gavin Barrie
Eleanor Bird
Chas Booth
Claire Bridgman
Mark A Brown
Graeme Bruce
Steve Burgess
Lezley Marion Cameron
Jim Campbell
Kate Campbell
Mary Campbell
Maureen M Child
Nick Cook
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
Joan Griffiths
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
Ethan Young
Louise Young

1 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 15 October 2020 as a correct record.

2 Community Centres and Libraries reopening (update) - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

a) Deputation - Goodtrees Neighbourhood Centre

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Goodtrees Neighbourhood Centre.

The deputation indicated that whilst they were aware of the complexities that reopening youth work centres could bring, they felt that there should be some movement and resources allocated by The City of Edinburgh Council to help make it possible for a small number of centres across the capital to operate Youth Work services.

b) Deputation – Gilmerton and Inch Community Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Gilmerton and Inch Community Council.

The deputation indicated that they had received several enquiries as to when the libraries and community centres within their area were to re-open and whilst they understood that the chance of contamination must be controlled, they felt that the benefit of reopening these facilities far outweighed the risk.

They understood that that the set up within the library would be different but stressed that knowing that they were open would make such a difference to so many.

c) Referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report which outlined the present adaptation and renewal arrangements in community centres and libraries, including performance data for libraries and approved use of centres, to the Council for approval of the additional cost of £200k being made available from Council reserves.

Motion

To approve the additional cost of £200k being made available from Council reserves.

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

Amendment

- 1) To approve the additional cost of £200k being made available from Council reserves.
- 2) To recognise the huge logistical challenges firstly of re-opening Council run facilities and then keeping them running during Covid-19 and thanks all staff for all their hard work in achieving this, and for their continued support.
- 3) To recognise the importance of keeping schools open and therefore the prioritisation of existing Facilities Management resources for this purpose.
- 4) To accept that such prioritisation of Facilities Management for schools has hugely impacted on Facilities Management resources available for other CEC buildings, including Community Centres and Libraries.
- 5) To ask therefore that:
 - this additional cost of £200k, and
 - any additional costs required to ensure timely re-opening of all remaining Libraries and Community Centres,

are added to Council claims to Scottish Government for recompense for the additional costs of Covid to be made in negotiations via COSLA.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), the amendment as accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Wilson:

- 1) To approve the additional cost of £200k being made available from Council reserves.
- 2) To recognise the huge logistical challenges firstly of re-opening Council run facilities and then keeping them running during Covid-19 and thanks all staff for all their hard work in achieving this, and for their continued support.
- 3) To recognise the importance of keeping schools open and therefore the prioritisation of existing Facilities Management resources for this purpose.

- 4) To accept that such prioritisation of Facilities Management for schools has hugely impacted on Facilities Management resources available for other CEC buildings, including Community Centres and Libraries.
- 5) To ask therefore that:
 - this additional cost of £200k, and
 - any additional costs required to ensure timely re-opening of all remaining Libraries and Community Centres,

are added to Council claims to Scottish Government for recompense for the additional costs of Covid to be made in negotiations via COSLA.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 10 November 2020 (item 11); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

3 Spaces for People Update – November 2020 – referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

(a) Deputation – Edinburgh Private Hire Association

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Edinburgh Private Hire Association.

The deputation asked that consideration be made at this stage to amend the proposal to allow private hire cars the same access as the Taxi trade to the specific areas detailed in the deputation submission.

(b) Deputation – Better Broughton

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Better Broughton

The deputation was pleased to see that the recommendations for further “Spaces for People” measures, included, as a top priority, the provision of wider pavements and an uphill cycle lane in Broughton Street, along with pedestrian improvements to the Broughton Street roundabout. They believed that the proposals had widespread support in the local community, and would also benefit those who used Broughton Street to walk or cycle from the north of Edinburgh to the City Centre.

(c) Deputation – Leith Links Community Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Leith Links Community Council.

The deputation asked that the Community Council and Edinburgh City Council engage with the local community and work towards a vision for a neighbourhood built for everyone, of all ages and abilities, to be able to move around in an as safe, healthy and green way possible.

(d) Referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report on the Spaces for People Update which provided an update on the schemes implemented by a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO), under delegated authority with recommendations on continuation or changes (as appropriate), to the Council for consideration of the Committee's recommendations.

Motion

- 1) To note the update on the Spaces for People programme.
- 2) To approve the specific scheme changes noted in paragraph 4.5 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To approve the new schemes as outlined in paragraphs 4.7, 4.8 – 4.11 and Appendix 2 of the report for:
 - 3.1 South Bridge – Town Centre Measures;
 - 3.2 Lanark Road, Longstone Road and Inglis Green Road;
 - 3.3 A1 and A90; and 1.1.3.4 Greenbank to Meadows.
- 4) To approve the recommendations included in Appendix 1 of the report.
- 5) To note the schedule of proposed measures near schools (Appendix 3 of the report).
- 6) To note the high level and detailed reports on Commonplace (Appendix 4 of the report) and approve the recommended schemes arising from the suggestions made (paragraph 4.36 and Appendix 1 of the report).
- 7) To note that since receiving legal advice regarding the East Craigs proposals, officers had carefully looked at every new Spaces for People scheme to ensure they were proportionate and go no further than was required to address the public health dangers posed by the pandemic.

To also note that the Spaces for People projects pursued to date had been assessed on this basis and complied with both the legal advice given and the guidance provided by the Scottish Government as a basis for this temporary national scheme.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

- 8) To note significant resident concern that had arisen around the Braid Road closure and its effect elsewhere in surrounding streets. To note its interlinked nature with Comiston Road, Braidburn Terrace and the proposed Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route. To agree that this specific scheme should continue to be monitored closely and that a short report would come to the January 2021 Transport and Environment Committee detailing a proposed way forward on this route. To agree that a briefing note be circulated to Transport and Environment Committee members and relevant ward councillors in mid-December 2020 providing more detailed monitoring info on traffic volumes, public transport journey times and air pollution levels.
- 9) To welcome the schedule of proposed measures near schools and agree that changes still to be implemented should be considered a priority under the Spaces for People programme.
- 10) To note the high level and detailed reports on Commonplace and approve the recommended schemes arising from the suggestions made.
- 11) To acknowledge the elements of the report relating to the removal of unnecessary barriers and street clutter; believe there was an opportunity for 'quick wins' which should be given greater priority and agree to receive an update report to the Transport and Environment Committee on progress made in two cycles.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the update on the Spaces for People programme.
- 2) To approve the specific scheme changes noted in paragraph 4.5 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To approve the new schemes as outlined in the report subject to
 - a) South Bridge – Town Centre Measures: permit further discussion on positioning of bus stops;
 - b) Greenbank to Meadows Quiet Route: permit short online consultation with affected residents.
- 4) To recommend that given the scale and complexity of the schemes for Lanark Road, Longstone and Inglis Green Road; the A1 and A90 that these are all paused and presented to TEC in one cycle after detailed designs and feedback are shared with, and further validated by, local elected members, interest groups, businesses, transport providers and residents.
- 5) To recommend the following suggestion from New Town and Broughton Community Council for London Road be considered as alternative option; Re-route the planned active travel along Montrose Terrace and onto Regent Road to

avoid London Road roundabout, avoiding Picardy Place whilst the tram works are in place.

- 6) To approve the revised recommendations presented which includes but is not limited to; the immediate re-opening of Braid Road, Links Gardens, Silverknowes Road (North) and a further extended review and consultation along the schemes in Tollcross, Bruntsfield and Morningside given the specific issues highlighted by businesses.
- 7) To recommend that officers re-examine the Silverknowes Parkway element of Pennywell Road schemes to address issues raised by households in relation to access and deliveries.
- 8) To note the schedule of proposed measures for schools (Appendix 3 in the report) and look to accelerate and prioritise these and changes still to be implemented or assessed should be considered urgently.
- 9) To note disappointment that no measures near schools are presented for Holy Cross Primary, despite many requests from the Parent Council, the School and Ward Members.
- 10) To recognise the importance of removal of unnecessary barriers and street clutter and that their removal should be given greater priority and requests an update report on progress made within two cycles (Transport & Environment Committee)
- 11) To note the high-level reports from Commonplace (Appendix 4 of the report) and approve the recommended schemes arising from the suggestions made as follows.
- 12) To note the high-level reports from Commonplace data confirmed that measures to support and enhance walking should be prioritised over all other as these have by far higher support and endorsement than other measures

Project List / Recommendation and Estimated Cost

(Scheme delivery dependent on installation costs and budget)

Location	Intervention (Proposed/Actual)	Review Outcome/Update
CITY CENTRE		
South Bridge – Town Centre measures	Footway widening & cycle lanes	Proposed scheme developed for Committee approval (Appendix 2A)
Waverley Bridge	Closure	Review complete – recommendation to continue with improvements
Forest Road	Cycle segregation	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes
George IV Bridge	Cycle segregation	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes
The Mound	Cycle segregation	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes
Princes Street East End	Bus gate	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes
Victoria Street	Part time closure	Review complete – recommendation to revise to pedestrian zone to open from George IV Bridge. Revised scheme recommended for approval.
Cockburn Street	Part time closure	Continue review to explore taking access from Market Street to facilitate access for residents and traders – to report back in one cycle
Cowgate	N/A	No scheme proposed. (Budget to be reallocated to South Bridge proposals).
Chamber Street	Temporary signals at George IV Bridge Junction	Incorporated into South Bridge scheme for Committee approval.

TOWN CENTRES		
Queensferry High Street	Pedestrian space	Scheme under review with local stakeholders. Installation expected in November 20
Great Junction Street	Pedestrian space (remove)	Review complete - recommendation to remove the interventions following review and feedback from Lothian Buses.
Stockbridge	Pedestrian space	Programmed for implementation on 5/11/2020 following completion of SGN works
Gorgie / Dalry Road	Pedestrian space	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes
Bruntsfield	Pedestrian space	Recommend further detailed review given specific feedback from businesses
Tollcross		Recommend further detailed review given specific feedback from businesses
Morningside	Pedestrian space	Recommend further detailed review given specific feedback from businesses

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Portobello	Pedestrian space	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes
Corstorphine	Pedestrian space	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes
Newington Corridor	N/A	Assessment concluded that it was not possible to introduce measures due to the road width
The Shore	Subject consideration and engagement	Proposals for this location will be considered as part of consideration of local area interventions for Leith (see below) with full consultation and outside of SFP given legal position in relation to LTN introduction

TRAVELLING SAFELY		Scheme list under review wrt available budget
Telford Road	Cycle segregation	Proposals withdrawn due to significant impact on public transport, delays and need for costly junction changes anticipated
Fountainbridge Dundee St	Cycle segregation	Scheme programmed for implementation.
Ferry Road	Cycle segregation	Review complete – recommendation to continue with installation of segregation units programmed
Melville Drive	Cycle segregation	Scheme on hold. There are alternative routes available if further funding is made available.
Teviot Place / Potterow	Cycle segregation	Scheme programmed
Buccleuch St / Causewayside	Cycle segregation	Scheme implemented. To be reviewed after two months
Crewe Toll Roundabout	Cycle segregation (Further consideration at DRG – traffic modelling)	The scheme design is to be reviewed following modelling. A Stage 2 Road Safety Audit has been completed and will feed into the design review – share ASAP with elected members
Meadowplace Road	Cycle segregation	Scheme on hold. Interventions possible if further funding is made available
Duddingston Road	Cycle segregation	Pause and due to residents concerns ie parking suspensions/local consultation required.
Wester Hailes Road	Cycle segregation (Alternative plans to be developed)	Remove scheme from Programme
Craigmillar Park corridor	Cycle segregation	Scheme programmed for implementation
Gilmerton Road	Cycle segregation	Scheme programmed for implementation
Kingston Avenue closure and connection to Gilmerton Rd via Ravenswood Ave	Road closure	Scheme currently on hold
Crewe Road South	Cycle segregation (segregator units to be installed)	Review complete - installation of segregation units completed. No further changes proposed
Old Dalkeith Road	Cycle segregation (segregator units to	Review complete – recommendation to reduce segregation to maintain road

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

	be installed)	width for buses and emergency vehicles. Installation of segregation units (where possible) complete
Comiston Road	Cycle segregation	Review complete – proposed to continue to monitor. Further review planned for December 2020. Installation of segregation units complete. Review with community and take account of network impact – LB included
Inglis Green Rd	Cycle segregation	Postpone Scheme and consult fully (Appendix 2B)
Pennywell Road	Cycle segregation	Review programmed December 2020, Installation of segregation units complete : REVIEW Access Issues
Mayfield Road	Cycle segregation	Scheme programmed for implementation
Quiet Corridor - Meadows / Greenbank	Various closures	Options included in Committee Report for approval (Appendix 2C)
A90 Queensferry Road	Bus Lanes and cycle segregation	Scheme to be reviewed independently of this report – full plans must be available and enhanced consultation where possible
A1 Corridor	Bus Lanes and cycle segregation	Scheme to be reviewed independently of this report – full plans must be available and enhanced consultation where possible
Slateford Road (A70)	Cycle segregation	Postpone design
Lanark Road	Cycle segregation	Scheme to be reviewed independently of this report – full plans must be available and enhanced consultation
Longstone Road	Cycle segregation	Scheme to be reviewed independently of this report – full plans must be available and enhanced consultation
Murrayburn Road (short section at Longstone)	Cycle segregation	Proposals included for Committee approval (Appendix 2B)
Orchard Brae Roundabout	Road markings	Scheme programmed for implementation

LOCAL AREA INTERVENTIONS		
East Craigs	Proposed closures & part-time bus gate	Options to be considered under separate report -
Drum Brae North	Cycle segregation	Options to be considered under separate report on East Craigs
Leith	TBA	Design under development
Corstorphine South (Featherhall)	Filtered permeability	Scheme to be developed using funding from Neighbourhood Environment Programme (NEPs) rather than Spaces for People (the estimated cost is £50,000)

SPACES FOR EXERCISE		
Braid Road	Road closure	Review undertaken – recommendation to reopen immediately
Links Gardens	Road closure	Review undertaken – recommendation to reopen immediately
Cammo Walk	Road closure	Review complete - recommendation to modify and reopen south Cammo car park included in this Committee report
Warriston Road	Road closure	Review undertaken – Recommendation to remove this scheme included in this Committee report
Stanley Street/ Hope Street	Road closure	Review complete – recommendation to continue with improvements to temporary signage
Braidburn Terrace	One-way road closure	Continuation of temporary one-way arrangement considered appropriate with Braid Road closure
Silverknowes Road (North section)	Road Closure	Review undertaken - revision proposed for approval in this report Should be re-opened immediately
Silverknowes Road (South section)	Alternative on-street proposal to be developed	Following notification response - progress alternative detailed design
Granton Square / Gypsy Brae	Cycle segregation	Local engagement ongoing - scheme under development.
Seafield Street	Cycle segregation	Review programmed for December 2020.
Kings Place	Link between Proms	Temporary measures installed - Review programmed December 2020
Maybury Road	Temporary traffic lights	Review complete – recommendation to continue with no changes (note traffic lights are now 'live' but further North and another set are due to be in situ nearer Queensferry Road imminently)
Arboretum Place	Crossing point	Temporary measures installed - Review programmed December 2020
Carrington Road	Road closure	Currently on hold

Public Proposals – Commonplace Consultation	Various	Recommend approval to progress detailed designs:
Broughton Street	Pavement widening and uphill cycle lane	To approve subject to consultation with local community: develop short / medium term proposals in order to recognise impact changes in traffic management to facilitate tram construction
Broughton St Roundabout	Improvements for pedestrian crossings	For Approval
Restalrig Road South (Smoky Brae)	Pavement widening and uphill cycle lane. Road layout TBA	For Approval

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Starbank Road	Pavement widening with give & go traffic management	To approve to detailed design work, subject to traffic modelling being completed to understand the impact on people moving along or living on Starbank Road, East Trinity Road and Ferry Road.
Fillyside Road - Crossing	Installation of a pedestrian/cyclist crossing point (Island – TBA)	For Approval
Fillyside Road	Pavement widening	For Approval
West End of Princes Street	Footpath widening at Johnny Walker site	No short term changes possible
Musselburgh boundary to Portobello (Edinburgh section)	Cycle segregation from CEC boundary in to Portobello	For Approval
Duddingston Road West	Cycle segregation	Assessment completed but considered not feasible due to road width
Portobello Promenade	Improved signage and minor interventions to reduce speed of cyclists	For Approval Additional/improved signage to be considered
Removal of Street Clutter	Working in partnership with Living Streets to remove street clutter	Proposed to package as a single, city wide scheme (excluding city centre) : progress report to TEC in Jan 2021
Greenbank Drive and Glenlockhart Road	Reduce speed limit to 20mph	Speed limit reduction to be considered by the Road Safety team

Schools	Various measures	See Appendix 3.
----------------	------------------	-----------------

Note: Information contained in this list will be subject to change with the potential for estimated costs to be revised during the detailed design phase. Actual costs are tracked during the procurement and installation phases.

Each project (excluding minor interventions at schools for example) is considered by a Design Review Group (peer review), subject to internal approval and shared with the agreed Notification Stakeholder Group.

On completion of all these stages the projects are considered by the Corporate Incident Management Team (CIMT) or Committee prior to implementation.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment 2

- 1) To note this update on the Spaces for People programme.
- 2) To approve the specific scheme changes noted in paragraph 4.5 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To approve the new schemes as outlined in paragraphs 4.7, 4.8 – 4.11 and Appendix 2 of the Executive Director's report for:

- 3.1 South Bridge – Town Centre Measures
 - 3.2 Lanark Road, Longstone Road and Inglis Green Road
 - 3.3 A1 and A90
 - 3.4 Greenbank to Meadows
- 4) To approve the recommendations included in Appendix 1 of the Executive Director's report.
 - 5) To note the schedule of proposed measures near schools (Appendix 3 of the Executive Director's report) and deliver these as quickly as possible.
 - 6) To note the high level and detailed reports on Commonplace (Appendix 4 of the Executive Director's report) and approve the recommended schemes arising from the suggestions made (paragraph 4.36 and Appendix 1 of the report)
 - 7) To note the issues of street clutter and unnecessary barriers and guardrails, and agree to receive an update on removal of these items to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the update on the Spaces for People programme.

- 2) To approve the specific scheme changes as noted in paragraph 4.5 and appendix 1 of the committee report, with the exception of the following:
 - a) believes there is insufficient justification for the continued closure of Silverknowes Road and therefore agrees to reopen this road with further work undertaken to establish cycleways on the route and options for safe crossing points at the north and south ends of the road.
 - b) agrees that officers re-examine the Silverknowes Parkway element of the Pennywell Road scheme to address issues with access and deliveries for households on Silverknowes Parkway.
 - c) believes there is insufficient justification for the continued closure of Braid Road, therefore agrees to reopen this road as well as install the planned improvements and appropriate traffic calming measures.
 - d) agrees the Orchard Brae roundabout be considered a priority project for implementation by the end of 2020.
- 3) To agree to continue consideration of the South Bridge - Town Centres scheme for one cycle pending further discussion on the positioning of bus stops.
- 4) To recognise the changes made to the Greenbank to Meadows quiet route and agrees to continue consideration to allow for a short online consultation with affected residents.
- 5) To agree to proceed with the A90 scheme (subject to further consideration of changes to the phasing of traffic lights at the Burnshot junction to control peak time traffic flow) and the A1 scheme

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Young

Amendment 4

To note the written deputation from the Private Hire Association to the Transport Environment Committee on 12 the November (see Item 3.10 here <https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/documents/b17338/Deputations%2012th-Nov-2020%2010.00%20Transport%20and%20Environment%20Committee.pdf?T=9>) which amongst other matters made reference to the following;

- No consultation regarding the Spaces for People proposals have taken place with the Private Hire Car (PHC) trade.
- Both taxis and PHC predominantly working on a pre-booked basis
- That by and large the PHC trade support the aims of Spaces for People
- PHC have a large number of both Hybrid and Electrically powered vehicles

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

- That PHC are licensed for public transport by City of Edinburgh Council (CEC)
- City of Edinburgh Council use PHC's by contract for both school and social work journeys
- Pre COVID demand was such that PHC made circa seven million journeys in the city
- Key workers have been able to use PHC's throughout the pandemic
- PHC's are an integral part of the city's Public Transport Network
- People with mobility issues who cannot manage access to hackney type vehicles use PHC's
- PHC's are by CEC regulation clearly marked, nearside, offside, front and back as Private Hire Vehicles.

To therefore recognise that it would be inequitable to not allow licensed PHC vehicles access through the bus gates proposed in the report when other CEC licensed public transport vehicles were allowed this privilege.

To further recognise that to deny such access on the basis of what other non-licensed vehicles might do was wrong thinking and the PHC trade should not be penalized on the basis of what other drivers might do.

To therefore resolve that where bus gates were instigated using emergency measures licensed PHC vehicles would enjoy the same privileges as other CEC licensed public transport vehicles.

- moved by Councillor Barrie, seconded by Councillor Bridgman

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 4 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Motion that the matter now be decided

During discussion of the above item, Councillor Fullerton requested in terms of Standing Order 23(1), that that the matter now be decided.

- moved by Councillor Fullerton, seconded by Councillor Child

Voting

For the motion that the matter now be decided	-	36 votes
Against the motion that the matter now be decided	-	25 votes

(For the motion that the matter now be decided: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Ethan Young.

Against the motion that the matter now be decided: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Louise Young.)

Decision

To approve the motion that the matter now be decided.

Voting

First Vote

The voting was as follows

For the motion	-	27 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	19 votes
For Amendment 2	-	9 votes
For Amendment 3	-	6 votes

(For the Motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Watt, Wilson, Work and Ethan Young.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Barrie, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Daggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.

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

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

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

Second Vote

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

For the Motion	-	27 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	25 votes
For Amendment 2	-	9 votes

For the Motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Watt, Wilson, Work and Ethan Young.

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

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

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

Vote 3

For the motion	-	36 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	25 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee of 12 November 2020 (item 10); referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Arthur declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a work colleague of persons involved in the proposals in this item and as a member of Spokes.

Councillors Corbett, Key, Main, Miller, Osler declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of Spokes.

4 Spaces for People – East Craigs Low Traffic Neighbourhood - referral from Transport and Environment committee

(a) Deputation – Get Edinburgh Moving

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Get Edinburgh Moving.

The deputation felt that a full public consultation should be held prior to any work commencing to implement the ETRO. This stressed that consultation should be managed to ensure the view of local, directly affected residents were taken into account first and foremost – not individuals or lobby groups from outside the directly affected area.

(b) Deputation – Corstorphine Community Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Corstorphine Community Council

The deputation indicated that they had received correspondence from local residents around issues of a perceived lack of democratic accountability and transparency to specific assertions about the proposed LTN such as the area is already a low traffic neighbourhood; an increase in pollution levels due to the rerouting of traffic; safety concerns for schoolchildren due to the rerouting of traffic; the proposed LTN does nothing to reduce traffic but simply concentrates it into certain streets; the proposed LTN forces people to make longer journeys and increases air pollution and more.

The deputation asked that in their role as a community representative body, a wish to have written clarification around the consultation processes and timescales, so that they might plan the necessary meetings and other communications between themselves and the community.

(c) Deputation – Low Traffic Corstorphine

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Low Traffic Corstorphine.

The deputation indicated their support for the Spaces for People proposals to increase safety around Craigmount High School and provide protected cycling infrastructure along the busy main road of Drum Brae North. They expressed disappointment at the decision to pursue option 2b, rather than option 2a as a solution and noted that bold and progressive actions to support social distancing and active travel were being consistently eroded away. The deputation hoped that additional measures would be brought forth in the future to support and enable more walking, cycling and wheeling for the school run.

(d) Deputation – Drum Brae Community Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Drum Brae Community Council

The deputation stressed that since this matter first arose and during the time since, they had been attempting to engage with the Council on the matter but felt that so far it had steadfastly omitted to meet it's statutory requirements in allowing the impacted Community Councils to participate.

The deputation indicated that due to that lack of response, they had reached a position where they had had to submit a Community Participation Request submission.

(e) Referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report setting out options for improving conditions for walking and cycling in the East Craigs area in response to COVID-19 following discussions at the Policy and Strategy Committee (20 August 2020), the Transport and Environment Committee (1 October 2020) and the City of Edinburgh Council's meeting (15 October 2020) to Council for approval of the Committee's recommendations.

Motion

- 1) To note the background to the Spaces for People programme, and particularly the proposed introduction of a Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in East Craigs.
- 2) To note the options to improve conditions for walking and cycling in the East Craigs area.
- 3) To approve option 2b for implementation by Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) as part of the Council's Spaces for People programme as set out in paragraphs 4.12 – 4.13 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 4) To approve commencement of an experimental traffic order and to propose a full public consultation prior to the decision by a later Transport and Environment

Committee, (date to be confirmed), as part of the process for the introduction of a LTN in East Craigs as set out in paragraphs 4.23 - 4.30 of the Executive Director's report.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

To delete all of the motion by Councillor Macinnes and replace with:

- 1) To note the background to the Spaces for People programme, and particularly the proposed introduction of the Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in East Craigs.
- 2) To note the legal opinion provided to both the Get Edinburgh Moving community group and the Council indicated, that using the emergency legislation and the SfP programme to progress an LTN was not a proportionate or appropriate action.
- 3) To recognise that option 2b presented for implementation by Temporary Traffic Regulation Order was yet to be presented to the stakeholder list and undergo the standard approved 5 day accelerated consultation and as such continued to raise concerns within the community.
- 4) To recognise the subtle but vital differences in the verbal amendment made at Transport and Environment Committee and that presented in the revised Motion (as stated in point 4) in relation to the timing of the consultation.
- 5) To note this disparity continued to be cause of concern across the wider East Craigs area.
- 6) To agree therefore that Option 3 presented in the original report continued to be the only democratically acceptable option available.
- 7) To agree that no part of the programme would be progressed unless or until a redesign was in place that gained local support and therefore request a full, comprehensive consultation with the local community.

- 8) To agree with proposals to introduce measures to address the footway pinch points around Craigmount High School and that these be carried out under the schedule of proposed measures for schools.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Brown

Amendment 2

To delete all of the motion by Councillor Macinnes and replace with:

- 1) To regret the flawed processes and previous poor decisions on implementing the East Craigs Low Traffic Neighbourhood and recognise the damage this had caused to the relationship between the Council and the people of East Craigs, North Gyle and Craigmount.
- 2) To congratulate the campaigning efforts of those in the community, who simply asked for the Council to consult properly before any decisions were taken, and believe the contents of the Transport and Environment Committee report vindicated those efforts over the last three months.
- 3) To agree that no experimental traffic regulation order should be progressed on the LTN until (a) a full public consultation had been undertaken and (b) the Transport and Environment Committee had been provided with the results of that consultation and given an opportunity to consider the appropriate next steps.
- 4) To agree to proceed with option 2b as set out in the committee report meantime in order to address concerns around social distancing and traffic speeds immediately outside Craigmount High School.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	36 votes
For Amendment 1	-	19 votes
For Amendment 2	-	6 votes

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

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

For Amendment 2: Councillors Aldridge, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Louise Young.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee of 12 November 2020 (item 11); referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Arthur, Key and Osler declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of Spokes.

5 Small Business Saturday 2020– Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

(a) Deputation – Unite the Union Edinburgh Cab Branch

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Unite the Union Edinburgh Cab Branch.

The deputation welcomed the motion by Councillor Cameron regarding business support to small businesses and asked the Council to also support this so that small businesses could get the help they needed to survive this pandemic and hopefully flourish again in the future and also still be of service to the communities, the charities they helped and be the ambassadors of this beautiful City.

(b) Deputation – Edinburgh Private Hire Association

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Edinburgh Private hire Association.

The deputation indicated that they wished to take the opportunity to support Councillor Cameron's motion regarding the Business support initiatives from the City of Edinburgh Council.

(c) Deputation – Edinburgh DJ Ltd

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Edinburgh DJ Ltd.

The deputation indicated that due to the restrictions they were no longer able to operate the most crucial part of their business which was equipment rental (hire) to all sizes of events across Scotland. The restrictions including the no music policy have all but wiped out their regular customers.

The deputation felt that the Council could do more to support businesses by generating grants and distributing them on an even and fair basis rather than creating a system which was hard to understand. They also felt that various types of events including drive in movies and large open-air events, areas where people had large seated areas outside etc where people are able to remain far apart should be considered for approval.

(d) Deputation – Dr Bells

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Dr Bells.

The deputation felt that the Council could do more to support businesses by interpreting the rules in a more even-handed manner. It appeared to them that the Council wished to deny as many applications as possible on technicalities, and indicated that these decisions would lead to many redundancies and businesses closing, and as the Scottish Government had supplied the funding to the councils, councils should now be forced to distribute these funds fairly.

(e) Deputation – Corstorphine Business

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Corstorphine Business.

The deputation outlined support which would be helpful to Corstorphine Business particularly in their early stage of development, and the Council's current work on Shop Local.

(f) Deputation – Edinburgh Farmers Market Cooperative

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Edinburgh Farmers Market Cooperative.

The deputation indicated that footfall had drastically reduced this year, due to the impact of COVID-19, with many customers self isolating and visitor numbers so much reduced. Following on from this, operational arrangements had been altered to ensure that the layout of the market gave space for social distancing of staff, customers and stallholders and was a safe place to work and shop which had involved extra costs

The deputation asked the Council to support the 40+ Scottish independent businesses selling at the market and the 30+ part-time staff employed by the

market and businesses at the market by granting their appeal to reduce or waive the Market Operators Licence fee.

(g) Deputation – All Wrapped Up Scotland

A written deputation was presented on behalf of All Wrapped Up Scotland.

The deputation asked the Council to consider grants being made available as happened for the arts, nightclubs etc which would help safeguard so many small businesses and strongly disagreed with the chancellor that an industry with over 400,000 people bringing in £14.7 billion was not unviable.

(h) Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

The following motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council notes that Small Business Saturday 2020 takes place on 5th December, and that the day-to-day environment within which businesses operate has changed vastly due to Government restrictions and efforts to minimise and mitigate the risks and impact of COVID-19 on Public Health.

Council notes the impact of COVID-19 on key industry sectors of our economy, including hospitality, entertainment, the arts and creative sectors, our festivals, leisure, culture and attractions.

Council notes that from 1 January 2021, businesses will be required to comply with new rules following the UK leaving the EU Single Market and Customs Union. Council recognises that we must work to support businesses when they come into effect on 1 January 2021.

Council further notes challenges which Edinburgh businesses are continuing to face; and welcomes the investment and changes to operational arrangements made by Edinburgh business owners to comply with COVID-19 restrictions and to keep patrons, customers and employees safe.

Council recognises the work undertaken to support businesses through business support, through work within the regulatory department to make it easier for businesses to adapt as we move through different restriction levels and the work done to distribute grants which has been of vital importance to businesses throughout the pandemic.

Council also notes that work has also begun on the new Economy Strategy which will build on previous strategies with a focus on good growth, wellbeing, sustainability and tackling poverty and inequality, but which will also need to adapt significantly to reflect the twin challenges of Brexit and the Coronavirus.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Council therefore calls for a report in one cycle to the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee to set out the work that is being done on the Edinburgh Guarantee, in partnership with businesses across the city.

Council calls for a further report, in one cycle, to the Housing Homelessness and Fair Work Committee that gives a detailed update, on business support that has been paid to Edinburgh businesses including insights and feedback received on the efficiency of the process.”

- moved by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron, seconded by Councillor Kate Campbell

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Campbell.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Cameron declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of EICC, EDI and CEC Holdings and a Director of the Edinburgh Community Solar Cooperative (ECSC).

Councillor Gordon declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Chair of EICC and a member of Capital City Partnership.

Councillor Smith declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of EICC and Capital City Partnership.

Councillor Watt declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member Capital City Partnership.

4 Appointments to Committees etc

On 28 May 2020, the Policy and Sustainability Committee, under interim political management arrangements, appointed members to executive committees, other committees, joint boards and outside bodies, etc for 2020/21. Councillor Neil Ross had tendered his resignation as a member of the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee and the Council was asked to appoint Councillor Gloyer in his place.

Decision

- 1) To appoint Councillor Gloyer in place of Councillor Neil Ross on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.
- 2) To note that members of the Liberal Democrat Group would be attending Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee on rotation and would advise Committee Services accordingly, but that Councillor Gloyer would be the main named contact.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 28 May 2020 (item 16); report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

5 Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions

As a result of an internal audit into the school admissions, and appeals process and Section 27 of the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019, details were provided on two proposed amendments to the Council's Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions.

Motion

To repeal the existing Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions and approve in its place Appendix 1 of the report by the Chief Executive, such repeal and approval to take effect from 20 November 2020.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

Council:

Recognises that current committee memberships are not reflective of the political make-up of the Council.

Acknowledges that this anomaly contravenes the principles of fairness and proportionality and is profoundly undemocratic.

Agrees to amend the Committee Terms of reference as follows:

- 3.1 Deletes 'unless expressly agreed otherwise at a meeting of the full Council' and amends the remaining wording to read 'Committee membership will be proportionate according to the elected member representation of political groups, except where a committee comprises a single representative from each political group, in which case the total number of elected members on that committee will be equal to the number of political groups represented on the Council at any one time.'

Council therefore calls for a report to be presented in one cycle setting out how this can be enacted.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Voting

The voting was as follow:

For the motion	-	36 votes
For the amendment	-	25 votes

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

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

For the amendment: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Daggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Louise Young.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

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

6 Public Holidays 2021-2027

Details were provided of the dates of public holiday from 2021 to 2027 and advising of a clash of the Spring holiday date with Easter Monday in the years 2022 and 2025.

Motion

- 1) To note the Public Holiday dates in Edinburgh for the period 2021 to 2027 as attached at Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To agree that a further report would be brought back to Council to consider the Edinburgh Spring Holiday in 2022.
- 3) To agree the Spring Holiday in 2025 shall be Monday 14 April 2025.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

To approve the report subject to the 2022 dates being updated to include the late May Spring Bank holiday being moved to Thursday 2 June 2022 and the extra Bank Holiday taking place on 3 June 2022 to mark Her Majesty the Queen's Platinum Jubilee.

- moved by Councillor Cook, seconded by Councillor Bruce

Voting

The voting was as follow:

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

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

(For the motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work, Ethan Young and Louise 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 motion by Councillor McVey.

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

7 By-election - No14 Craigentiny-Duddingston Ward

Decision

To note that Ethan Young, (Scottish National Party) had been elected as a councillor for No 14 Craigentiny/Duddingston Ward.

(Reference – report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

8 Edinburgh International Group Update

In response to a motion by the Lord Provost, details were provided on the progress in re-establishing the Edinburgh International Group.

Decision

- 1) To note that the Edinburgh International Group reconvened in October 2020.

- 2) To note that partners agreed to the development of a forward schedule of regular meetings to support ongoing collaboration, and the refresh of the Edinburgh International framework by June 2021.

(References – Act of Council No 16 of 15 October 2020; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

9 City of Edinburgh Council – 2019-20 Annual Audit Report to the Council and the Controller of Audit – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the principal findings arising from the Council's 2019/20 external audit to the Council for information.

Motion

To note the report by the Finance and Resources Committee.

- moved by Councillor Munn, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Amendment

- 1) To note that, following the audit process, it was anticipated that an unqualified audit opinion would be issued on the Council's annual accounts for 2019/20.
- 2) To note that, following approval by the Finance and Resources Committee, the audited annual accounts would be signed and submitted to the external auditor.
- 3) To note the areas of strength identified within the wider scope audit work and that progress in the delivery of the remaining improvement actions set out in Appendix 5 of the auditor's report would be reported to the Committee during the coming year.
- 4) To note that, once approved, a summarised version of the annual accounts would also be published on the Council's website by 30 November 2020.
- 5) To note the concerns raised by the external auditor that the Council was only able to deliver 77% of approved savings in 2019/20.
- 6) To regret that despite previous warnings from the external auditors in this regard, the Council was still deemed to have no long-term financial strategy.
- 7) To note with concern the opinion of the external auditors that the Council's reserves were at the lower range of what they would deem to be prudent.
- 8) To request a report from the Head of Finance in two cycles setting out a strategy for the rebuilding of the Council's reserves.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Voting

The voting was as follow:

For the motion	-	39 votes
For the amendment	-	23 votes

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

For the amendment: 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 Louise Young.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Munn.

(Reference – Finance and Resources Committee of 5 November 2020 (item 1); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

10 Revenue Budget 2020-23 - 2020-21 Month Five Position and Framework Assumptions Update - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report seeking approval of the use in 2020/21 of up to £0.6m from the Council's earmarked reserves to meet costs associated with the independent review of the Council's whistleblowing arrangements and culture to Council for consideration.

Motion

To approve the use in 2020/21 of up to £0.6m from the Council's earmarked reserves to meet costs associated with the independent review of the Council's whistleblowing arrangements and culture.

- moved by Councillor Munn, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Amendment

- 1) In relation to paragraph 1.1.7 of the recommendations and paragraph 4.34 of the report by the Executive Director of Resources, to note that the council was agreeing to not more than £600k for the costs, to be taken from reserves, and that any costs in excess of £600k would need to be reported to and agreed by Finance and Resources Committee, subject to approval of Council, prior to any further commitment being made.
- 2) To note that at Finance and Resources Committee, members expressed concern about a potential escalation of costs well beyond £600k and agreed that the next meeting of Finance and Resources Committee would be presented with details on the cost of the independent review and a breakdown of charges; and that thereafter an update would be provided to each committee meeting on the financial impact of the independent inquiry.
- 3) To agree that the terms of reference and programme of work agreed by the review should be mindful of reasonable expectations of best value and proportionality of cost.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), paragraphs 1) and 2) of the amendment were accepted as addendums to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Munn:

- 1) To approve the use in 2020/21 of up to £0.6m from the Council's earmarked reserves to meet costs associated with the independent review of the Council's whistleblowing arrangements and culture.
- 2) In relation to paragraph 1.1.7 of the recommendations and paragraph 4.34 of the report by the Executive Director of Resources, to note that the council was agreeing to not more than £600k for the costs, to be taken from reserves, and that any costs in excess of £600k would need to be reported to and agreed by Finance and Resources Committee, subject to approval of Council, prior to any further commitment being made.
- 3) To note that at Finance and Resources Committee, members expressed concern about a potential escalation of costs well beyond £600k and agreed that the next meeting of Finance and Resources Committee would be presented with details on the cost of the independent review and a breakdown of charges; and that thereafter an update would be provided to each committee meeting on the financial impact of the independent inquiry.

- 4) To agree that the terms of reference and programme of work agreed by the review should be mindful of reasonable expectations of best value and proportionality of cost.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee of 29 October 2020 (item 5); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

11 Town Centre Fund - Additional Allocations - referral from the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee

The Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee had referred an update report on the Town Centre Fund – Additional Allocations to Council for consideration.

Motion

- 1) To agree the allocation of the additional £0.954m of the additional Town Centre Fund money.
- 2) To agree the reallocation of £0.500m from the South Queensferry public realm project
- 3) To note the agreed strategic statement: “The Council will direct investment in Edinburgh’s town centres and local centres to projects that strengthen and reinforce their roles as set out in the Edinburgh Local Development Plan; contribute to inclusive growth; and enhance their resilience and sustainability in the face of change.”
- 4) To recognise the importance of outdoor public space especially in the current circumstances.
- 5) To further recognise the importance of investing in regeneration areas and the coalition commitment to tackling poverty and inequality.
- 6) To allocate to the projects as set out in the table below:

Gracemount public realm - £100k	100,000.00
Craigmillar town centre - £170k	170,000.00
Westside Plaza Phase 3	300,000.00
Granton Station	747,000.00
Pentlands Community Space	75,000.00
Pennywell Hub	62,000.00
TOTAL	£1,454,000.00

- 7) To agree that if it became apparent that any projects would not be able to achieve the funding timescales set out in 3.1 of the report, funding should be reallocated by the Executive Director of Place in consultation with the Convener and Vice Convener of Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee.

- moved by Councillor Kate Campbell, seconded by Councillor Watt

Amendment 1

Council

- 1) To agree the allocation of the additional £0.954m of the additional Town Centre Fund money.
- 2) To agree the reallocation of £0.500m from the South Queensferry public realm project.
- 3) To agree to fund the following:
 - a) Bruntsfield St Oswald's (£0.55m)
 - b) The Corstorphine Community Centre (£0.75m)
 - c) Pentlands Community Space (£0.15m)
- 4) To agree that if it became apparent that any projects would not be able to achieve the funding timescales set out in 3.1 of the report by the Executive Director of Place, funding shall be reallocated by the Executive Director of Place in consultation with the Convener and Vice-Convener of Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee.

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment 2

As per recommendation 1.1.3 of the report to Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on 5 November 2020 which calls for members to select projects from the shortlist in Appendix 1, allocates the funding as per the table below, recognising the case for funding to be targeted on those projects in communities which experience the greatest disadvantage:

Project	Funding allocated (£m)	As a percentage of funding requested
Craigmillar town centre	0.170	100%
Gracemount public realm	0.100	100%
Granton station	0.759	89%
Pennywell hub	0.125	100%
Westside plaza phase 3	0.300	100%

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Booth

Amendment 3

- 1) To agree the allocation of the additional £0.954m of the additional Town Centre Fund money.

- 2) To agree the reallocation of £0.500m from the South Queensferry public realm project.
- 3) To agree to allocate funding to cover 100% of the stated costs for:
 - a) Bruntsfield St Oswald's
 - b) The Corstorphine Community Centre
 - c) Pennywell Hub
- 4) To agree that if it became apparent that any projects would not be able to achieve the funding timescales set out in 3.1 of the report by the Executive Director of Place, funding shall be reallocated by the Executive Director of Place in consultation with the Convener and Vice-Convener of Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

Voting

First Vote

The voting was as follows

For the motion	-	26 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes
For Amendment 2	-	10 votes
For Amendment 3	-	8 votes

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

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, Graczyk, Howie, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bridgman, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Louise Young.

Abstentions: The Lord Provost.)

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

Second Vote

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

For the Motion	-	26 votes
For Amendment 1	-	25 votes
For Amendment 2	-	10 votes

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

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

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

Abstentions: The Lord Provost.)

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

Third Vote

For the motion	-	36 votes
For Amendment 1	-	25 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Ethan Young.

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

Abstentions: The Lord Provost.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Kate Campbell.

(References – Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee of 5 November 2020; referral from the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

The Lord Provost declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a trustee of Corstorphine Community Centre.

Councillor Douglas declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of Corstorphine Community Centre.

Councillor Lang declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a family member was a member of the board of North Edinburgh Arts

Councillor Webber declared a non-financial interest in the above item as of the board of Pentland Community Space

13 Trams to Newhaven – COVID-19 Final Business Case Refresh - referral from Transport and Environment committee

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report detailing the Trams to Newhaven – COVID-19 Final Business Case Refresh for the project to Council for approval.

Motion

- 1) To note the analysis set out in the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that under all scenarios presented, the economic case for the project remained positive with a benefit to cost ratio above 1.
- 3) To note that the impact of COVID-19 on financing costs was uncertain and that the future call on reserves could range from £0m to £93m, but that reserves would be replenished over the longer-term.
- 4) To approve the potential use of reserves of up to £93m noted at paragraph 3).
- 5) To note that in all but one scenario project cancellation had a higher cost to the Council than continuing with the project.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

- 6) To note that should the Council decide to cancel the project, there would be a £32m call on reserves in the current financial year under all scenarios, this would need to be funded through the cancellation and/or delay of projects in the Council's capital programme.
- 7) To note the total cost of cancellation was calculated at £107.4m compared with £207.3 to build the line and that this £107.4m would be incurred with none of the benefits set out in the Final Business Case (FBC) being realised.
- 8) To note that since the Trams to Newhaven FBC was approved, the emerging policies and strategies only strengthen the case for high capacity, high quality public transport in the city.
- 9) To note that the emerging policies and strategies would, other things being equal, lead to the development of a transport network where tram would expect to attract higher levels of demand compared to the assumptions made at the time of the FBC.
- 10) To approve continuing with the construction of the Trams to Newhaven project which was still projected to be within the budget of £207.3m as set out in the Final Business Case for the project and approved by Council.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

To delete all of the motion by Councillor Macinnes and replace with:

- 1) To note the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To express concern that the report set out a choice between an unaffordable cancellation at an immediate cost to the taxpayer of £32m plus sunk costs OR an unaffordable risk of a strain on Council reserves in the near future of £93m. All of this based on a set of assumptions that could prove to be optimistic given potential long-term travel pattern changes from a new work from home culture.
- 3) To condemn the actions of the SNP/Labour Administration and its allies for endangering the Council's finances and future services by accepting the 2019 Business Plan given its reliance on future fare revenue, inflated project costs and timescales and failure to take full account of the risks to fare revenue.
- 4) To therefore agree to instruct the Chief Executive to provide a report as a matter of urgency setting out:
 - a demonstrable plan as to how ringfenced Reserves can be set aside to cover the £93m deficit identified in the report
 - how this funding can be accommodated in a properly structured and long-awaited long-term financial plan as repeatedly called for by the Council's external auditors.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

- the opportunity costs of building up and using Reserves to support this project including any service withdrawals or redesigns necessary
 - how, given the parlous state of Council reserves in the current financial year, the Council can be insulated from current and future risk of bankruptcy
 - a transparent breakdown within the tram project of cost savings and overspends identified to date against the original business plan
 - actions being undertaken to enable value engineering and acceleration of the project timeline to reduce cost and mitigate risk
 - a full analysis of the revenue impacts across bus and trams as was provided in the original business case (but is missing in this update) given (i) the Council's proposed merger of its Transport ALEOs (ii) the direct impact future tram fare revenue will have on bus revenue and services (iii) and the risks to future tram income which apply equally to bus income and dividends payable from Lothian Buses to CEC placing an even greater strain on Council budgets over and above the £93m risk outlined in the report.
- 5) To further instruct the Chief Executive to seek financial assistance from Scottish Government to support both construction and loan charge costs of this project so that Edinburgh receives a fairer share of Scotland wide infrastructure spending in line with its place as Scotland's capital city.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the analysis set out in the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that under all scenarios presented, the economic case for the project remained positive with a benefit to cost ratio above 1.
- 3) To note that the impact of COVID-19 on financing costs was uncertain and that the future call on reserves could range from £0m to £93m, but that reserves would be replenished over the longer-term.
- 4) To approve the potential use of reserves of up to £93m noted at paragraph 3).
- 5) To note that in all but one scenario project cancellation had a higher cost to the Council than continuing with the project.
- 6) To note that should the Council decide to cancel the project, there would be a £32m call on reserves in the current financial year under all scenarios, this would need to be funded through the cancellation and/or delay of projects in the Council's capital programme.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

- 7) To note the total cost of cancellation was calculated at £107.4m compared with £207.3 to build the line and that this £107.4m would be incurred with none of the benefits set out in the Final Business Case (FBC) being realised.
- 8) To note that since the Trams to Newhaven FBC was approved, the emerging policies and strategies only strengthen the case for high capacity, high quality public transport in the city.
- 9) To note that the emerging policies and strategies would, other things being equal, lead to the development of a transport network where tram would expect to attract higher levels of demand compared to the assumptions made at the time of the FBC.
- 10) To approve continuing with the construction of the Trams to Newhaven project which was still projected to be within the budget of £207.3m as set out in the Final Business Case for the project and approved by Council.
- 11) To therefore agree to instruct the Chief Executive to provide a report as a matter of urgency setting out:
 - a demonstrable plan as to how ringfenced Reserves can be set aside to cover the £93m deficit identified in the report
 - how this funding can be accommodated in a properly structured and long-awaited long-term financial plan as repeatedly called for by the Council's external auditors.
 - the opportunity costs of building up and using Reserves to support this project including any service withdrawals or redesigns necessary
 - how, given the parlous state of Council reserves in the current financial year, the Council can be insulated from current and future risk of bankruptcy
 - a transparent breakdown within the tram project of cost savings and overspends identified to date against the original business plan
 - actions being undertaken to enable value engineering and acceleration of the project timeline to reduce cost and mitigate risk
 - a full analysis of the revenue impacts across bus and trams as was provided in the original business case (but is missing in this update) given (i) the Council's proposed merger of its Transport ALEOs (ii) the direct impact future tram fare revenue will have on bus revenue and services (iii) and the risks to future tram income which apply equally to bus income and dividends payable from Lothian Buses to CEC placing an even greater strain on Council budgets over and above the £93m risk outlined in the report.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

- 12) To further instruct the Chief Executive to seek financial assistance from Scottish Government to support both construction and loan charge costs of this project so that Edinburgh receives a fairer share of Scotland wide infrastructure spending in line with its place as Scotland's capital city

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), paragraph 5 of Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	35 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes
For Amendment 2	-	8 votes

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

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, Barrie, Bridgman, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Louise Young.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note the analysis set out in the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that under all scenarios presented, the economic case for the project remained positive with a benefit to cost ratio above 1.
- 3) To note that the impact of COVID-19 on financing costs was uncertain and that the future call on reserves could range from £0m to £93m, but that reserves would be replenished over the longer-term.
- 4) To approve the potential use of reserves of up to £93m noted at paragraph 3).
- 5) To note that in all but one scenario project cancellation had a higher cost to the Council than continuing with the project.
- 6) To note that should the Council decide to cancel the project, there would be a £32m call on reserves in the current financial year under all scenarios, this would need to be funded through the cancellation and/or delay of projects in the Council's capital programme.
- 7) To note the total cost of cancellation was calculated at £107.4m compared with £207.3 to build the line and that this £107.4m would be incurred with none of the benefits set out in the Final Business Case (FBC) being realised.
- 8) To note that since the Trams to Newhaven FBC was approved, the emerging policies and strategies only strengthen the case for high capacity, high quality public transport in the city.
- 9) To note that the emerging policies and strategies would, other things being equal, lead to the development of a transport network where tram would expect to attract higher levels of demand compared to the assumptions made at the time of the FBC.
- 10) To approve continuing with the construction of the Trams to Newhaven project which was still projected to be within the budget of £207.3m as set out in the Final Business Case for the project and approved by Council.
- 11) To note that construction costs associated with COVID were being captured in the event of any specific support available. Request the Council Leader write to the Scottish Government again to highlight the issue of capital pressure on construction projects across Council projects, including tram and seeking consideration of specific financial assistance from Scottish Government to help mitigate this. To agree the Leader also write again to the UK Government to request support on loan charge costs in recognition that most of the borrowing supporting the Council's capital projects are through the public loans works board.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee of 12 November 2020 (item 6); referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Macinnes declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Chair of Transport for Edinburgh.

Councillors Doran, Laidlaw and Miller declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of Transport for Edinburgh.

15 Regulation of Fireworks - Motion by Councillor Lang

The following motion by Councillor Lang was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council:

- 1) recognises that whilst the majority of people use fireworks in a safe and responsible manner, the reckless misuse of fireworks by a minority has continued to caused damage and distress in a number of local communities.
- 2) expresses its sincere thanks to the emergency services who tended to a number of serious incidents in the city earlier this month because of the misuse of fireworks.
- 3) notes that 94% of those who responded to the 2019 Scottish Government consultation on the regulation of fireworks agreed there should be more control over the sale of fireworks and 92% were in favour of greater control on the use of fireworks.
- 4) welcomes the recent report from the Fireworks Review Group and the 11 recommendations submitted to the Scottish Government, including the creation of no firework zones, limitations on the days and times that fireworks can be set off, and measures to tackle proxy-purchasing of fireworks by those under the age of 18.
- 5) agrees that the Leader of the Council write to the Minister for Community Safety to express the Council’s support for additional measures to address the misuse of fireworks and to ask that such measures are put in place in time for November 2021.

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Young

Amendment 1

To replace Paragraph 5 of the motion by Councillor Lang with:

5) Council:

“Notes the Leader wrote to both the UK and Scottish Governments in 2018. Since then there has been some progress in the Scottish Parliament with publication in early November 2020 of recommendations from the Independent Firework Review Group and the outcome of the Scottish Government’s consultation in 2019 but regrets that the Westminster Government have taken no substantive action since. Agrees that the Leader will write again to the UK Government to support calls to change the sale of fireworks legislation which is required to make progress. Also agree the Leader will write to the Scottish Government to request a timeline on action points from the review.

Agrees that City of Edinburgh Council with partners (Fire/Police Scotland) will provide firework safety information on appropriate web/social media platforms”.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

1) To insert after point 1 of the motion by Councillor Lang:

“Recognises that fireworks are particularly hazardous for many of our disabled citizens, including those who cannot move out of the way quickly and their assistance animals, such as guide dogs, which may become frightened and consequently distracted from their work by fireworks, putting their owners at risk; further recognises distress caused to both pets and wild animals by fireworks, which causes stress, harm and sometimes death.”

2) To insert after Point 5 of the motion:

“Agrees that in the same correspondence the Council Leader will offer council backing for Scottish ministers in their dialogue with UK ministers to act promptly in relation to reform of those aspects of reserved legislation on sale and supply of fireworks which would support the Fireworks Review Group’s aim of making use of fireworks safer and more responsible.”

- moved by Councillor Howie, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), the whole of Amendment 1 and paragraph 1 of Amendment 2 were accepted as amendments to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

- 1) To recognise that whilst the majority of people used fireworks in a safe and responsible manner, the reckless misuse of fireworks by a minority had continued to caused damage and distress in a number of local communities.

- 2) To recognise that fireworks were particularly hazardous for many of our disabled citizens, including those who could not move out of the way quickly and their assistance animals, such as guide dogs, which may become frightened and consequently distracted from their work by fireworks, putting their owners at risk; further recognise distress caused to both pets and wild animals by fireworks, which causes stress, harm and sometimes death.
- 3) To express the Council's sincere thanks to the emergency services who tended to a number of serious incidents in the city earlier this month because of the misuse of fireworks.
- 4) To note that 94% of those who responded to the 2019 Scottish Government consultation on the regulation of fireworks agreed there should be more control over the sale of fireworks and 92% were in favour of greater control on the use of fireworks.
- 5) To welcome the recent report from the Fireworks Review Group and the 11 recommendations submitted to the Scottish Government, including the creation of no firework zones, limitations on the days and times that fireworks could be set off, and measures to tackle proxy-purchasing of fireworks by those under the age of 18.
- 6) To note the Leader wrote to both the UK and Scottish Governments in 2018. Since then there had been some progress in the Scottish Parliament with publication in early November 2020 of recommendations from the Independent Firework Review Group and the outcome of the Scottish Government's consultation in 2019 but regret that the Westminster Government had taken no substantive action since. Agree that the Leader would write again to the UK Government to support calls to change the sale of fireworks legislation which was required to make progress. Also agree the Leader would write to the Scottish Government to request a timeline on action points from the review.
- 7) To agree that City of Edinburgh Council with partners (Fire/Police Scotland) would provide firework safety information on appropriate web/social media platforms.

16 Additional Costs Arising from The Short Term Lets Legislation - Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

The following motion by Councillor Neil Ross was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council:

- Welcomes the intention of the Scottish Government, following a second consultation which closed on 16 October 2020, to publish legislation in December to give local authorities powers to license short-term lets and introduce control areas.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

- Notes that the Control Area Regulations, as defined in the Consultation Paper, would allow planning authorities to designate all or part(s) of their area as a control area.
- Notes that within such a designated area, the use of a dwelling house for short term letting, in a property where the host does not normally live, would always be deemed to involve a material change of use and to require planning permission.
- Notes that there are over 6,500 active listings of entire properties for short term letting in Edinburgh.
- Recognises that, should this legislation be introduced next year, the Council's Planning and Licensing Departments are likely to receive a significant number of applications from short term let landlords.
- Therefore, given the current pressures on the Council's finances, requests a report to the Finance and Resources Committee within two cycles to quantify the likely costs to process these applications, which may be received as a result of this new legislation, and to outline the options for funding."

Motion

Council:

- Welcomes the intention of the Scottish Government, following a second consultation which closed on 16 October 2020, to publish legislation in December to give local authorities powers to license short-term lets and introduce control areas.
- Notes that the Control Area Regulations, as defined in the Consultation Paper, would allow planning authorities to designate all or part(s) of their area as a control area.
- Notes that within such a designated area, the use of a dwelling house for short term letting, in a property where the host does not normally live, would always be deemed to involve a material change of use and to require planning permission.
- Notes that there are over 6,500 active listings of entire properties for short term letting in Edinburgh.
- Recognises that, should this legislation be introduced next year, the Council's Planning and Licensing Departments are likely to receive a significant number of applications from short term let landlords
- Therefore, given the current pressures on the Council's finances, requests a report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee within two cycles to quantify the likely costs to process these applications, which may be received as a result of this new legislation, and to outline the options for funding.

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross, seconded by Councillor Osler

Amendment 1

To accept paragraphs 1-5 of the motion by Councillor Neil Ross and replace paragraph 6 with;

“Notes that costs from any licensing and planning system would normally be expected to be contained within the income received from applications received.

Therefore, given the current pressures on the Council’s finances, agrees the report to the Policy & Sustainability Committee, with the timeline for this being set out in the report to December 2020 Policy and Sustainability Committee on the Council’s response to the Scottish Government’s consultation. The future report will include information that sets out an assessment of whether the likely costs to the planning and licensing system, which may be received as a result of this new legislation, can be contained within the respective budget and if not the likely revenue impact for the council’s budget in year 2021/22.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Watt

Amendment 2

To add at the end of the motion by Councillor Lang:

- 1) Notes that planning and licensing regimes are both fee-based, and that fees should be set in a way which covers the cost of the application process; further notes that there is likely to be a significant additional cost of inspection and enforcement, and that enforcement action costs should be estimated for the purposes of this report; Notes the costs arising from processing licence applications would normally be expected to be contained within the income from application fees and that planning application fee rates are set nationally by the Scottish Government. They are currently under review. Licence fee rates for short term lets are expected to be determined locally by the licensing authority and set on a cost recovery basis for the licensing system.
- 2) Welcomes control areas for planning purposes, notes that a policy in the Local Development Plan / City Plan to prevent loss of homes to alternative uses would provide clarity on the determination of any such change of use applications; welcomes the intention, set out in the Choices for City Plan consultation earlier in the year, to consult on designating a Short Term Let Control area in the city, and on introducing a new policy on loss of homes to alternative uses; notes that 87% of respondents to the consultation supported control areas while 88% supported a new policy on loss of homes, expects that officers will take due consideration of this support in the forthcoming City Plan, and agrees that a members briefing will be circulated setting out the actions being taken to support acceleration of the wider roll-out of short term let control areas once the legislation is passed and on options for limiting loss of homes to alternative uses, prior to the adoption of the new City Plan.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Miller

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), the final sentence of Amendment 1 and paragraph 1 of Amendment 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	25 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	36 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To welcome the intention of the Scottish Government, following a second consultation which closed on 16 October 2020, to publish legislation in December to give local authorities powers to license short-term lets and introduce control areas.
- 2) To note that the Control Area Regulations, as defined in the Consultation Paper, would allow planning authorities to designate all or part(s) of their area as a control area.
- 3) To note that within such a designated area, the use of a dwelling house for short term letting, in a property where the host did not normally live, would always be deemed to involve a material change of use and to require planning permission.
- 4) To note that there were over 6,500 active listings of entire properties for short term letting in Edinburgh.
- 5) To recognise that, should this legislation be introduced next year, the Council's Planning and Licensing Departments were likely to receive a significant number of applications from short term let landlords.
- 6) To note that costs from any licensing and planning system would normally be expected to be contained within the income received from applications received.
- 7) Therefore, given the current pressures on the Council's finances, agree the report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee, with the timeline for this being set out in the report to December 2020 Policy and Sustainability Committee on the Council's response to the Scottish Government's consultation. The future report would include information that set out an assessment of whether the likely costs to the planning and licensing system, which may be received as a result of this new legislation, could be contained within the respective budget and if not the likely revenue impact for the council's budget in year 2021/22.
- 8) To note that planning and licensing regimes were both fee-based, and that fees should be set in a way which covered the cost of the application process; further note that there was likely to be a significant additional cost of inspection and enforcement, and that enforcement action costs should be estimated for the purposes of this report; Notes the costs arising from processing licence applications would normally be expected to be contained within the income from application fees and that planning application fee rates were set nationally by the

Scottish Government. They were currently under review. Licence fee rates for short term lets were expected to be determined locally by the licensing authority and set on a cost recovery basis for the licensing system.

- 9) To welcome control areas for planning purposes, note that a policy in the Local Development Plan / City Plan to prevent loss of homes to alternative uses would provide clarity on the determination of any such change of use applications; welcome the intention, set out in the Choices for City Plan consultation earlier in the year, to consult on designating a Short Term Let Control area in the city, and on introducing a new policy on loss of homes to alternative uses; note that 87% of respondents to the consultation supported control areas while 88% supported a new policy on loss of homes, expect that officers would take due consideration of this support in the forthcoming City Plan, and agree that a members briefing would be circulated setting out the actions being taken to support acceleration of the wider roll-out of short term let control areas once the legislation was passed and on options for limiting loss of homes to alternative uses, prior to the adoption of the new City Plan.

17 Extension of Visitor Parking Permits - Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

The following motion by Councillor Neil Ross was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council:

- Notes that the Council issues visitor parking permits in books of 10 and will exchange or refund only complete books of unused out of date permits.
- Notes that many residents hold a stock of visitor parking permits to be handed out to family, friends, carers and other visitors.
- Notes that, as a result of the restrictions during lockdown and the more recent restrictions on meeting other people, many of these permits remain unused
- Where the permits expire at the end of 2020, in order to avoid books of 2020 permits being posted into the Council in 2021 in order to be exchanged for books of 2021 permits, agrees that their validity should be extended to 31 December 2021.

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross, seconded by Councillor Osler

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Neil Ross

18 Celebrating the Rainbow Box Foundation – Motion by By Councillor Johnston

The following motion by Councillor Johnston was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council

- 1) Recognises the fantastic work of the Rainbow Box campaign, which now provides personal items, toiletries and iPads to over 60 wards across ten hospitals across the Lothians, for those suffering from Covid-19.
- 2) Further recognises the work of Staff Nurse Alison Williams, who founded the campaign in March of this year, and who has since been awarded the British Empire Medal and asks the Lord Provost to further recognise on behalf of the Council.
- 3) Requests that the Chief Officer of the Health and Social Care Partnership explore how the campaign can be further supported, with specific reference to volunteers.”

- moved by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Johnston.

19 Non-Disclosure Agreements - Motion by Councillor Rose

The following motion by Councillor Rose was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council:

Instructs the Monitoring Officer to produce a report in one cycle of Council setting out:

- 1) How individuals shall be assured that City of Edinburgh Council or any subsidiary organisations will not enforce any Non-Disclosure Agreements regarding any information shared with the Independent Inquiries launched by Council.
- 2) The mechanism to alert Council should the Independent Inquiry take an interest in an area where the City of Edinburgh Council may be inhibited by Non-Disclosure Agreements.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rose.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment

To delete all of Councillor Rose’s motion and replace with:

“Council notes the independent investigations currently underway, now led by the Independent Chair, Susanne Tanner QC, and that this investigation is fully empowered to

raise the use or relevance of non-disclosure agreements, if, in the opinion of the Chair, it is determined that such matters are of relevance to the terms of reference.

Council agrees that any existing non-disclosure agreement does not prevent any individual, or organisation, speaking to the independent investigation team on any matter and Council should further note that any non-disclosure agreement cannot prevent employees from making protected disclosures under whistleblowing legislation, regardless of any confidentiality provisions”.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12) the amendment was accepted as an addendum at the start of the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

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

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

For the amendment: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rose, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work, Ethan Young and Louise Young.)

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor McVey.

20 Questions

Decision

To agree that any Supplementary Questions should be submitted to the Lord Provost and that they be posted with their answer on the Council’s website.

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

21 Leader’s Report

Decision

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

To note the report.

(Reference – report by the Leader of the Council, submitted)

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 20 of 19 November 2020)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question

Can the Convener list the road safety projects in which the design, tendering or implementation has been delayed as a result of officer resource being diverted to Spaces for People projects?

Answer

The Council has prioritised resources towards the delivery of the Spaces for People programme, to ensure that people can walk, wheel and cycle safely during the global COVID-19 pandemic. This includes improvements to road safety to the city's 140 or so schools.

A report is being prepared for the Transport & Environment Committee on 28 January 2021 on the prioritisation and delivery of the road safety programme. This report will include further information on planned projects.

Supplementary Question

The Convener did not answer my question. I asked for a list of road safety projects that have been delayed. Can the Convener provide this factual information or explain why it cannot be provided now?

Supplementary Answer

As was noted in the written answer a full report will be forthcoming at the next Transport and Environment Committee. The analysis has not been carried out as this would require a review of several programmes and would need to be cross referenced with projects carried out or underway in the Spaces for People programme. Some projects all or in part have been taken forward in advance of timescales, some are on track and others have been delayed which means they need to be amended. This process would require data collection, analysis, review and management oversight and consultation with members. Officers are undertaking a full review and the report will be open to detailed scrutiny in January, when Councillors will be able to ask for specific explanations.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Further to the answer provided in response to question 5.5 at the 15 October 2020 meeting of the Council:

- Question** (1) Has the Convener been able to obtain an installation date for the speed table?
- Answer** (1) The final design and delivery of this feature will now be included and budgeted in the Queensferry High Street Town Centre project. Installation will be programmed with proposed early enabling works expected to commence Spring/Summer 2021.
- Question** (2) Has the Convener been able to obtain an explanation for the delays to the installation timetable?
- Answer** (2) Following the Transport Service restructure many staff have been deployed on a temporary basis to other critical teams or the Spaces for People pandemic recovery programme. Unfortunately, this situation has created the recent delay.
- Supplementary Question** Given officials initially agreed to carry out this work “in the first weeks of the 2019” school summer holidays, can the Convener clarify if she considers this latest delay to spring 2021 to be acceptable?
- Supplementary Answer** This is a topic that has been raised and responded to before at council questions. I have expressed my considerable concern to the service about the delay in implementing the speed table. I fully recognise the frustrations for the local community. However, acknowledging the fundamental impact of COVID-19 on all Council services, I recognise the the reasons why this has not been completed this year. I will expect officers to take a proactive approach to informing local ward councillors of the different stages towards the expected start dates of spring/summer 2021.

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 19 November 2020**

Question (1) Can the Convener confirm the criteria currently being used to determine whether a repair in a Council tenant property is considered an emergency?

Answer (1) Emergency repairs include un-containable leaks, blocked toilets, loss of heating and or hot water, loss of electricity, smashed window or property unsecure and smoke alarm repairs. The service aims to carry out emergency repairs within 4 hours of them being reported.

Question (2) In light of the ongoing COVID-19 restrictions, what is the current position with respect to addressing non-emergency repairs which have been reported by Council housing tenants?

Answer (2) From 5 October 2020 the service has been taking appointments for non-emergency repairs.

This includes all repairs with the exception of two person visits to avoid close contact with our operatives whilst carrying out repairs within our tenant's home. The Council's website will be updated when the service is able to offer this appointment.

Questions (3) How many non-emergency Council housing repairs are currently outstanding and how does this compare to pre-COVID levels?

Answer (3) There are a number of non-emergency repairs that are scheduled to take place in the coming days/weeks. Each of these have an agreed booked appointment slot with the tenant. Our current schedule does not exceed 4 weeks as per our recovery+ plan. This does exceed pre COVID timescales as non-emergency appointments were generally achieved within 10 days.

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

**Supplementary
Question**

My third question has not been answered. I asked how many non-emergency repairs are outstanding and the response provided said "a number of repairs are to be carried out". I ask again; how many such repairs are outstanding and what was the relevant number before COVID-19?

**Supplementary
Answer**

There are currently 2547 appointments scheduled to be carried out over the next five-week period. All tenants receive a text reminder the day before the appointment.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Residents of both Craigentenny and Duddingston ward and Portobello and Craigmillar ward have raised the issue of vehicles parking in front of the shared cycle/walking route at the Seafield end of Portobello promenade thus blocking access.

Question (1) Are there any plans to address this issue?

Answer (1) Yes. Officers are aware of this issue and are currently working on a design to improve the access to the Promenade at Seafield Road East, using bollards to restrict regular vehicle parking whilst maintaining emergency and planned vehicle access.

Question (2) If 'yes', when can we expect to see those measures introduced?

Answer (2) We are planning to deliver these measures early in 2021.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Howie for answer by
the Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 19 November 2020**

Question (1) What is the current criteria for the allocation of sheltered housing?

Answer (1) The Council letting policy sets out that that preference is given to households over 55 or where a member of the household has a need for this type of accommodation such as a younger person who has a life-long or progressive medical condition or who needs more accessible housing due to restricted mobility.

Sheltered housing is therefore targeted towards people who have been awarded a Gold priority for bidding for homes through a Choice based letting system, who have mobility needs that can be met in this type of accommodation. Where no households meet the criteria and have made a bid for the property or the properties but do not meet the needs of people with gold priority the homes will be offered to older households or households where there is a current or future need for this accommodation.

Question (2) How many sheltered housing tenancies have been allocated to applicants who require partially or fully adapted accommodation in the last 5 years?

Answer (2) The terms “partially” or “fully adapted” housing are not used in the description and letting of Council homes. Prospective tenants are advised if a home has a wet floor shower or if the homes is fully wheelchair accessible.

In the last 5 years there have been 705 new lets in Council Sheltered Accommodation. Of these lets 314 went to households awarded a gold priority due to mobility reasons. This included 176 homes which were fully wheelchair accessible.

When a tenant is allocated a home an assessment of any requirement for adaptation is made and adaptations carried out in line with the tenants needs. Where a sitting tenants' needs change and there is an assessed need for further adaptations those adaptations will be made. For example 28 major adaptations in sheltered housing were carried out in 2018/19.

Questions (3) How many sheltered housing tenancies have been allocated to applicants who do not require partially or fully adapted accommodation in the last 5 years?

Answer (3) The remaining 391 new lets in Council Sheltered Accommodation not allocated to households with a gold priority are as shown in the table below.

Silver Priority applicants – This priority is awarded based on housing need and includes homeless households and households downsizing to smaller accommodation	210
Waiting time – this will mainly be older households with long waiting time who have a need for this type of accommodation	181

Supplementary Question

Thank you to the Convener for her answer.

Notes that the Convener confirms allocation of sheltered housing for those who need it and those who don't. Is there a plan to review the allocation of sheltered housing, taking into account demographic changes and pressure on hospital beds in relation to delayed discharges?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Sheltered housing is currently managed through the Council's existing Letting Policy, which means that any properties available for let are advertised and allocated in line with this policy. While sheltered properties are currently advertised with a preference for households aged 55 or over, they will also be offered to people who are younger, but are assessed as needing the adaptations.

While there are no plans to review the Letting Policy at the moment, we continue to monitor housing need, supply and demand. The Council has committed to letting 70% of its homes to homeless households and in 2019/20 13% of homes were allocated to people with gold priority.

Housing and Health and Social Care colleagues have been and continue to work together to identify shared priorities and outcomes for people with assessed housing need. We are keen to align suitable housing with appropriate care and support for a variety of client groups, to ensure that service users' needs are met in the right way.

The Home Accessibility Referral Team assesses people with mobility issues to ensure that they get priority when they bid for social housing. This includes sheltered housing.

In terms of delayed discharge, HART has a Housing Outreach Officer who works with colleagues from NHS Lothian to ensure that people delayed in hospital as the property from which they were admitted no longer meets their mobility needs are awarded urgent gold priority. While some of the people delayed in hospital choose to go in to sheltered housing (and they have the highest level of priority to do so), the majority choose mainstream housing that meets their needs (potentially with adaptations). Many patients are younger, so sheltered housing is not something they would consider.

QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Spaces for People Proposals for Lanark Road/Inglis Green
Road

Can the Convener confirm

- Question** (1) How many comments were received in total regarding the scheme?
- Answer** (1) During the notification period a total of 343 comments were received.
- Question** (2) How many comments were:
- (a) from individuals and
 - (b) from organisations
- Answer** (2) a) 329 responses were received from individuals.
- b) 14 responses were received from organisations (including those responses received from elected members).
- Questions** (3) How many were:
- (a) for/supportive of the proposals;
 - (b) against/objections to the proposals;
 - (c) neutral
- Answer** (3) Of the responses from individuals, 19 were supportive, 300 were against the proposals, and 10 were neutral.
- Of the responses from organisations, four were supportive, seven were against and three were neutral.

**Supplementary
Question**

The feedback assessment provided to councillors on Lanark Road states: "Public. Over 300 emails received both in favour and against". We see from the answer that 300 (92%) were in fact against and 19 (<6%) were supportive. In light of the Convener's answer does she genuinely consider that the feedback to elected members by the department accurately and properly represented the position?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Notification was sent to all ward councillors, transport spokespeople, emergency services, Living Streets, Spokes, RNIB, Edinburgh Access Panel and relevant Community Councils on 25 September 2020.

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Can the Convener confirm

- Question** (1) Following the announcement by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in respect of the extension of the scheme to end March what discussions have taken place regarding placing of CEC employees on furlough?
- Answer** (1) Council service areas that had previously furloughed employees/workers were asked to consider whether they had any categories of employees/workers who remained eligible to be furloughed under the extended Scheme. Meetings have been held between Finance, HR and officers from the respective service areas to discuss current service requirements and assess if any further furlough application should be considered.
- Question** (2) How many CEC employees are currently furloughed?
- Answer** (2) 36 Council employees are currently furloughed, all of whom work in the Council's Outdoor Education facilities.
- Questions** (3) What sum has been received from UK Treasury in furlough payments?
- Answer** (3) The Council has received £0.449m income in respect of claims to 31st August 2020 under the Coronavirus Job Retention Scheme. It is anticipated that further payments totalling c. £0.160m will be received in respect of claims for the period 1st September to 31st October.
- Questions** (4) Is it CEC's intention to furlough further employees?
- Answer** (4) As stated in response to question 1, this is still under active consideration by service areas, Finance and HR. Any further furlough application will be reported to the Finance and Resources Committee as a part of the Revenue Budget Monitoring Report.
- Questions** (5) How many CEC staff are currently redeployed in areas of work, which is not their usual area of work and what teams are involved?

Answer (5) This information is not held corporately by the Council, because the redeployment of staff is managed at a local level in service areas.

Supplementary Question In relation to the answer to point 5, am I correct in saying the answer is that the Council does not know where its staff are redeployed and what they are doing?

Supplementary Answer Human Resources holds a central record of employees impacted by Covid-19 e.g. infected, self-isolating, or unable to work from home, etc. The repurposing or redeployment of staff in response to Covid-19 and service renewal requirements is managed dynamically by individual service areas. It is therefore a service responsibility to manage their staffing and to determine where staff need deployed to address resource gaps and ensure essential services are maintained. Therefore, at a Council level, Human Resources does not hold this information.

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Young for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

A number of Spaces for People (SfP) schools measures have been implemented or are in plan for primary schools.

Question

(1) Please provide information on what these measures are and whether they are live or pending etc. as follows:

(a) (live) schools which have SfP measures already in place and a brief explanation of the measures (e.g. pavement widening) as well as the date it was implemented

(b) (agreed) schools which have agreed SfP measures which are not yet installed, with a brief description of what the measure is, and the date for implementation

(c) (pending) schools which have proposed SfP measures which are not yet out for ward councillor consultation, with a brief description of what the proposed measure is likely to be, and a proposed date if known

(d) (outstanding) schools which require SfP measures but they have not been designed yet.

(e) (none) schools which do not require any SfP measures

This can be provided as 4 lists, or one consolidated list showing the category, description, date.

Answer

(1) (a) The implementation date is not readily available. All schools in the list below have been assessed as part of SfP and even the one-way systems have been marked out using vinyl arrows. However, we have only noted those with physical Traffic Management as being live, and those that had a 'light touch' with no notification as none.

(b) Noted below.

(c) This is a work in progress and will continue to be communicated as the assessments are progressed.

(d) This is a work in progress and will continue to be communicated as the assessments are progressed.

(e) This is as noted above.

School	Proposal	Status
Murrayburn Primary School	Road Closure and Footpath Widening with Double Yellow Lines (DYLs) at junctions	Live
Gylemuir Primary School	One-way school gate system to be arranged with school, as well as a park smart campaign. Temporary path installed.	Live
Carrick Knowe Primary School	Letter drop residents to cut back all vegetation on Lampacre Road. Close roads at school frontage.	Agreed, install by 30/11
Broomhouse Primary School	One way school gate system to be arranged with school and liaise with St David's Church to use as Park and Stride.	None
Forrester High School	Segregated Cycle Lanes (linking in with Meadow Place Road)	Spaces for People – Travelling Safely team progressing this.
Trinity Primary School	One way school gate system to be arranged with school.	None
Wardie Primary School	Arrange opening other gates with school for one way system at pick up and drop off time. Close access lane to traffic.	None
Victoria Primary School	Run a Park Smart campaign, ensure both gates are open for access into school, implement footpath widening and close road to traffic.	Live

Trinity Academy	No measures as permanent 20mph on Craighall Road is at TRO stage	None
Bruntsfield Primary School	Road closures.	Live
Buckstone Primary School	Run a Park Smart campaign, ensure both gates are open for access into school and agree a one way system at the gates.	Pending
South Morningside Primary School	Liaise with school to set up a walking bus, encourage Waitrose for use as a Park and Stride site. Road closure on Canaan Lane.	Live
Boroughmuir High School	Proposing to extend NE footway of Viewforth	Live
Sciennes Primary	Footway widening at gates. Will also arrange for diversion signs to be relocated from footways. Road closure installed along frontage.	Live
Tollcross Primary	Liaise with school on making gates one way and utilise car park gate also, restricting entry times for teachers. Permanent scheme delivering footpath widening here.	None
Preston Street Primary	Liaise with school on one way gate system, lane closure on Dalkeith Road and widen footways.	Live

James Gillespie's Primary and High Schools	Liaise with schools on creating in/out gate system. Implement pavement widening temporarily.	Live
Royal Mile Primary School	No measures possible due to surrounding infrastructure	None
Taobh na Pairce	Encourage parents to use side gate as more space	None
Canal View Primary	Use Westside Plaza as a Park and Stride site, have teachers at the vehicle access to stop vehicles entering the school car park at the start and end of the day to ensure social distancing, restrict entry times for teachers.	None
Clovenstone Primary	Arrange one way gates with school	None
Sighthill Primary	Ensure paths surrounding the school are clear of vegetation. Liaise with school to open main gate to create a one way in/out system that will be delineated with cones/ barriers.	None
Wester Hailes Education Centre	Run 'paths for all' campaign	None
Corstorphine Primary School	Road closures and footway build out	Live
East Craig's Primary School	Arrange one way gates with school.	None

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Fox Covert Primary School/ St Andrews	Arrange a one way gate system with school, organise park and stride from Drum Brae Hub	None
Hillwood Primary School	Arrange one way gate system	None
Roseburn Primary School	Arrange one way gate with school.	None
Craigmount High School	Measures to be proposed as part of East Craigs Spaces for People programme	None
Dean Park Primary	Liaise with school on gate management system at entry/ exit times.	None
Ratho Primary School	Liaise with Bridge Inn as a Park and Stride site, arrange pick up/ drop off with the school recommending parents leave their children before they get to the school gate, if this is not possible, the vehicle access should be utilised as an exit point for parents, this would restrict entry times for teachers.	Agreed – Dates TBC as still to go to CIMT
Balerno High School	TTRO for DYL's to prevent drop off happening in cycle lane on Bridge Road along school frontage.	Agreed – Dates TBC as still to go to CIMT
Queensferry Primary School	Arrange one way gate system with the school, TTRO at school frontage to prevent parking	Live
Kirkliston Primary School	One way gate system, restrict teachers access times to car park. Encourage Park and Stride. Temporary Path installed	Live

Echline Primary School	One way gate system, restrict teachers access times to car park, TTRO at school frontage to prevent parking.	Live
Dalmeny Primary	Liaise with the school on setting up a walking bus to reduce number of parents at the school.	None
Queensferry High School	Permanent measure already in the pipeline. Lining work complete in school grounds to mark a temporary path.	None
Blackhall Primary School	Arrange vegetation to be cut back on approach to school. Mark 2m spacing on footpath at school gates. Investigate segregating cycle lanes on Craigcrook Road.	Outstanding
Clermiston Primary School	Mark 2m spacing at school gates, remove guardrail in Parkgrove Place.	None
Davidsons Mains Primary School	No waiting TTRO between the school and the Turtle Dove café to keep cycleway clear and maximise footway width. Arrange park and stride with school, continue to promote the cycle train and WOW. Install prohibition of vehicles and footway widening.	Agreed – Dates TBC as still to go to CIMT
Cramond Primary School	Mark 2m spacing at the school gate	None
The Royal High School	Liaise with school on one way system. Widen footway by 2m on south side of Barnton Avenue.	Live

Balgreen Primary School	Liaise with school on one way system. Have requested additional DYL's.	None
Craiglockhart Primary School	Liaise with school on one way system. Widen footways around school and remove guardrail. Introduce parking restrictions to clear towpath entrance.	None – measures were installed but removed at request of head teacher.
Dalry Primary School	Liaise with school on one way system. Widen footways around school.	Live
Stenhouse Primary School	Liaise with school on one way system. Close Saughton Mains Drive at frontage of school to create more space for pedestrians.	None
Tynecastle High School	Liaise with school on one way system.	None
Craigour Park School	Encourage Park and Stride. They are having issues. They would like pavement widening and removal of parking or road closure to enable this.	None
Gilmerton Primary School	Additional enforcement from Police Scotland to enforce school streets.	None
Liberton Primary School	Road closure at school frontage, investigate new temporary footway to rear of school.	Pending
Prestonfield Primary School	Widen footway along frontage of school, introduce TTRO to prevent parking opposite school. Liaise with school on one way gate system. Close road along	Agreed, install by 30/11

	school frontage.	
Liberton High School	Remove guardrail at Mount Vernon entrance.	Live
Leith Primary School	Liaise with school on one way system and marking out footway. Request enforcement from Police Scotland on School Streets.	None
Craigtinny Primary School	Liaise with school on one way system and marking out footway. Widen footway along frontage and revoke parking.	Widening is live, one way agreed, install one way by 30/11
Hermitage Park Primary	Widen footway at front of school, remove guardrail. Liaise with school on walking and cycling promotion	Live
Lorne Primary School	Liaise with school on one way system and marking out footway. Contact School with regards to a park smart campaign as soon as possible. Build out footway and revoke parking at frontage	Live
Leith Academy	Contact school to ensure all access gates are being used.	None
Towerbank Primary School	Contact school to see if they require arrows. Request additional School Streets enforcement with Police Scotland.	None

Duddingston Primary	Request additional School Streets enforcement with Police Scotland, communicate Park and Stride with Parents. Spaces for People installing segregated cycle facilities on Duddingston Road	None
Brunstane Primary School	Liaise with school on Park and Stride at The Range. Contact Head Teacher with regards to removing railings in school Close Magdalene Gardens and Magdalene Drive along frontage of the school.	Closure in place. TTRO for DYL's is live. Plans to introduce closure on the bend outside the school is pending.
Parsons Green Primary School	Liaise with school for requirement of footway arrows and implementation of Walk Once a Week. Closure on Paisley Drive.	Live
Royal High Primary School	Liaise with school on any additional support/ arrows they need.	None
Portobello High School	Stanley Street closed under Spaces for People for active travel/ physical distancing. Mark to contact head over concerns in the car park.	None
Craigroyston Primary School	Liaise with school on one way gates and to see if closure of Muirhouse Place West would be beneficial.	Pending
Pirniehall Primary School		Outstanding
Forthview Primary School		Outstanding
Craigroyston Primary School	Liaise with school on one way gates	Outstanding

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

St Josephs RC Primary School	Liaise with school on one way gates	None
Castleview Primary School	Extend Footway by 1 metre along school frontage, remove guardrail and introduce DYL's from Greendykes Road along the school frontage.	Outstanding
Newcraighall Primary School	Liaise with school on Park and Stride.	None
Castlebrae Community High School	Introduce parking restrictions to keep junction clear.	Agreed, install by 30/11
St John Vianney's RC School	Close road along frontage of school, maintain access for residents and waste	Agreed, install by 30/11
St Catherine's RC Primary School	Close road along frontage of school, maintain access for residents and waste	Agreed, install by 30/11
St Marys RC Primary School	Mark out footprints etc around school and in playground	None

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Young for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 19
November 2020**

Question

- (1) Ward councillors have appreciated the timely updates on new covid cases in schools and whether this has resulted in individual or full class isolations. Mindful of the concerns around remote learning and digital engagement can the Convener please advise the following:
- (a) If an individual pupil is off school, after how many days would they be offered remote learning?
- (b) Pupils offered remote learning – will this always be possible digitally or have there been circumstances where this has not been possible and what has been made available instead?
- (c) If a full class is required to isolate, is remote learning available from the first day of isolation, and if not, how soon after?
- (d) Classes receiving remote learning – is this provided digitally and it is ‘real time viewing a teacher’ or pre-recorded or written assignments only (or other)?

Answer

- (1) (a) At present, this will vary across the school estate. The QICS has issued a Digital/Remote learning survey to all schools with a completion date of 18th November. The purpose of this is to allow us to gather information about the extent to which schools are able to accommodate digital needs of learners within their current digital estate in the event of pupils requiring to self-isolate or the event of periods of home learning or blended (connected) learning (remote learning). Schools who evaluate as having low confidence levels in (a) continuity of learning provision and (b) the engagement of pupils in remote learning tasks set

r

will be provided with proportionate support from the Quality Improvement Service and Digital Officers within the Closing the Gap workforce.

(b) Schools have gathered data, during school closures, and since pupils returned to school in August to identify young people who are not currently able to access remote learning digitally. Schools are committed to ensuring that these young people are provided with alternative resources e.g. learning packs which provide textbooks, reading materials, paper versions of tasks set, in line with learning set digitally to other members of the class. Schools work hard to ensure that these packs reach young people timeously and try to ensure that assessment arrangements are in place to provide feedback to young people about their progress in learning. This would usually take place over the 'phone speaking directly with young people and their parents/carers.

(c) As stated above, this will vary across the school estate. However, initial consultations with Primary Head Teachers has indicated that this is implemented from the first day of self-isolation where young people are able to access their learning digitally and with greater independence. This would be done through Teams, school websites or other digital platforms, accessing locally and nationally produced resources e.g. Edinburgh Learns Learning grids, which have been produced for all sectors. and National resources such as Clickview. This is more likely to be consistent across P5-7 year groups. Where digital access is not enabled school staff, such as home link officers, are delivering learning packs to young people.

Arrangements are in place to ensure regular Health & Wellbeing check-ins between teachers, and the young people in their classes, together with planned opportunities to share assessment information, including specific feedback to support young people to continue to progress with their learning, despite Covid-related absences.

(d) In June, 2020, a pilot was undertaken to enable the “two-way video” facility to facilitate synchronous digital learning. This included 2 Primary Schools, 1 Secondary School, Special Schools, and individual young people, with complex additional needs, within mainstream settings. This was done in full consultation with Head Teachers and the Teachers’ Panel members (EIS) and colleagues working within Child Protection, to fully risk assess the process to ensure the safety, and protection, of pupils and staff. A Responsible User Protocol, Staff Guidance and Quick Start Guides for learners, parents & carers have been created. Senior leaders have been asked to share these protocols with their communities, to inform their decisions about readiness to enable this aspect of their Digital strategy to support remote learning. Engagement is being tracked by the Digital Team and the Digital Technologies QIEO.

Pupils may also access asynchronous digital learning where schools are providing access to recorded learning sessions and tasks and, as stated in the responses above, are setting learners tasks for completion and submission to / discussion with their teachers to provide ongoing assessment and feedback.

Question (2) From these early examples over the last couple of months, have any lessons been learned that will change how remote learning is provided?

Answer (2) Initial consultation with Head Teachers has provided examples of effective practice already developed:-

Clarity for staff needed regarding the learning to be set to ensure equity of provision for all learners e.g. Literacy, Numeracy, Health & Wellbeing tasks set each day, with learning differentiated. Learning should provide continuity, and context, clearly connected to in-school learning, whilst acknowledging that some pedagogical approaches have been impacted by infection control measures e.g. play-based approaches. Policy detailing the arrangements for assessment of learners’ progress, and provision of feedback, which is clearly understood by learners, parents & carers.

Head Teachers also report examples of the impact of school closures on learners, which has informed their ongoing contingency planning for remote learning:-

Assessments in Literacy and Numeracy, for the most part, indicate that younger learners (particularly P1/2) have more gaps in their learning. Health & Wellbeing Assessments also evidence that developmental aspects of learning are impacted more significantly for younger groups of learners e.g. the ability to share, cooperate and collaborate in learning, potentially due to reduced social interaction.

Older pupils have less gaps in learning as they are able to access learning more independently and accessing digital platforms more confidently. In a few cases, some of these learners are exceeding expected levels of attainment.

Where pupils have experienced curricular pathways which provide opportunities for consolidation (overlearning) there is evidence of greater retention and progress. This is most prevalent in older pupils.

Pupils' engagement in learning has evidenced challenges in equity of Digital provision. It is also essential that, where access to Digital Devices is in place, pupils are taught the skills of using these devices effectively whilst in school so they can use these confidently if learning at home.

The data gathered from the aforementioned Digital/Remote Learning survey will be analysed to support schools where there are gaps in their remote learning provision, inclusion a deficit in the provision of digital devices.

Blended (connected) Learning guidance is being reviewed, informed by this survey and by ongoing consultation with Head Teachers. This will provide practical solutions to schools to support the wide range of scenarios which necessitates remote learning, and provide greater consistency about the expectation across all schools regarding their remote learning provision e.g. how quickly should learners be provided with remote learning following as a result of the need to self-isolate, curricular range and frequency of tasks set, arrangements for assessment of learning including the provision of feedback.

Question

- (3)** Do all pupils now have access to a digital device (either their own or CEC-provided) and if not, when will this be resolved?

Answer

- (3)** Devices have been allocated based on SIMD 1/2 data, with deployment primarily on specific secondary schools where that allocation would be broadly sufficient to deliver a 1:1 approach to a school's S3 cohort, making adjustments to ensure coverage where necessary. Where the SIMD profile leans more to the upper deciles, schools will receive a proportionately smaller allocation of devices that they can use to supplement their own device stock and use as appropriate. In total this accounts for around 2100 devices. We are currently taking this forward with 10 secondary schools. The device framework supplier has been instructed to deploy devices directly to those schools first, as they begin preparing staff, pupils and parents for a 1:1 deployment to the designated cohort, with our support. The Digital/Remote Learning survey data will be used to deploy the remaining 500 devices to support schools with this and any other unexpected COVID-related circumstances. Funding has also been reserved to pay for connectivity as that need arises. Schools continue to invest in digital devices making use of their DSM budget and Pupil Equity Funding.

In summary, the rollout has started in identified secondary schools, and should be complete within the next 2/3 weeks. The reserved devices are available for any school to requisition should they have any contingency issue. When the need to reserve centrally passes, the remaining devices will be issued on the basis of the current stocks held by schools. No learner who needs a device for contingency learning will be deprived of a device unless the whole city goes into lockdown

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Young for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 19
November 2020

PE in schools

Question (1) Are primary schools allowed to hold PE classes indoors as it stands today? If not, when is guidance expected to change (or is it related to the Tier system)?

Answer (1) Yes. Local CEC guidance fully reflects and is aligned with national guidance. Local guidance includes national advice below as regards the Tier system.

The key national document is here:

<https://education.gov.scot/media/ohyofihd/pe-guidelines-02-11-20.pdf>. There have been 7 versions of this guidance released between August- November 2020, with the latest on 2nd November which stated:

“From 2 November 2020, if staff complete risk assessments that reflect the most current advice (all risk assessments should be proportionate to the relevant protection level of the local area), and mitigations are in place, physical education can take place both indoors and outdoors as follows:

Levels 0-3 Primary Indoors: Children can participate in contact and non-contact activities. Primary Outdoors: Children can participate in contact and non-contact activities.

Levels 0-3 Secondary Indoors: Young people can participate in contact and non-contact activities. Secondary Outdoors: Young people can participate in contact and non-contact activities.

Level 4 – Children and young people within school settings can only participate in activities that are non-contact and outdoors.

Question (2) If the weather is such that children should not be outdoors, what is the guidance to schools on providing an alternative indoor option?

Answer

- (2) A working group of senior officers and practitioners, including PE specialists from primary and secondary sectors, Health and Safety and Facilities Management, has produced a local CEC PE Guidance document. This is updated in line with national guidance (currently V4) and has been made available to all schools on the SORT portal and via weekly Risk Matters bulletin. It will continue to be updated in line with any national guidance. Advice is provided on groupings, face coverings, mitigation of risk, ventilation, equipment use, cleaning and infection control. Two exemplar risk assessment templates have also been provided, one for PE overall (including indoor PE) and one for Changing Room use.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Extracurricular activities

Prior to the October break, councillors and parents were assured that outdoors sports would start being reintroduced after the holiday.

- Question** (1) How many schools are offering their facilities to community-led or privately-run sports groups and when this start?
- Answer** (1) Community access to sports facilities at all secondary schools has been in place from w/b 16th November 2020. Phase I restart began from w/b 2nd November across 7 schools including Queensferry HS, Balerno HS, Forrester HS, St Augustine's HS, Broughton HS, Portobello HS and Leith Academy due to their historically higher footfall. Community access at Castlebrae HS, Drummond HS and Trinity Academy has not re-commenced due to low demand for use post-lockdown.
- Question** (2) How many community-led and privately-run sports groups have asked for access to school outdoor facilities but this has not yet been granted?
- Answer** (2) All community access requests have been facilitated where possible and no lets have been refused. Customers who have not been able to get their first choice day/time eg: because of new staggered timing; spaces closed due to maintenance works or classroom usage have been offered alternative spaces and/or times. We have no way of tracking every instance of this, but ultimately we accommodate every customer somewhere/sometime.
- Question** (3) Where access is still not yet permitted, what are the reasons for the delay and when will access resume?
- Answer** (3) Reasons for denying requests include – sport spaces being over-subscribed, used for other purposes e.g. class rooms, non-compliance e.g. ventilation or out of action due to maintenance/repair reasons.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Rose for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Non-Disclosure Agreements

Question (1) Can the Convener advise of the total number and spend on Non-disclosure or settlement agreements of any type, from May 2013 to the present?

Answer (1) The request relates to non-disclosure or settlement agreements of any kind, which includes a very wide scope of information across the Council.

Examples of non-disclosure or settlement agreements include: commercial settlements; employment-related settlements; settlements relating to allegations of abuse; personal injury settlements. The Council also settles some insured claims (primarily in relation to roads defects) which fall within its insurance excess cap.

There is no single source for officers to interrogate and therefore unfortunately we are unable to provide the detailed information requested. To answer the question would require a solicitor to assess not less than 6,300 files in Legal Services alone in the period between May 2013 and present day, November 2020, which may, or may not, contain information relevant to the question raised. The cost to the Council of officers locating, retrieving and providing the information would be substantial, involving hundreds of hours of work to collate. The request is also likely to extend to Insurance Services and to all other Directorates who may directly hold contract engagement details on behalf of their own service.

Non-disclosure or settlement agreements are generally entered into by the Council in the interests of protecting the public purse. Given the breadth and nature of its services, the Council is litigated against on a regular basis. It is often in the Council's best financial interest that a matter is settled

out of court and that such settlements would also be subject to the agreement of the individual who may raise such a claim, where they will often have the benefit of independent legal advice, prior to agreeing any such resolution.

Any non-disclosure or settlement agreements of a sensitive or high value nature are subject to appropriate professional legal advice in relation to the terms of settlement, including the appropriate level of financial settlement. Advice is also taken in relation to related non-disclosure agreements, which might form part of certain types of settlement agreement and are often confidential both ways to protect both the Council and any claimant. Settlement agreements in the context of employment matters require the employee to take independent legal advice and such agreements cannot prevent employees from making protected disclosures regardless of any confidentiality provisions.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thanks for the answer. Of course I understand the volume of work indicated in the answer would be unreasonable. On 2.5.19 I asked a question about NDAs in relation to staff, and received a helpful answer. Will the Convener agree to have it updated to the present, and to include numbers and costs for personal abuse (or personal detriment), as referred to in the Answer, over the same period as the original question (now extended)? This narrows the scope enormously.

**Supplementary
Answer**

The updated clarification helpfully narrows the scope of the information sought and relevant officers will now assimilate such information available for the purpose of a response.

QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 19 November 2020**

Spaces for People Adaption Work

Recently, the plastic batons segregating the cycle way on Ferry Road have been replaced by “segregation units.”

Question

(1) What are the reasons for replacing the batons with segregation units?

Answer

(1) The ‘batons’ were always a temporary intervention in lieu of the segregation units being available to replace them. This was set out in the notification on the project.

Question

(2) Why were segregation units not installed in the first place?

Answer

(2) There was quite a long lead in time for production and delivery of the segregation units from the supplier. This was due to the considerable nationwide demands for equipment of this kind, a fact which has been notified before at Full Council. The batons allowed for the project to be implemented, as part of the Council’s response to the COVID-19 pandemic, much sooner than would otherwise have been possible.

Question

(3) How many Spaces for People schemes have been subject to adaption work such as this since the initial installation?

Answer

(3) Both pre and post implementation the majority of the measures will have some form of adaptation throughout their existence to take on board feedback received, reviews and government guidance.

Question

(4) What is the total cost of adaption work?

Answer

(4) The total cost of installing and removing all ‘batons’ (Orange cylinders) on the travelling safely schemes was: £31,699.70.

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Depute Leader of the
Council at a meeting of the Council
on 19 November 2020**

Coronavirus Measures and Powers

In proposing an amendment to a Conservative Emergency Motion on Public Health Measures last Council, the Leader made clear his view that Local Government should limit itself to following the Coronavirus measures and advice put in place by National Government.

“ . . . if you're looking for the information to help you explain these measures of guidance . . . that comes from listening to what the Government is saying, and I think, meeting our obligations and responsibility as local people to not undermine those, and try and explain those and echo some of those messages from the Government . . . there's one singer and one song when it comes to this . . . “

[Cllr McVey, 7:29:30 on the webcast]”

Question

Would the Depute Leader agree that Local Government in the UK should simply follow the advice and measures of National Governments?

Answer

Local government are required to follow the legislation as set out below. Decisions from this legislation should of course take account of the Public Health Advice, and the impact on the economy of the city in arriving at any response to our governments decisions.

The applicable legislation is **The Health Protection (Coronavirus) (Restrictions and Requirements) (Local Levels) (Scotland) Regulations 2020**, (“the Regulations”), [here](#).

These Regulations came into force on 2 November 2020. The Scottish Ministers made the Regulations in exercise of the power conferred by paragraph 1(1) of Schedule 19 of the Coronavirus Act 2020, that is:

1)The Scottish Ministers may by regulations make provision for the purpose of preventing, protecting against, controlling

or providing a public health response to the incidence or spread of infection or contamination in Scotland (whether from risks originating there or elsewhere).

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 19 November 2020**

Spaces for People Expenditure to date

Question (1) Can a full breakdown of Spaces for People expenditure (incurred and scheduled) be provided please, broken down by project.

Answer (1) See table below

The current forecast programme expenditure sits at £5.5M, including contingency and a substantial allowance for scheme maintenance and removal. The project team have successfully gained additional 'Spaces for People' and 'Places for Everyone' funding from Sustrans to increase the overall project budget by £1.95m, taking the total budget to £6.95m. This increased budget will fully fund the proposed scheme list, allow us to make enhancements to schemes where possible, broaden the scope of surfacing improvements and further increase the removal of street clutter.

If changes to the budget or programme are required, then this would be reverted to the Transport and Environment Committee in January for approval.

Question (2) Can a breakdown of expenditure (incurred and scheduled) be provided, showing the expenditure with a view to making improvements to benefit:

(a) Pedestrians

(b) Cyclists

(c) Safe Travel to Schools

- Answer** (2) (a) (b) It is not possible to give a clear breakdown of these costs as all interventions have been designed to make it easier and safer for people to move around our streets, These changes to our pavements, pathways and roads create space for everyone, whether they are
- walking
 - cycling
 - using a wheelchair or other mobility equipment
 - using a pram.
- (c) £150,000 has been allocated to interventions specifically relating to schools. £20,625.49 has been spent up to this point.
- Question** (3) How much has been spent implementing floating bus stops and implementing disabled parking bays?
- Answer** (3) Floating bus stops - £16k.
Disabled bays - £74.80 which includes removal.
- Question** (4) Given the supply line for the Cycle Lane Defenders meant they could not be installed initially at Comiston Road for example, as the supplier ran out, and more had to be produced to meet demand, what additional costs were incurred in material and time by the temporary cones and other measures prior to the further “temporary” measures?
- Answer** (4) The Creating Safe Spaces for Walking and Cycling report that was approved by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in May refers to the implementation of SfP measures that were dependent on funding and/or availability of materials and contractors. Due to the current circumstances there has been a high demand for the materials being used to create spaces nationwide. This includes the segregation units and as a result of the urgent nature of the measures, when required, a three-phase approach was taken. The three phases where 1) traffic cones then 2) traffic cylinders and finally 3) segregation

units. There were no additional costs as these were planned costs to mitigate supply issues. The majority of the measures will have some form of adaptation through their existence to take on board feedback received, reviews and government guidance.

Supplementary Question

It strikes me from the answer that approximately £20,000 has been spent on safe travel to schools (or interventions relating to school as it is phrased) and yet in a previous answer to my colleague Councillor Jim Campbell, about £32,000 had been spent on installing and removing orange cylinders and batons as part of Spaces for People schemes. If accurate, is the Convener concerned by that limited level of expenditure on school travel measures at this time as stated in her answer and the contrast with spend on “temporary” orange batons which are now removed?

Supplementary Answer

Costs associated with interventions related to schools have been kept to a minimum because there is limited requirement for cycle segregation units or cylinders and more requirement for parking restrictions and road closures. As a result the materials used are more readily available and easier to install thus reducing the costs of the measures. It therefore seems inappropriate and unnecessary to compare levels of spending between projects of a different nature when successful outcomes are of primary concern.

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
South Bridge	Awaiting decision	£117,683.55	£12,033.17	£1,369.75	Underway
Waverley Bridge	On	£13,305.46	£371.80	£7,585.46	Underway
Forest Road	On	£52,695.78	£3,839.33	£33,863.78	Underway
George IV Bridge	On	£138,179.63	£5,687.06	£118,389.63	Installed
The Mound	On	£148,331.72	£2,669.17	£148,088.37	Installed
Princes Street East End	On	£100,375.96	£2,469.90	£95,282.23	Underway
Victoria Street	On	£18,501.01	£371.80	£16,781.01	Installed
Cockburn Street	On	£13,638.45	£371.80	£12,716.00	Installed
Chamber St / George IV	On	£136,000.00	£5,032.00	£1,493.45	Underway
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£6,729.45	£0.00	£6,402.17	
City Centre Phase 1		£745,441.01	£32,846.03	£441,971.85	
Queensferry High St	On	£30,000.00	£1,024.55	£0.00	
Great Junction St	On	£14,957.64	£307.51	£2,840.50	Underway

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
Stockbridge	On	£48,494.40	£3,784.70	£3,126.50	Underway
Portobello High Street	On	£30,132.72	£1,965.44	£2,598.50	Underway
Newington	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Gorgie / Dalry Road	On	£43,812.35	£3,433.65	£42,721.29	Installed
Corstorphine	On	£43,060.40	£2,953.17	£3,243.50	Underway
Bruntsfield	On	£31,983.48	£2,389.81	£29,998.69	Installed
Tolcross	On	£31,761.69	£1,652.80	£29,898.08	Installed
Morningside	On	£63,081.17	£4,229.95	£56,188.81	Installed
Haymarket Terrace	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Easter Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Shopping Streets		£337,283.85	£21,741.58	£170,615.87	
Telford Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Carrington Road	On	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Fountainbridge Dundee	On	£61,858.64	£4,980.14	£0.00	
Ferry Road	On	£106,284.88	£8,168.73	£100,146.32	Installed
Melville Drive	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Teviot Pl / Potterrow	On	£6,952.32	£257.24	£0.00	
Buccleuch St / Causewayside	On	£46,185.52	£3,537.28	£37,378.44	Underway
Crewe Toll Roundabout	On	£28,995.00	£1,880.20	£0.00	
Meadowplace Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Duddingston Road	On	£48,320.48	£3,805.36	£0.00	
Wester Hailes Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Craigmillar Park / Liberton	On	£110,058.80	£7,851.87	£0.00	
Gilmerton Road	On	£42,695.68	£3,717.04	£0.00	
Crewe Road South	On	£88,222.63	£5,116.01	£85,216.63	Installed
Old Dalkeith Road	On	£78,008.98	£3,056.52	£75,002.98	Installed
Comiston Road	On	£139,839.05	£10,466.80	£113,207.61	Underway
Ingils Green Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Pennywell Road	On	£119,757.32	£8,785.73	£111,788.32	Installed
Mayfield Road	On	£29,715.11	£2,380.00	£0.00	
QC - Meadows / Greenbank	On	£43,680.00	£2,751.46	£0.00	
Queensferry Road 1a	Awaiting decision	£75,261.00	£4,965.51	£0.00	
A1 Corridor	Awaiting decision	£93,692.00	£6,662.40	£0.00	
Slateford Road (A70), Lanark Rd, Longstone Rd & Murrayburn Rd	On	£252,774.00	£19,092.74	£0.00	
Orchard Brae	On	£13,330.00	£851.91	£0.00	
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£5,992.61	£0.00	£0.00	
Phase 1b Bus Lanes	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
West Coates	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Arterial Routes		£1,391,624.02	£98,326.94	£522,740.30	

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
East Craigs	Awaiting decision	£55,598.00	£4,878.09	£0.00	
Drum Brae North	On	£36,419.00	£2,896.50	£0.00	
Leith Connections	On	£42,880.00	£4,087.20	£0.00	
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£2,536.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Low Traffic Neighbourhoods		£137,433.00	£11,861.79	£0.00	
Braid Road	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Links Garden	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Cammo Walk	On	£1,700.00	£0.00	£1,700.00	Installed
Warriston Road	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Stanley Street/Hope Street	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Braidburn Terrace	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Silverknowes Road (South)	On	£33,318.00	£2,464.65	£0.00	
Silverknowes Road (North)	On	£27,900.00	£2,306.09	£0.00	
Granton Sq / Gypsy Brae	On	£77,463.92	£5,981.42	£0.00	
Braid Hills Drive	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Seafield Street	On	£2,174.00	£78.10	£1,467.00	Installed
Kings Place	On	£17,177.00	£929.50	£877.00	Underway
Arboretum Place	On	£12,431.46	£729.55	£1,766.10	Underway
Maybury Rd Temp. Crossing	On	£55,883.63	£1,950.00	£22,975.84	Underway
Spaces for Exercise		£238,048.01	£14,439.31	£28,785.94	
Broughton Street	Awaiting decision	£49,428.24	£4,939.08	£0.00	
Broughton St Roundabout	Awaiting decision	£50,624.20	£3,817.03	£0.00	
Restalrig Rd South - Opt. 2	On	£6,920.00	£416.20	£0.00	
West End of Princes Street	On	£3,763.00	£316.92	£0.00	
Musselburgh to Portobello Opt. 1 Edinburgh section	On	£55,399.20	£5,601.98	£0.00	
Duddingston Road West	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Fillyside Road - Crossing	On	£30,000.00	£1,950.00	£0.00	
Fillyside Road	On	£4,584.36	£411.93	£0.00	
Glenlockhart Drive	On	£2,798.00	£103.53	£0.00	
Starbank Road	On	£12,608.40	£1,128.81	£0.00	
Commonplace Interventions		£216,125.40	£18,685.48	£0.00	
Schools		£150,000.00		£20,625.49	
Sub-total			£3,413,856.42	£1,184,739.45	
Consultancy Support			£300,000.00	£118,478.78	

Thursday, 19th November, 2020

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
Internal Management Costs			£750,000.00	£504,759.07	
Segregation units for maintenance and schemes to be developed			£171,292.00	£0.00	
Monitoring & Evaluation			£175,000.00	£86,410.00	
Removal Allowance			£450,000.00	£0.00	
Street Cleaning Over Winter Period 20/21/22			£50,000.00	£0.00	
Removal of Street Clutter			£50,000.00	£0.00	
Uncertainty - installation, maintenance, removal			£196,005.10	£0.00	
TOTAL PROJECTION			£5,556,153.52	£1,894,387.30	

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 19 November 2020

Question (1) What assessments have been done of the likely average walking/cycling time for pupils at each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site?

Answer (1) Secondary GME has a city wide catchment area. In line with policy any pupil living more than 3 miles from any secondary GME school would receive transport support, usually in the form of a bus pass. As such it is only expected that those living within 3 miles of any option would walk or cycle to school. No further detailed assessment on walking and cycling has been carried out.

Question (2) How compatible are each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site, with the '15 minute city' agenda?

Answer (2) Secondary school catchment areas in the city are of a scale that they would not be considered as one of the services which should be available within a 15 min or 20 min city concept. In line with policy pupils are expected to walk or cycle up to 3 miles to reach their catchment secondary schools (which takes much longer than 15 mins to walk). Beyond 3 miles travel support is provided.

Question (3) What is the estimated average public transport travel time for the current P1-3 years at Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce to each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and the temporary Darroch site?

Answer (3) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (4) What is the estimated average public transport travel time from a likely city-wide catchment of each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespies High School and to the temporary Darroch site?

Answer (4) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (5) What proportion of the current school role at Taobh na Pairce live within the following distances of each of the four options for GME secondary, James Gillespies High School, and the temporary Darroch site, broken down by school year:

(a) less than 1km

(b) between 1km and 3km

(c) greater than 3km

Answer (5) It was not possible to provide the information in time for the Full Council meeting.

Question (6) The current informal consultation on GME secondary states that, in the short term, "Darroch would be the Gaelic Secondary with curriculum support from the surrounding Secondary Schools" (p.17).

(a) Which surrounding schools are being considered for curriculum support?

(b) Would a statutory consultation be required to change the curriculum support away from James Gillespies High School?

(c) What is the anticipated pupil capacity of Darroch during this period?

(d) When does the council expect that Darroch will exceed the capacity outlined in answer to c) above?

Answer

- (6) (a) Support from surrounding schools will depend on capacity available in different subject areas, if pupils are to join classes physically. Closest schools are Tynecastle, Boroughmuir and St. Thomas'. Boroughmuir already has capacity issues. Use of digital resource and Esgoil will enable ease of access to a wide range of subjects and levels.
- (b) No. Curriculum support means taking subjects in another school if they have availability. This practice already happens.
- (c) The overall capacity of James Gillespie's High School is estimated to be 1850 once the Darroch Annexe is operational although further work on timetabling and use of the facility requires to be completed with the school to finalise
- (d) The current school roll projections suggest this will be exceeded in 2025.

Supplementary Question

Please could I ask that the three questions which have not been answered (3, 4 and 5) are answered by email to all councillors before Wednesday 25th November, when the first parent consultation event on this subject takes place?

Supplementary Answer

All answers are approximate and based on the level of analysis it was able to carry out in the limited time available.

Answer to question 3.

What is the estimated average public transport travel time for the current P1-3 years at Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce to each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespie's High School and the temporary Darroch site?

James Gillespie's - 30 minutes

Darroch - 27 minutes

Castlebrae - 40 minutes

Granton - 26 minutes

Liberton - 39 minutes

WHEC - 45 minutes

Answer to question 4.

What is the estimated average public transport travel time from a likely city-wide catchment of each of the four options for GME secondary, compared to James Gillespie's High School and to the temporary Darroch site?

James Gillespie's - 28 minutes

Darroch - 25 minutes

Castlebrae - 38 minutes

Granton - 27 minutes

Liberton - 37 minutes

WHEC - 43 minutes

Answer to question 5.

What proportion of the current school roll at Taobh na Pairce live within the following distances of each of the four options for GME secondary, James Gillespie's High School, and the temporary Darroch site, broken down by school year:

(a) less than 1km

(b) between 1km and 3km

(c) greater than 3km

	1k	1-3k	Over 3k
James Gillespie's	2.9%	10.5%	86.6%
Darroch	3.3%	13.9%	82.8%
Castlebrae	0.7%	11.2%	88.0%
Granton	4.1%	8.1%	87.8%
Liberton	3.3%	3.1%	93.5%
WHEC	0.0%	2.4%	97.6%