

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 25 November 2021

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
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
Lewis Ritchie
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 Street Furniture - Motion by Councillor Howie

a) Deputation – Guide Dogs Scotland

The deputation indicated that they had serious concerns about the proliferation of temporary street furniture, which could act as an obstacle to people with vision impairment or limited mobility. They felt it remained vital that people with a vision impairment and others with limited mobility should continue to be able to access their streets, businesses and other local services safely.

They asked the Council to consider the following:

- Review and enforce any existing guidance on the placement of street furniture;
- Evaluate whether disabled people, including people with sight loss, can use temporary measures effectively
- Encourage businesses to consult with groups in the area that may be affected by the proposals
- Consider the need for an accessible barrier with colour contrast and a tap rail so that long cane users can navigate safely
- Ensure the minimum pavement width remaining allows two pedestrians to pass each other while socially distancing
- Ensure no structures or signs allowed outside the designated area, the presence of tables and chairs should never discourage pedestrians from using the footway
- Where possible furniture should be located on the carriageway to enable social distancing
- Potential locations for outdoor seating/tables should be assessed to ensure that they don't add to existing street clutter. For example, that tables/chairs should not be located near to/next roadworks, bike racks, diversion signs and any other street clutter likely to impede the safe passage of pedestrians

b) Motion by Councillor Howie

The following motion by Councillor Howie was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17, and verbally altered in terms of Standing Order 22.5:

“Council:

- 1) Notes Councillor Miller's Equal Pavements Pledge motion which was passed during September's Full Council Meeting.
- 2) Recognises the increase in street furniture facilitates the Covid recovery.
- 3) Commends the work done by many pubs and restaurants to make their outdoor areas in public spaces disability-friendly.
- 4) Notes that the recent applications for pubs and restaurants to place platformed seating areas outside their premises are now increasing and

altering so that they become permanent arrangements instead of temporary.

- 5) Notes however that issues raised by Guide Dogs for the Blind Scotland regarding the enforcement of the regulations on street furniture indicate there are still issues for the blind and visually impaired people in Edinburgh.
- 6) Is concerned that many blind and visually impaired people avoid parts of our city, such as Portobello Promenade, because the street furniture regulations are being ignored, leading to excessive, and for them, dangerous, street clutter.
- 7) Calls for officers to compile, in consultation with Guide Dogs for the Blind Scotland and other disability groups, a report on the continued impact of street furniture on blind and visually impaired people, the wider disabled community and parents with buggies and how to mitigate it and how this should be aligned with the aforementioned motion.”

- moved by Councillor Howie, seconded by Councillor

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Howie.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Howie declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the owner of a guide dog.

Councillor Ritchie declared a non- financial interest in the above item as the owner of a business with an outside seating area.

2 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 28 October 2021 as a correct record.

3 Leader's Report

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

- Congratulations to Fergus Linehan recipient of Edinburgh award
- Edinburgh becoming a Living Wage City
- 16 Days of Activism campaign – Action on Violence against Women
- COP26 – Edinburgh Climate Summit
- Net Zero target for 2030

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Councillor Whyte | - Legacy of COP26 – work done by the Council to become net zero by 2030 - costs |
| Councillor Miller | - Brexit – staffing crisis in health care |
| Councillor Aldridge | - Violence against women and girls
- Net Zero targets
- Broken Coalition commitments |
| Councillor Day | - Edinburgh Award
- Violence against women and girls
- Use of 4 libraries within the city as COVID test centres |
| Councillor Kate Campbell | - Violence against women and girls
- Accreditation of Edinburgh as a Living Wage City - work with businesses |
| Councillor Bruce | - Council loss in income streams due to COVID – proposals for making up shortfall |
| Councillor Burgess | - Climate emergency – concern at failure to reach agreement at COP26 |
| Councillor Louise Young | - Schools and school excursions – theatre visits |
| Councillor Watt | - Congratulations to Councillor McVey on becoming a white ribbon ambassador and support for 16 Days of Activism Campaign
- Licences for zero licence policy for sexual entertainment venues |
| Councillor Macinnes | - COP26 - Next steps to obtain 2030 net zero target goal in Edinburgh |
| Councillor Laidlaw | - Edinburgh’s contribution to COP26 – diesel generators being used for the City’s outdoor ice rink and Christmas market |
| Councillor Jim Campbell | - Transport and Environment Committee - advice from Clerk and Legal adviser |
| Councillor Main | - Net zero targets – Merchiston Community Council declaration of climate and ecological emergency – local action |

- Councillor Munro - Funding settlement by Scottish Government – representations by Leader and Depute Leader

4 Appointment to Committees and Outside Organisations etc

In terms of Standing Order 30.1, the Lord Provost ruled that there had been a material change in circumstances and that the Conservative Group amendment should be considered.

Appointments to Outside Bodies for 2017–22 were approved by Council on 29 June 2017 and appointments to the Council's committees were made at the Council meeting on 27 May 2021.

Councillor Gavin Corbett had submitted his resignation as a councillor of the City of Edinburgh Council for Ward 9, Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart and this had resulted in a number of vacancies at committees, joint boards and outside organisations.

Motion

To appoint Councillor Key as the Canal Champion.

- moved by Councillor Fullerton, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

- 1) To consider that the resignation of Councillor Corbett is a material change of circumstances, and agrees to recast the Committee places in line with the political balance of the Council seeking nominations from the political parties to fill their allocated places.
- 2) In response to recommendations 1.6 and 1.8 of the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, to appoint Councillor Doggart to the Edinburgh Community Solar Co-operative and Councillor Jim Campbell to the Board of Energy for Edinburgh.
- 3) To seek nominations for the places as Canal Champion and on the Torness Local Liaison Committee (paragraphs 1.5 and 1.7 of the recommendations).

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment 2

- 1) To appoint Councillor Staniforth to the Finance and Resources Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Burgess to Transport and Environment Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.

- 3) To appoint Councillor Booth to the Committee on Discretionary Rating Relief Appeals in place of Council Corbett.
- 4) To appoint Councillor Booth to the Lothian Valuation Joint Board/Lothian Electoral Joint Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 5) To appoint a Canal Champion in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 6) To appoint Councillor Main to the Edinburgh Community Solar Co-operative in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 7) To appoint Councillor Burgess to the Torness Local Liaison Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 8) To appoint Councillor Burgess to the Board of Energy for Edinburgh in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 9) To agree that Councillor Miller receive the Green Group Leader's Senior Councillor Remuneration with effect from 29 November 2021.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Miller

The Lord Provost ruled that as there was no opposition to the motion by Councillor Fullerton, that Councillor Key be appointed as the Canal Champion.

The Lord Provost further ruled that a vote be taken between Amendment 1 and Amendment 2.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For Amendment 1	-	25 votes
For Amendment 2	-	35 votes
Abstentions	-	1

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

For Amendment 2: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Ethan Young.

Abstentions: Councillor Child.)

Decision

To approve the Motion by Councillor Fullerton and Amendment 2 by Councillor Burgess as follows:

- 1) To appoint Councillor Staniforth to the Finance and Resources Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Burgess to Transport and Environment Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 3) To appoint Councillor Booth to the Committee on Discretionary Rating Relief Appeals in place of Council Corbett.
- 4) To appoint Councillor Booth to the Lothian Valuation Joint Board/Lothian Electoral Joint Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 5) To appoint Councillor Key as the Canal Champion in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 6) To appoint Councillor Main to the Edinburgh Community Solar Co-operative in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 7) To appoint Councillor Burgess to the Torness Local Liaison Committee in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 8) To appoint Councillor Burgess to the Board of Energy for Edinburgh in place of Councillor Corbett.
- 9) To agree that Councillor Miller receive the Green Group Leader's Senior Councillor Remuneration with effect from 29 November 2021.

(References – Act of Council No 8 of 29 June 2017; Act of Council No 6 of 24 August 2017; Act of Council No 4 of 27 June 2019; Act of Council No 7 of 27 May 2021; report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, submitted.)

5 Independent Inquiry Report Arising Out of Allegations Concerning the Conduct of the late Sean Bell

The Council had considered the outcome of an independent inquiry commissioned by the Council into complaints about the conduct of the late Sean Bell, a former senior manager in the Communities and Families directorate, who passed away in August 2020 whilst due to stand trial for sexual offences charges, and agreed to a further report on how the recommendations of the inquiry would be implemented in full.

An update was provided on progress which had been made and the proposed next steps in this regard.

Motion

- 1) To note the progress with regard to the recommendations made in the Inquiry report.
- 2) To agree that a further review of the misuse of public funds issue in the way detailed by Pinsent Masons would be disproportionate and costly but notes this means there will be unresolved issues in relation to whether and how the outcomes of the investigations undertaken at the time into this and the related Fair Treatment at Work Complaint by the whistleblowers were actioned.
- 3) To acknowledge the difficulty in this for the whistleblowers, who did the right thing in bringing information forward, and asks that the redress scheme appropriately takes account of the impact on them of potential previous failings of the Council to satisfactorily deal with issues raised.
- 4) To note that the Review undertaken by Brodies, requested by the then Monitoring Officer, was not a reinvestigation and related only to whether the Monitoring Officer was required to conduct further investigation under the relevant legislation; further notes that this has been made available to some councillors and agrees to make this report available to all Councillors in appropriate data room conditions.
- 5) To recognise the issue of proportionality on this matter as set out in 2) above, to request officers to consider any additional actions which can be progressed through relevant working groups set out in section 4.3 of the report by the Chief Executive to make improvements (for example in relation to record keeping and assurance as to completion of actions), to ensure that in future assurance can be provided that all relevant actions have been taken in relation to matters such as those raised by the whistleblowers.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

- 1) To note the progress with regard to the recommendations made in the Inquiry report.
- 2) To instruct the Chief Executive to organise a private briefing, or create a data room for Members, within one cycle in order to review the reports that identify those officers who made up the “old boys' network”.
- 3) To agree that a further review of the misuse of public funds issue in the way detailed by Pinsent Masons would be disproportionate and costly but notes that there remain issues to be resolved in relation to whether and how the outcomes of the investigations undertaken at the time into this and the related Fair Treatment at Work Complaint by the whistleblowers were actioned.

- 4) To note that the Review undertaken by Brodies, requested by the then Monitoring Officer, was not a reinvestigation and related only to whether the Monitoring Officer was required to conduct further investigation under the relevant legislation; further notes that this has been made available to some councillors and agrees to make this report available to all Councillors in appropriate data room conditions.
- 5) To note that recent events, notably the information included in the October 2021 Tanner report, throw new light on the credibility of some of the evidence supplied to those investigations and the likelihood that the appropriate actions were taken thereafter.
- 6) To therefore instruct that a short management review is undertaken to determine the accurate position so that councillors, the whistleblowers and those who undertook the investigations (both latter groups containing current Council staff members) can understand the outcomes, any failings by the Council management at the time, and what action remains necessary to ensure that a just and proportionate resolution is found that recognises all those damaged by the actions of Sean Bell. This review to be reported to Council within two cycles.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Rose

Adjournment

In accordance with Standing Order 21 a vote was taken to adjourn the meeting to allow the motion and amendment to be considered.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For an adjournment	-	55 votes
Against an adjournment	-	0 votes

The meeting was adjourned for 50 minutes.

Resumption

On resuming the meeting, the following adjustment to the motion by Councillor McVey was submitted:

To add to the end of paragraph 4 of the motion by Councillor McVey:

“Agrees the conclusion on proportionality doesn’t preclude further request for management actions to seek additional assurance if necessary in future.”

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	41 votes
For the amendment	-	16 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To note the progress with regard to the recommendations made in the Inquiry report.
- 2) To agree that a further review of the misuse of public funds issue in the way detailed by Pinsent Masons would be disproportionate and costly but note this meant there would be unresolved issues in relation to whether and how the outcomes of the investigations undertaken at the time into this and the related Fair Treatment at Work Complaint by the whistleblowers were actioned.
- 3) To acknowledge the difficulty in this for the whistleblowers, who did the right thing in bringing information forward, and ask that the redress scheme appropriately took account of the impact on them of potential previous failings of the Council to satisfactorily deal with issues raised.
- 4) To note that the Review undertaken by Brodies, requested by the then Monitoring Officer, was not a reinvestigation and related only to whether the Monitoring Officer was required to conduct further investigation under the relevant legislation; to further note that this had been made available to some councillors and agree to make this report available to all Councillors in appropriate data room conditions. To agree the conclusion on proportionality didn't preclude further requests for management actions to seek additional assurance if necessary in future.
- 5) To recognise the issue of proportionality on this matter as set out in 2) above, to request officers to consider any additional actions which could be progressed through relevant working groups set out in section 4.3 of the report by the Chief Executive to make improvements (for example in relation to record keeping and

assurance as to completion of actions), to ensure that in future assurance could be provided that all relevant actions had been taken in relation to matters such as those raised by the whistleblowers

(References – Act of Council No 2 of 28 October 2021; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

6 Boundary Commission for Scotland – 2023 Review of UK Parliament Constituencies

Details were provided on the Boundary Commission for Scotland's initial proposals for a new map of UK Parliamentary constituencies in Scotland. Scotland had been allocated 57 constituencies for the 2023 Review, two fewer than at present, the UK Parliament retaining 650 constituencies in total. The overall aim was to make the electorate of each constituency more equal.

Under the proposals Edinburgh retained 5 constituencies, with the current names, with minor changes to the boundaries between constituencies, however, it was proposed that the Edinburgh East constituency should include the western half of Musselburgh.

Decision

- 1) To note the Boundary Commission for Scotland consultation on the proposed new UK Parliamentary Constituencies.
- 2) To approve the proposed response to the Boundary Commission for Scotland as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Chief Executive.

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

7 Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership – Appointment of Service Director - Operations

Details were provided on the recruitment process which would be followed to appoint the Service Director Operations within the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership. Normally, Service Directors employed by the Council would be appointed by a Recruitment Committee comprising seven elected members, however, in the current circumstances, it was proposed that the Council waive its right, and agree that responsibility for the selection of these posts be given to an Integration Joint Board (IJB) recruitment panel.

Decision

- 1) To note the arrangements for the appointment of the Service Director – Operations, Health & Social Care.
- 2) To agree the arrangements for the recruitment and appointment of the Service Director – Operations, including the establishment of an IJB recruitment panel to make the appointments.

- 3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to authorise the appointment (if necessary) of the Service Director – Operations following the selection of appropriate candidates by the IJB.

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

8 City of Edinburgh Council – 2020/21 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 City of Edinburgh Council – 2020/21 Annual Audit Report to the Council and the Controller of Audit to the Council for noting.

Motion

To note the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.

- moved by Councillor Munn, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Amendment

- 1) To note the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) To instruct the Chief Executive to present a report to the March Council meeting setting out progress in relation to each of the main actions identified in the key messages section of the External Auditor’s report; agreeing that:
 - (a) such a report should also include an update on progress towards completing all outstanding management actions arising from Internal Audit activity; and
 - (b) the potential consequences for the City of Edinburgh’s medium-term financial framework arising from the absence of a medium-term financial strategy for the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board.

- moved by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	37 votes
For the amendment	-	21 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Munn.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee of 18 November 2021 (item 1); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Bruce, Cameron, Dixon, Osler and Staniforth declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of Edinburgh Leisure.

Councillors Bird, Brown and Gordon declared a non-financial interest in the above item as trustees of Spartans Community Football Academy.

9 Call for Action on Zebra Markings for Side Streets - Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

a) Deputation – Bruntsfield Primary School Parent Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Bruntsfield Primary School Parent Council.

The deputation strongly supported the motion by Councillor Neil Ross for a trial of cost-efficient Zebra markings for side streets to encourage walking to school and to promote the wider Living Streets for the school community and all of Edinburgh.

The deputation urged the Council to proceed with a trial as soon as possible and to show its support for the national call by Living Streets and other road safety groups to ask the government to give zebra markings the same legal force as zebra crossings.

b) Deputation – South Morningside Primary School Parent Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of South Morningside Primary School Parent Council.

The deputation were very pleased to see the proposal to introduce a trial of side street zebra crossings which they strongly supported. They believed that painted zebra markings would be an excellent addition to the measures that allowed safe travel to school and that these crossings would make a real difference to encouraging active travel.

The deputation indicated that they would also like to volunteer a proposal for a trial route, were willing to help canvas parents for opinions on whether the route

had improved their walk to school and had suggested a route as an option for the trial.

c) Deputation – Stockbridge Primary Parent Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Stockbridge Primary Parent Council.

The deputation indicated that they were in full support of the call for action on zebra markings for side streets as they felt that this cost effective initiative would go some way to improving the safety of their pupils, in particular those who used the Saxe-Coburg crossing, until other measures could be put in place.

They stressed that it was particularly appealing that the zebra markings could be actioned quickly given the additional hazards the children faced in the dark mornings and afternoons of the Scottish winter and felt that other schools in Edinburgh would benefit from zebra markings on side-streets.

d) Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the national call for authorisation from central government to use zebra markings for side streets. The joint statement has been signed by Living Streets, British Cycling, Guide Dogs, the Campaign for Better Transport, The Ramblers, Sustrans and Playing Out as well as motoring body The AA.
- 2) Recognises that, in the face of the global climate crisis and worsening obesity and physical inactivity levels, the need to enable millions more people across the nation to make local journeys on foot is not a choice but an absolute necessity.
- 3) Notes that Greater Manchester Council has published new evidence showing that zebra markings on side roads lead to drivers giving way 30% more than where there is no marking and is asking for permission to roll out a large-scale trial of zebra markings at side roads.
- 4) Notes that the Danish city of Aarhus is to trial 3D zebra style crossings.
- 5) Notes that new YouGov polling data published and commissioned by Living Streets has found that:
 - **83%** of adults would feel more confident crossing the road with zebra markings

- **29%** of adults have been hit or had a near miss at a side road
 - **65%** of adults think the UK government should authorise zebra markings on side roads
 - **76%** of parents of 4-11-year-olds would feel safer about their child walking to school (or allowing them to walk independently) if there were zebra crossings on side roads
 - **76%** would also be more likely to walk to school if there were zebra crossings at side roads.
- 6) Notes that the proposed side road zebra markings - that do not use expensive Belisha Beacons or zigzags - are in common use across the world to give greater priority to pedestrians when crossing quieter roads. They are also in widespread use across the UK in supermarket car parks and airports and are already authorised for use on protected cycle tracks. The crossings typically cost around £1,000 compared to £40,000 for a zebra crossing with Belisha Beacons.
- 7) Requests that the Convener of Transport & Environment writes to the Scottish Government ministers responsible for Transport and Active Travel to
- highlight the benefits to pedestrians of zebra markings for side streets;
 - ask for authorisation, if necessary in conjunction with the UK Government, for the Council to implement zebra markings for side streets; and
 - report to the Transport & Environment Committee within two cycles to provide details of the correspondence with the Minister, including the response received from the Minister and details of any progress made.
- 8) Requests that officers investigate the potential to set up a trial of zebra markings on side streets in Edinburgh, learning from the trials in Manchester and Aarhus, by selecting suitable locations in each of the locality areas in collaboration with local councillors with a focus towards, but not exclusive to, safer routes to school. Officers should report their recommendations to the Transport and Environment Committee in one cycle with the aim of commencing the trial within the current Council term.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Neil Ross.

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross, seconded by Councillor Lang

Amendment

- 1) To agree paragraphs 1-7 of the motion by Councillor Neil Ross.
- 2) To replace paragraph 8 of the motion and add paragraph 9 as follows:
 - “8) To recognise that discussions have already taken place with officers on this topic as the Coalition acknowledged this wider campaign and the benefits that zebra crossings of this nature could bring to Edinburgh’s residents. Councillor Watt has, for example, already requested a pilot in her ward.
 - 9) To request that officers investigate the potential to set up a trial of zebra markings on side streets in Edinburgh, learning from the trials in Manchester and Aarhus. Suitable trial locations should be identified by taking into account other planned road changes and related aspects of the City Mobility Plan, with engagement with local Ward Councillors and Community Councils. This report should be prepared with the intent of returning to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles (March 2022) setting out the possibilities for positive action on this topic.”

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	25 votes
For the amendment	-	35 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor Macinnes as follows:

- 1) To note the national call for authorisation from central government to use zebra markings for side streets. The joint statement had been signed by Living Streets, British Cycling, Guide Dogs, the Campaign for Better Transport, The Ramblers, Sustrans and Playing Out as well as motoring body The AA.
- 2) To recognise that, in the face of the global climate crisis and worsening obesity and physical inactivity levels, the need to enable millions more people across the nation to make local journeys on foot was not a choice but an absolute necessity.
- 3) To note that Greater Manchester Council had published new evidence showing that zebra markings on side roads led to drivers giving way 30% more than where there was no marking and was asking for permission to roll out a large-scale trial of zebra markings at side roads.
- 4) To note that the Danish city of Aarhus was to trial 3D zebra style crossings.
- 5) To note that new YouGov polling data published and commissioned by Living Streets had found that:
 - **83%** of adults would feel more confident crossing the road with zebra markings
 - **29%** of adults have been hit or had a near miss at a side road
 - **65%** of adults think the UK government should authorise zebra markings on side roads
 - **76%** of parents of 4-11-year-olds would feel safer about their child walking to school (or allowing them to walk independently) if there were zebra crossings on side roads
 - **76%** would also be more likely to walk to school if there were zebra crossings at side roads
- 6) To note that the proposed side road zebra markings - that did not use expensive Belisha Beacons or zigzags - were in common use across the world to give greater priority to pedestrians when crossing quieter roads. They were also in widespread use across the UK in supermarket car parks and airports and were already authorised for use on protected cycle tracks. The crossings typically cost around £1,000 compared to £40,000 for a zebra crossing with Belisha Beacons.

- 7) To request that the Convener of the Transport and Environment write to the Scottish Government ministers responsible for Transport and Active Travel to
 - highlight the benefits to pedestrians of zebra markings for side streets;
 - ask for authorisation, if necessary in conjunction with the UK Government, for the Council to implement zebra markings for side streets; and
 - report to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles to provide details of the correspondence with the Minister, including the response received from the Minister and details of any progress made.
- 8) To recognise that discussions had already taken place with officers on this topic as the Coalition acknowledged this wider campaign and the benefits that zebra crossings of this nature could bring to Edinburgh's residents. Councillor Watt had, for example, already requested a pilot in her ward.
- 9) To request that officers investigate the potential to set up a trial of zebra markings on side streets in Edinburgh, learning from the trials in Manchester and Aarhus. Suitable trial locations should be identified by taking into account other planned road changes and related aspects of the City Mobility Plan, with engagement with local Ward Councillors and Community Councils. This report should be prepared with the intent of returning to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles (March 2022) setting out the possibilities for positive action on this topic.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Neil Ross declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of Living Streets Scotland.

10 Freedom of the City of Edinburgh on the Edinburgh Squadron of the Scottish and North Irish Yeomanry - Motion by the Lord Provost

The following motion by the Lord Provost was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council:

Notes that 2021 is the 250th anniversary of the birth of Sir Walter Scott and the variety of celebrations organised to commemorate this.

Notes that on 30th October 2021 the City hosted the largest civic commemorative event seen for several generations to mark the 250th anniversary.

Notes that the Scottish and North Irish Yeomanry, based at Redford barracks, is formed of four Squadrons and has a rich history and role in Scotland's past. They are

formed of A (Earl of Carrick's Own) Squadron based in Ayr, B (North Irish Horse) Squadron in Belfast, C (Fife & Forfar/Scottish Horse based in Cupar and in Edinburgh, E (Lothians & Border Yeomanry) Squadron.

Notes that the latter's antecedent Regiments having been formed by Sir Walter Scott, protected the Lord Provost on North Bridge, formed the Reconnaissance unit for the 51st Highland Division at St Valery in 1940 and more recently supported the SNHS.

Notes that Edinburgh Squadron has been at the forefront of the military contribution at home and abroad and has a proud and deep connection within the communities in which we live and serve.

Agrees to confer the Freedom of the City of Edinburgh on the Edinburgh Squadron of the SNIY in recognition of the above."

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

11 Granton Gas Holder - Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

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

"Council:

Welcomes the UK Government announcement that it will provide £16.482 million from its Levelling-Up Fund to support the Council in the first phase of the Granton Waterfront regeneration programme, with the money allocated to restore the B-Listed Granton Gas Holder.

Recognises the historic value of the Gas Holder as an iconic building for North Edinburgh and beyond, and its role in providing heritage context to the new development and public realm, with the aim to create a 'new coastal town'.

Commits to working with the UK Government to secure additional Levelling-Up funding for projects across the City of Edinburgh to supplement existing sources of funding."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment

To delete last paragraph of the motion by Councillor Laidlaw and replace with:

“Notes the Council applied for 6 projects in total and 5/6 were not approved by the UK Government but notes that these may be applied for in future funding rounds and the Council will continue to apply for available funding from available sources which can support the aims of the Capital.”

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Laidlaw:

- 1) To welcome the UK Government announcement that it will provide £16.482 million from its Levelling-Up Fund to support the Council in the first phase of the Granton Waterfront regeneration programme, with the money allocated to restore the B-Listed Granton Gas Holder.
- 2) To recognise the historic value of the Gas Holder as an iconic building for North Edinburgh and beyond, and its role in providing heritage context to the new development and public realm, with the aim to create a ‘new coastal town’.
- 3) To commit to working with the UK Government to secure additional Levelling-Up funding for projects across the City of Edinburgh to supplement existing sources of funding.
- 4) To note the Council applied for 6 projects in total and 5/6 were not approved by the UK Government but note that these may be applied for in future funding rounds and the Council would continue to apply for available funding from available sources which could support the aims of the Capital.

12 Cycle Parking Technical Guidance - Motion by Councillor Booth

a) Deputation - Spokes

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Spokes.

The deputation were concerned with the provision of cycle parking in new developments as they had seen numerous planning applications be approved with substandard cycle parking, and in some cases no provision whatsoever. They felt that all the main aspects of proposed cycle parking should be set out in planning applications and should also specify how security would be achieved as well as how easy to access and use the parking would be.

The deputation welcomed the motion by Councillor Booth to urgently bring forward the technical factsheet on cycle parking.

b) Motion by Councillor Booth

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the recently reported rise in cycle thefts in Edinburgh, with the capital responsible for over a third of Scottish statistics, and an increase of over 10% in thefts in the capital compared with last year;
- 2) Notes that safe, secure, well-lit and convenient cycle parking at both origin and destination locations can significantly reduce the chance of a bicycle being stolen, and is also essential to encouraging more people to cycle;
- 3) Welcomes the recent changes to the Permitted Development (Scotland) Order which removed the requirement for planning permission for certain small bike storage sheds;
- 4) Notes with dismay that the Planning technical factsheet "Cycle Parking in New Developments", which at the meeting of full council in December 2018 the Planning Convenor said he was keen to publish "as quickly as possible" has still not been published;
- 5) Therefore agrees that the council will urgently consult with Sustrans, Spokes and any other organisations with expertise in cycle parking as it sees fit, and present draft technical factsheet(s) on cycle parking to the next meeting of Planning Committee for approval.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment

- 1) To agree paragraphs 1-3 of the motion by Councillor Booth.
- 2) To replace paragraphs 4 and 5 of the motion with:
 - “4) Notes that there has been considerable unfortunate delay in delivering this Factsheet, as a result of Covid-related resource pressures, a change of internal personnel, procurement requirements and funding issues but that the work is now almost complete. It is expected that this Factsheet

will be published shortly and before the end of 2021, following senior management approval.

- 5) Notes that input to the Factsheet was received from Spokes, Living Streets and the Access Panel.”

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Booth:

- 1) To note the recently reported rise in cycle thefts in Edinburgh, with the capital responsible for over a third of Scottish statistics, and an increase of over 10% in thefts in the capital compared with last year.
- 2) To note that safe, secure, well-lit and convenient cycle parking at both origin and destination locations could significantly reduce the chance of a bicycle being stolen, and was also essential to encouraging more people to cycle.
- 3) To welcome the recent changes to the Permitted Development (Scotland) Order which removed the requirement for planning permission for certain small bike storage sheds.
- 4) To note that there had been considerable unfortunate delay in delivering the Planning technical factsheet "Cycle Parking in New Developments", this Factsheet, as a result of Covid-related resource pressures, a change of internal personnel, procurement requirements and funding issues but that the work was now almost complete.
- 5) To note that input to the Factsheet was received from Spokes, Living Streets and the Access Panel.
- 6) To therefore agree that the council would present technical factsheet(s) on cycle parking to the next meeting of the Planning Committee and note that this Factsheet would be published before the end of 2021, following senior management approval.

13 St Margaret's Chapel Guild - 80th Anniversary - Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

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

“Council notes:

In 1942 the Very Reverend Dr Selby Wright CVO TD, at that time minister of Canongate Kirk, placed an advertisement in the local press inviting anyone with Margaret in their name to place flowers in St Margaret's Chapel in Edinburgh Castle. Such was the response that the St Margaret's Chapel Guild was founded and has been in existence ever since. 2022 will be the Guild's 80th anniversary.

The aims of the Guild are to follow the example and to practice the principles of St Margaret, to promote the use of the Chapel for public and private devotion, to ensure that those with the name of Margaret place flowers in the Chapel every week of the year, and to support organisations or people with ideals similar to St Margaret's.

The Guild is a non-denominational charity and holds services in the chapel every year on St Margaret's Day, 16th November.

In acknowledging the positive work of the St Margaret's Chapel Guild, Council requests that the Lord Provost marks their 80th Anniversary in an appropriate way.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Neil Ross.

14 Questions

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

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 14 of 25 November 2021)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021

At the 19 August 2021 meeting of the Transport Committee, and following a discussion on the business bulletin item covering the Kirkliston cross roads, committee voted to agree “that a report setting out options for reconfiguring the junction and any other appropriate action should be presented to committee for decision in November 2021”.

Question (1) Why was a report not presented to committee at the November meeting?

Answer (1) A detailed update of the proposed junction improvements was provided in the Business Bulletin for Transport and Environment Committee on [14 October 2021](#).

Question (2) When will the report be presented?

Answer (2) A report on progress on the proposed signal control improvements will be presented to Transport and Environment Committee on 27 January 2022.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost, so can I thank the Convener for the answers that she's provided. If I go back to the meeting in August, the motion that both her and I voted for, it says in my question, a report setting out options for reconfiguring the junction and we've not had that yet, so can I ask her to clarify if the report that we get in January will cover off that point because there was a consultant's report that had options for reconfiguring the junction and that's never come to Committee.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Lang. What has come to Committee was the business bulletin on 14 October, where it stated quite clearly that there was no scope for physical alterations at that particular junction so in my mind that covers off quite a bit of the content of your supplementary question, however, what I will do is ask officers to meet with you again to go over that particular part and see whether not there's any further action to be taken to answer your supplementary question.

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 November 2021**

Question (1) What engagement has there been with Living Streets Edinburgh since the October meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee regarding the review of pedestrian waiting times at road crossings?

Answer (1) There is ongoing engagement with Living Streets on the Travelling Safely pedestrian prioritisation at traffic signals workstream and broader study. This engagement will continue for the workstream and will focus on the findings of the study when complete.

Question (2) How many crossing waiting times have been reviewed since this meeting of the committee?

Answer (2) Prior to Committee meeting on 14 October 2021, there were seven pedestrian crossings which had not been reviewed as part of the Travelling Safely programme that was agreed by Transport and Environment Committee. These seven have now been completed.

Question (3) What programme is in place to review pedestrian waiting times at crossings throughout the city?

Answer (3) As set out in answer 2 there was a programme of work focusing on key routes as part of the Travelling Safely programme. As part of the on-going discussions with Living Streets, where concerns are raised regarding waiting times at crossings, officers are seeking to improve these crossing times wherever possible.

**Supplementary
Question**

Yes , thank you, quite a simple question, supplementary for this Lord Provost. So in the answer to question 1, it mentions that the broader study which I think does sit separately from the travelling safely programme and she says that the engagement will continue for the workstream and will focus on the findings of the study when complete, has she got any indication as to the timescale for the completion of that study?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Not yet but I will ask officers to inform you when they are able to give you a proper timing on it, thank you.

**Comment by
the Lord
Provost**

Councillor Macinnes, can we make sure that that notification goes to everybody rather than just Councillor Lang, thank you.

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Howie for answer by
the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 November 2021**

Question (1) According to our equalities data, what percentage of staff identify as disabled?

Answer (1) 2.9% of our employees have self-classified and recorded themselves as having a long-term condition or disability. This is based on response rate of 80.8%. The remaining 19.2% of employees have either stated they prefer not to say (5.2%) or left the question blank (14%).

Question (2) In terms of degree of disability, how many of these staff have been offered support to get Department of Work and Pensions Access to Work funding for assistance with their role?

Answer (2) The Council does not hold this information since the Access to Work scheme operated by the UK Government requires employees to submit their Access to Work application directly to the Department for Work and Pensions. The Council does, however, provide appropriate support and advice to employees on reasonable adjustments through its occupational health provider, health and safety professionals and our property and facilities management teams.

Question (3) What steps has the council taken to make the recruitment process easier for people who experience neurodivergence (e.g. on the autistic spectrum or with attention deficit disorder) but don't qualify as disabled?

Answer

- (3) The Council is committed to building an inclusive recruitment culture where all people feel valued, included and able to be at their best during the recruitment process. The Council recognises that every person will potentially have different needs and may require different reasonable adjustments, therefore, recruiting line managers work with individuals to ensure they have a positive experience when applying to work for the Council.

In addition, the Council is a Disability Confident Employer in accordance with the UK wide scheme operated by the Department for Work and Pensions. This means that the Council offers guaranteed interviews for jobs where candidates meet the essential requirements and consider themselves to have a disability or long-term condition. It should be noted that, for employment purposes, disability is a matter of self-classification, not a requirement to meet a specification 'qualifying criteria'.

Question

- (4) For each of the past 3 years:
- How many, both in numbers and as a percentage of all applicants through myjobscotland.gov.uk indicated they identified as disabled and were eligible for the Guaranteed Interview Scheme and what percentage of those were Modern apprenticeships?
 - How many of these were invited to an interview?
 - How many of these required adjustments to attend the interview?
 - How many of these adjustments were accommodated by us enabling them to attend?
 - How many of these were offered the job?

Answer

- (4) Appendix 1 provides the figures requested for Local Government Employees.

This information is drawn from the national recruitment portal for Local Government, operated by the Improvement Service, known as MyJobScotland. It should be noted that this does not require mandatory disclosure by job applicants about whether they consider themselves to have a disability or long-term health condition.

The Council's recruitment process clearly advises that if a candidate for a post requires any reasonable adjustments to enable them to attend an interview, that they should contact the recruiting line manager to facilitate this.

No request for a reasonable adjustment should be declined by a recruiting line manager and professional advice on reasonable adjustments is available from different experts, as outlined in the answer to question 2, if an individual is selected for employment. In addition, it should be noted that pre-employment occupational health screening questionnaires will review if any reasonable adjustments are required.

Question

- (5) Part time contracts (Temporary and permanent):

- Does the council operate a scheme whereby disabled people work part time and at the same time retain full benefits?
- If so, how many are employed on a temporary basis?
- If so, how many are employed are on a permanent basis?

Answer

- (5) The Council does not offer a scheme whereby employees that consider themselves to have a disability or long-term health condition can request part time hours but retain a full-time salary. As with all part-time employment arrangements, salary is pro-rated to the hours worked.

The Council does however offer a range of flexible working options to all employees which these includes, part time working, permanently working from home and variable hours, etc.

Question**(6)** Pay grades, career development, promotion:

- What grades are disabled employees on?
- How many disabled employees are offered career development opportunities?
- How many disabled employees occupy promoted positions?
- How many disabled employees are currently occupying grade 10 posts or above?

Answer**(6)** A breakdown by grade for Local Government Employees that have self-classified as having a disability or long-term condition is provided in Appendix 1 to these responses.

All employees, irrespective of any protected characteristic, including disability or long-term health conditions are offered career development opportunities and any individual a disclosed disability or long-term health condition who meets the minimum essential criteria will be guaranteed an interview should they apply for a promotion, as stated.

The Council does not have a recording category of 'promoted positions.' However, the Workforce Dashboard, which is regularly reported to the Finance and Resources Committee classifies employees at Grade 5 or above to be a Frontline Manager or Specialist, based on this description the Council has 259 colleagues who have declared a disability or long-term health condition to be in a promoted post (excluding teachers). 7 of these colleagues are Grade 10 or above. On the basis of this definition, employees in these roles could be deemed to be 'promoted.'

In addition, employees with self-classified disabilities or long-term conditions are employed within Chief Officer roles. However, this detail is not provided, because of the limited number of employees at this level, which may make individuals directly identifiable

Data for Question 4

	2020		2019		2018	
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Candidates declaring a disability (from the total number of candidates applying)	4077	5.4	3082	5.1	3017	4.7
Invited to interview (from those declaring a disability)	920	22.5	726	23.6	637	21.1
Offered a role (from those invited to interview)	74	8	111	15.3	36	5.7
Candidates for Modern Apprentice roles	15		36		47	

Data for Question 6

Grade	Employees self-classifying with a disability or long-term condition
GR1	14
GR2	33
GR3	89
GR4	107
GR5	69
GR6	56
GR7	74
GR8	41
GR9	12
GR10	7
Total	502

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 25
November 2021**

Question (1) Please can the Convener confirm whether the cost of fully bilingual Gaelic/English signage throughout the new Meadowbank building has been investigated, either by the council or by Edinburgh Leisure?

Answer (1) The cost of fully bilingual signage has not been investigated. For the new Meadowbank Sports Centre, Edinburgh Leisure's approach is to keep the signage clear and uncluttered, taking cognisance (in the design of the signage) of the challenges that people with dementia and other cognitive issues face regards to signage and what would support their ease of use. There are several TV/ electronic screens throughout the building to identify areas/ spaces and share information with customers. The TV screens identifying the activity areas will also detail the Gaelic equivalent.

The Welcome to Meadowbank Sports Centre sign to the right-hand side of the main entrance on the external wall will also be displayed in Gaelic.

Question (2) If so, what was the estimated cost of fully bilingual signage? What was the estimated cost of monolingual signage?

Answer (2) As noted above, the cost of fully bilingual signage has not been investigated.

Question (3) If this has not been investigated, why not?

Answer (3) This is answered in the response to question 1.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thanks very much Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for his answer where he states that the cost of bilingual signage at the new Meadowbank building has not been investigated. The council's own Gaelic language plan which was approved in 2018 states that the Council will encourage and I quote "all council ALEOs to consider Gaelic and/or bilingual signage as and when new or refreshed signage is introduced", so please can the Convener clarify why has he ignored the Council's own policy on this?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for the question Councillor Booth and I would refer you back to the answer and if you go on to read you will see that the approach, certainly Edinburgh Leisure's approach has been to keep the signage clear and uncluttered taking cognisance of the challenges that people with dementia and other cognitive issues face, so that is the reason. Also I would say that a lot of planning and thought has gone into the master plan, indeed we just won an award last week from 80 awards for the master plan for Meadowbank so we are very proud of that and there has been a lot of thought gone into this and there are TV screens which are quite capable of identifying activity areas and they will also detail in Gaelic.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 November 2021**

Question (1) Please can the Convener confirm whether the cost of fully bilingual Gaelic/English signage on the Newhaven tram extension has been investigated?

Answer (1) Discussions have taken place between the project and the Capital Gaelic Development Officer. A translation of the location signage to be installed on the Tram to Newhaven project has been requested. Initial costings for the translation are awaited from Gaelic Place- Names of Scotland.

Question (2) If so, what is the estimated cost of fully bilingual signage? What is the estimated cost of monolingual signage?

Answer (2) The cost of signage is borne by Edinburgh Trams as they instruct design to accord with brand requirements. Any additional cost for the inclusion of a Gaelic translation will be assessed when the translation (which will inform the size of each sign and in turn support requirements) has been prepared and discussed with Edinburgh Trams.

Question (3) If this has not been investigated, why not?

Answer (3) As noted above.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for her answer and in particular I welcome the fact that as she is investigating the cost of bilingual signage and therefore in contrast to the previous answer does appear to be complying with Council policy in this regard. Please could the Convener clarify what the timetable is for the likely cost of bilingual signage coming back for a decision, will she please share that information with members of the Council's Gaelic Implementation Group and can she clarify that the investigation into costs also includes the possibility of signage for the tram stop names themselves?

**Comments by
the Lord
Provost**

Before the Convener answers, we pushed one question just a little bit far there Councillor Booth.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you very much though Councillor Booth for those questions. In terms of timing I don't have a particular timing but we will certainly come back to everybody in this Council with that particular timing. I am more than happy to share any results on that with the Gaelic Implementation Group and similarly around costs. I would say that I am very keen to see Gaelic place names along the tram route, I don't know if it's possible or not but as you know from previous answers I've given around Gaelic issues in this chamber and other committees, I think it's very important to mark both the historical connections with Gaelic in this city and the presence of Gaels in this city, it is important to mark that and to comply with the Scottish Government Act on that.

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021

Question

Please could the Convener set out in table form (1) the number of parking spaces currently available to N3 permit-holders in the following streets, (2) the net gain or loss to N3 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented in these streets, and (3) totals for both.

- Bedford Street
- Cheyne Street
- Comely Bank Avenue
- Comely Bank Grove
- Comely Bank Place
- Comely Bank Row
- Comely Bank Street
- Comely Bank Terrace (both sides)
- Dean Park Street
- Learmonth Avenue
- Learmonth Crescent
- Learmonth Gardens
- Learmonth Grove
- Learmonth Park
- Learmonth Place
- Learmonth View

- Portgower Place
- Raeburn Place
- South Learmonth Gardens

Answer

The table below sets out the requested information. Please note that permit and shared use parking places are marked in continuous blocks rather than individual parking places. Therefore, the figures below are estimated parking space numbers based on the current available lengths of kerbside parking and the lengths of parking that may be lost should TRO/21/16 be implemented

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you very much to the Convener for her answer. Lord Provost I may be overreaching with this so please do intervene if I am, I'd like to clarify on the net loss numbers if I could to the Convener, in N3 we're seeing overall about 13% in this section of N3, 30% loss in the most densely populated area, some 40% and 10 to 27 for others, have attempts been made to try and replace some of that lost parking because of the hubs, is that too much?

Comments by the Lord Provost

Pushing it Councillor Mitchell but I think Council Macinnes got a good answer or not by looking at the view.

Councillor Macinnes

I have to be honest Lord Provost, I didn't actually understand the question, could you repeat it please in a more succinct manner?

Clarification by Councillor Mitchell

Of Course, sorry, could the Convener clarify if attempts have been made to possibly try and replace some of the lost parking because looking at the actual TRO it doesn't seem like there have been attempts made?

Supplementary Answer

I would have to confirm that with officers and again I'll ask them to return directly to you and to the rest of the Chamber with that answer

Zone N3 streets	Parking spaces currently available to N3 permit-holders	Net gain or loss to N3 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented
-	-	
Bedford Street	33	-2
Cheyne Street	26	-4
Comely Bank Avenue	101	-10
Comely Bank Grove	46	-6
Comely Bank Place	36	-10
Comely Bank Row	32	-6
Comely Bank Street	40	-8
Comely Bank Terrace (both sides)	31	-4
Dean Park Street	36	-14
Learmonth Avenue	56	-10
Learmonth Crescent	56	-4
Learmonth Gardens	69	-2
Learmonth Grove	60	-10
Learmonth Park	19	0
Learmonth Place	30	-2
Learmonth View	13	-2
Portgower Place	15	-2
Raeburn Place	0	0
South Learmonth Gardens	73	-2
Totals	772	-98

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021

Question

Please could the Convener set out in table form (1) the number of parking spaces currently available to N2 permit-holders in the following streets, (2) the net gain or loss to N2 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented in these streets, and (3) the totals for both.

- Bangholm Terrace
- Eildon Street
- Goldenacre Terrace
- Howard Place
- Howard Street
- Inverleith Avenue
- Inverleith Row
- Inverleith Terrace
- Monmouth Terrace
- Montagu Terrace
- Royston Terrace
- Warriston Crescent

Answer

The table below provides the requested information. Please note that permit and shared use parking places are marked in continuous blocks rather than individual parking places. Therefore, the figures below are estimated parking space numbers based on the current available lengths of kerbside parking and the lengths of parking that may be lost should TRO/21/16 be implemented.

<u>N2 zone streets</u>	parking spaces currently available to N2 permit-holders	net gain or loss to N2 permit-holders should TRO/21/16 be implemented
-	-	
Bangholm Terrace	20	-2
Eildon Street	84	-8
Goldenacre Terrace	18	-4
Howard Place - included with Inverleith Row	-	-
Howard Street - included with Inverleith Row	-	-
Inverleith Avenue	0	0
Inverleith Row	70	0
Inverleith Terrace	108	-2
Monmouth Terrace	12	-2
Montagu Terrace	10	0
Royston Terrace	20	-4
Warriston Crescent	44	0
Totals	386	-22

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 November 2021**

In the report about Lanark Road provided to the Transport and Environment Committee on 14 October, in the Active Travel Measures Travelling Safely update in item 7.1, Appendix 2 (Lanark Road: Monitoring Results, Feedback from Engagement Exercise and Recommendations) contains cycle and vehicle count data for Lanark Road near Redhall Bank Road and Spylaw Bank Road.

For each of the survey periods, please could you provide the daily counts for each date within the survey period for both locations:

Question

- (1)** October 2020 data, in the report all that was provided was an average from the 5 working days. Please provide the individual counts for each of 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 October, to include the weekend for both cycle and vehicles.

Answer**(1)**

Cycles per Day	Location	
	Spylaw Bank	Redhall Bank
07/10/2020	120	149
08/10/2020	140	155
09/10/2020	130	136
10/10/2020	89	141
11/10/2020	131	183
12/10/2020	99	91
13/10/2020	98	98

Vehicles per Day	Spylaw Bank
07/10/2020	10,628
08/10/2020	10,688
09/10/2020	11,222
10/10/2020	12,929
11/10/2020	10,886
12/10/2020	9,128
13/10/2020	10,635

There were no vehicle counts carried out at Redhall Bank during October 2020.

Question**(2)** August 2021 data - the data for the school holiday period is missing. Please provide data for each of 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 August for both cycle and vehicles

Answer**(2)**

Cycles per Day	Location	
	Spylaw Bank	Redhall Bank
16/08/2021	92	115
17/08/2021	92	120
18/08/2021	112	141
19/08/2021	128	136
20/08/2021	103	131

Vehicles per Day	Location	
	Spylaw Bank	Redhall Bank
16/08/2021	9,008	8,475
17/08/2021	9,420	8,838
18/08/2021	9,992	9,097
19/08/2021	10,085	9,763
20/08/2021	9,987	9,859

Question**(3)**

In the July 2021 and August 2021 survey periods, it appears from the report that the weekends were excluded from the survey.

- a) Why wasn't a full week of data captured in the survey periods to include weekends?
- b) If it was included, please can you provide cycle and vehicle counts for both locations for the weekend days for July and August 2021.

Answer**(3)**

- a) Traffic counts generally focus on working days which provide the most consistent data in terms of levels of use. Data at weekends is more variable, and involves more optional trips, thus is less reflective of the general level of use.
- b) Not applicable.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answer. In terms of the response to 3(a) where it relates to traffic counts generally focusing on working days which is probably the most consistent data, the answer states that weekends were variable and involves more optional trips, what does the Convener regard as optional trips, where is this less reflective of the general level of use but is nearly a third of the time 2 days out of 7, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Rust, I missed the first part of your question so my apologies for not answering it correctly but in terms of the difference in the nature of trips it's very important when you are establishing whether something is for leisure purposes or whether or not something is for commuting and it helps us to understand a little bit about where the infrastructure needs to go and understand the use of it, that's why I think those traffic counts have previously concentrated on week days, but weekends are much more variable in terms of who is out cycling and how many trips are taken, it's also impacted by weather etc, so there's a number of different reasons for it.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Depute Leader of the
Council at a meeting of the Council
on 25 November 2021**

The Depute Leader will be aware of considerable comment on this policy approved by the Transport and Environment Committee on 17 May 2018 regarding litter and litter bins in Victoria Park.

The policy review is annually, or as required.

Question (1) Can the Depute Leader confirm which Committee of Council will next review this policy, and when this review is due to take place?

Answer (1) The Litter Bin Siting Policy is reviewed annually as part of the annual review of Waste and Cleansing Policies. The most recent review was reported to Transport and Environment Committee on [11 November 2021](#).

Question (2) Would the Depute Leader agree that a review would be a helpful in response to the comment from the community around Victoria Park?

Answer (2) I agree that a brief review by officers of the number of bins and their location in Victoria Park, alongside the current frequencies, would be helpful with the outcome to be circulated to ward Councillors.

Question (3) Finally, would the Depute Leader accept that more frequent servicing of the litter bins where they are currently sited in Victoria Park, and other locations throughout the city, would reduce the unacceptable spectacle of litter overflowing from Council litter bins and contaminating the public realm?

Answer (3) Litter bin servicing is carried out by the Council's street cleansing team. At the end of October 2021 the service began to roll-out Routesmart, with the routes designed using a range of parameters including frequency of servicing. Officers will include data gathered from the Routesmart system alongside other available information in the review noted in answer 2.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Depute Leader for his answer. Would the Depute Leader like to agree I'm sure with all ward colleagues that the initiative taken by Trinity Academy, the staff and students to help litter-pick in Victoria Park is also a great example of a community working together?

**Comments by
the Lord
Provost**

I'm not sure that's a supplementary question along the lines of getting clarification Councillor Campbell so we'll move on.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Doggart for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 November 2021

Question

In November 2018, Council approved a motion that prevented the erection of large structures in Princes St Gardens East prior to Remembrance Sunday. Could the convener explain why the construction of the “big wheel” this year breached that motion?

Answer

At the meeting of Council on 22 November 2018 the following adjusted motion by Councillor Doggart was approved:

Council:

Asks Officers to investigate and report back to the Transport and Environment Committee how the work to construct the Princes Street Gardens Christmas Market and attractions could be programmed so that:

1) a dignified no-work cordon is maintained round the Garden of Remembrance, and

2) the erection of high structures are delayed till after Armistice Day and Remembrance Sunday from 2019 on?”.

The Big Wheel is an important part of Edinburgh’s Christmas and one that the producers are contractually obliged by the Council to supply. The wheel’s location is fixed due to piling and foundation works that were undertaken to support it in 2013.

The installation of the wheel takes several days. It is the first element that must be installed as all the rest of the

Christmas site must be constructed around it because of its size.

A delay in the installation of the big wheel would delay the opening of the Christmas markets by at least 3 weeks, to the second week in December. The dates of the Christmas market are detailed within the contract and to delay or shorten these would put the Council in breach of its contract.

Proposals for this year's activities were agreed at the All-Party Oversight Group on Festivals and Events on 25 March 2021. A further update, including construction dates, was circulated to Group spokespeople on the Culture and Communities Committee and City Centre ward Councillors on 19 October 2021.

While the wheel must be constructed before Remembrance Sunday, there is a strict works embargo in response to the approved motion. For 2021, this was as follows:

11 November – no Christmas works for an hour around 11:00. Remembrance sites are kept clear and unoccupied.

14 November – no Christmas works in the East gardens at all, all day

15 November – Royal British Legion Scotland start to remove Garden of Remembrance.

The Star Flyer is not installed until after Remembrance Sunday.

Two planning applications for the site at East Princes Street Gardens have been approved by Development Management Sub-Committee (20/03707/FUL – for 2020 to 2022; and 21/04953/FUL for 2021/22) Both of these approved applications detail that construction will commence 20 days prior to opening, including erection of the big wheel.

This issue will be reviewed when revised arrangements for Christmas in Edinburgh are put in place next year.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I'll try and stick to the rules and thank the Convener for his answer. Could the Convener clarify why a motion of Council has been ignored or overturned by (1) unelected officers who have signed contracts (2) an APOG that meets in secret and has no decision making powers and (3) on presentation by officers to Development Management Sub-Committee?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Councillor Doggart for the supplementary question. I can confirm that none of that has happened, I think it's in the answer there that the motion that was passed did not agree to do it, it agreed to investigate and report back, so the report back did go to the Transport and Environment Committee and then was referred on to Culture and Communities, so there has been lots of sight of this, there was two elements to it of course, there was the dignified no-work cordon which was established and was maintained, there was no work done on Remembrance Sunday and the other part of it was of course to delay the construction of the big wheel but of course the reasons for why that wasn't possible is there and was discussed at the time I have to say and is to do with the fixing of foundations which were established in 2013 and can't be moved, and we are contractually obliged to do that first and to use those foundations so, but the respectful cordon was established and was maintained at the key moments. I have to say also another part of that was that we would revisit it at the end of the contract and of course that contract is ending this year, so that is there and will be dealt with in terms of timings in any new contract that comes forward, so we have fulfilled every aspect of the motion.

QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 25 November 2021**

I thank the Convener on the understanding that Scotrail have been written to in terms of the earlier Decision of Council.

Question (1) Can the Convener share a copy of her letter?

Answer (1) Content shown below:

‘Tackling Poor Air quality and ensuring Edinburgh meets its net-zero carbon target

The City of Edinburgh Council has a strong desire to deliver significant improvements to air quality across the city, in partnership with Scottish Government and other valued key stakeholders such as Network Rail Scotland.

A key area of concern for Edinburgh is the impact that rail emissions have on the city’s air quality and the need to ensure that this sector is contributing effectively to meeting air quality requirements.

The City of Edinburgh Council remains dedicated to meeting our ambitious 2030 net-carbon emissions target and we are seeking an understanding or assurance that ScotRail’s future investment plans also reflect this aim.

We have a shared vision for the Waverley Valley and the future of Waverley station and we recognise its importance as a welcoming gateway into the city. However, we must also consider the environmental impact of the Inter7City fleet, at a time when we are working to implement a low emission zone to help achieve a cleaner green city for all. This will be key to reducing polluting vehicles into our historic city centre.

It is considered that the Inter7City Fleet account for a significant source of diesel emissions into the Waverley.

Service levels will no doubt have been impacted by the pandemic but I would assume that you are working towards a situation where passenger numbers return to previous levels. In light of this I wondered if you could provide more information on the projected engine emissions for the fleet running a full timetable in terms of CO2, NOX and particulate matter. It would also be useful for us to understand the emissions standards that these engines conform to presently and your intentions for the future.

Finally, as we consider our sustainability targets, there will be the requirement for a new public transport strategy and there is a need to consider the contribution of rail services within that plan as we look towards integrated ticketing, for example. We deeply value the relationship with your company and would be keen for early engagement on this subject as our plans develop.

If you feel an online meeting would be helpful my service and policy advisor would be happy to set this up. You can contact her at victoria.baillie@edinburgh.gov.uk ‘

- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Question | (2) Can the Convener share a copy of the response? |
| Answer | (2) I am happy to do so when it is received. |
| Question | (3) If the same EURO VI emissions standards that are proposed for commercial vehicles in the delayed Edinburgh Low Emissions Zone (LEZ) were applied to diesel power trains, what penalty income could the Council expect to receive from Scotrail? |
| Answer | (3) The LEZ proposals are designed on the basis that ‘Low emission zones set an environmental limit on certain road spaces , allowing access to only the cleanest vehicles and can help to transform towns and cities into cleaner, healthier places to live, work and visit.’, to quote the Scottish Government website (my bold)? While understanding the contribution to air quality levels that rail can make is useful, addressing those levels does not lie within the remit of our proposed Low Emission Zone. |
| Question | (4) Will the Convener use the delay in the LEZ scheme to request that all transport modes within the area comply to the same standards? |

Answer

- (4) Officers are working hard to address the terms of the committee amendment to the proposed LEZ and we expect to see a report back to committee in January. If accepted by Committee it is expected that there would be no significant variance in the anticipated enforcement date.

As stated above the LEZ terms of reference relate to road space only.

The very careful preparation of the LEZ proposals included all motor vehicles except motorcycles or mopeds. This reflects both Scottish Government advice and similar approaches in the other Scottish cities leading on LEZs and helps to reinforce consistency for road users in the four cities.

Decision of Council, October 2020

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jim Campbell:

- 1) To note the low numbers of passengers currently traveling by all modes of public transport, including intercity train. Recognise this had substantially increased the emissions and the costs of public transport, when expressed in terms of passenger kilometres.
- 2) Wish to understand the environmental impact of Scotrail's Inter7City fleet, which were anticipated to be a significant source of diesel emissions in the Waverley Valley and therefore request the Transport Convener to write to Scotrail to seek their direct commitment to Edinburgh's 2030 net-zero carbon target and get assurance that their investment plans will reflect this aim with:
 - a) Information on the emissions standards these engines conformed to; and
 - b) The projected engine emissions in the Waverley Valley of the Inter7City fleet of trains running a full timetable, in terms of CO₂, NO_x and Particulate matter.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Planning
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 25 November 2021**

Question (1) How many Council lease holders have been written to as part of CityPlan 2030 and the proposed changes in land use?

Answer (1) Statutory notifications were sent out as required to all properties on or within 20 metres of a plan proposal site, in a similar way as planning applications are notified.

Of these we have established through the Estates database that 46 are direct Council leaseholders. Taking into account sublets by ground leaseholders that figure rises to some 85 premises.

Question (2) Can a breakdown of these lease holders' activities be provided?

Answer (2) The lease holders and sublet activities are:

Car Park; light industrial workshops; fitness; storage; trade counter/retail; trades (electricians, joiners, plumbers); charity office/depot; dry cleaning; brewery; government office.

Question (3) In terms of the lease duration of these lease holders, what is the longest, the mean and mode value?

Answer (3) Lease duration:

- Longest – to 2120 (ground lease) 99 years
- Mean – 10.2 years
- Mode – 4 years

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. Just on a point of clarification I wonder if the Council has made any provision to offer businesses affected durable alternative leases?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I thank Councillor Johnson for his supplementary and it may be necessary, I don't necessarily have the detail here and now, I would say that in the City Plan itself there is policies ECON 5 which talks about re-provision to create mixed-use development which I draw the Councillor's attention to and also that there is a 10 year effective land supply, sorry a 9 year current effective land supply which will take us to the middle of the new plan period so the need for the land that the Councillor's asking about is not immediate but I will make enquiries about your particular question and see if we get a response for you, so thank you for the question Councillor Johnston.

QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 November 2021**

- Question**
- (1)** Please can the Convener list the number of old/obsolete items of IT equipment which have been returned to Digital Services in the last two years from
- a) the Corporate division, and
 - b) the learning & teaching division.

Answer

(1) Any IT equipment returned to the Council's Digital Services which can be re-used either in the Corporate or Learning and Teaching digital estate is recycled and reissued for use within the Council. This can include devices previously deemed to be either 'old' or potentially 'obsolete' prior to being upgraded.

Detailed information is not held on the specific number/types of equipment which are returned, however the overall asset register of devices in use on the Council's networks is monitored to ensure that this remains within our licensed use thresholds.

- Question**
- (2)** In each case will the convener please also specify:
- a) the number of items that have been rebuilt/reused within the council?
 - b) the number of items that it is not possible to rebuild/reuse within the council?

- Answer** (2) a) As stated in response to question 1, detailed information is not held on the number/types of equipment which are specifically re-used, however the overall asset register of devices in use on the Council's networks is monitored to ensure that this remains within our licensed use thresholds.
- b) A total of 2,592 laptops or desktops over the last 2 years have been unable to be recycled/reused within the Council.

Question (3) Of those that cannot be reused within the council, how many are donated to charity, and how many are recycled?

Answer (3) Where devices are unable to be reused or rebuilt, then these are fully wiped and sent onto ReUsingIT, to enable these to be recycled for the benefit of the community. Over the last 2 years, a total 2,592 desktops or laptops have been recycled and reissued through this route as part of our community benefits approach.

Question (4) What steps is the council taking to increase the proportion of old IT equipment which is reused or donated to charity?

Answer (4) The Council is currently planning to work with a local partner on the re-use of old iPads and iPhones to mirror our approach to laptop and desktop community benefit recycling.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer, I do have a single supplementary question. I am a bit concerned that in his answer he said that no record is held of the number of items of IT equipment returned, please could he clarify why this information isn't held given the requirements of the waste other electrical and electronic equipment directive and will he seek clarity from officers on this and circulate the response to Councillors?

Supplementary Answer Thank you Councillor Booth. I'm happy to seek clarity, my understanding is that when items are returned they go to the service and not into central place unless they are unusable so I'll seek clarity on that but I think you know what happens is the they go back to the service and are reused within the service so there's no record kept centrally, that's my understanding, but I'll get clarity and circulate it, thanks for your question.