

# Minutes

## The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 22 September 2022

Present:-

### LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Robert Aldridge

### COUNCILLORS

Scott Arthur  
Danny Aston  
Jule Bandel  
Alan C Beal  
Marco Biagi  
Chas Booth  
Graeme Bruce  
Steve Burgess  
Jack Caldwell  
Lezley Marion Cameron  
Kate Campbell  
Christopher Cowdy  
James Dalglish  
Euan R Davidson  
Cammy Day  
Sanne Dijkstra-Downie  
Denis C Dixon  
Stuart Dobbin  
Phil Duggart  
Katrina Faccenda  
Pauline Flannery  
Catherine Fullerton  
Neil Gardiner  
Fiona Glasgow  
Joan Griffiths  
Dan Heap  
Euan Hyslop  
Stephen P Jenkinson  
Tim Jones  
David Key

Simita Kumar  
Lesley Macinnes  
Martha Mattos Coelho  
Finlay McFarlane  
Ross McKenzie  
Amy McNeese-Mechan  
Adam McVey  
Jane E Meagher  
Claire Miller  
Max Mitchell  
Jo Mowat  
Alys Mumford  
Marie-Clair Munro  
Vicky Nicolson  
Hal Osler  
Ben Parker  
Tim Pogson  
Susan Rae  
Frank Ross  
Neil J Ross  
Jason Rust  
Alex Staniforth  
Edward J Thornley  
Val Walker  
Mandy H Watt  
Iain Whyte  
Norman J Work  
Louise Young  
Lewis J Younie

## **1 Order of Business – Suspension of Standing Order 24.1 - Voting**

---

The Lord Provost ruled that Standing Order 24.1 be suspended for this meeting and that voting be taken by a show of hands and with a clear public audit trail from vote to Member.

## **2 Bus Service Single Fares - Motion by Councillor Thornley**

---

### **a) Deputation – Edinburgh Bus Users Group**

The deputation indicated that their aim was to provide a voice for bus users and were committed to protecting and improving Edinburgh's bus network for the benefit of bus users and potential users. They indicated that Edinburgh's bus network was widely considered a model services by people in and outwith Edinburgh.

The deputation stressed that there were a number of challenges facing bus services in Edinburgh including the shortage of drivers and the withdrawal of the Scottish Government's Covid related support. They indicated that to improve the services, bus priority measures needed to be put in place together with good bus stops and that the partnership between Lothian Buses and the Council needed to be re-established.

The deputation was in support of the motion by Councillor Thornley and felt that there was scope to extend the reach of the bus network by allowing for an interchange service.

### **b) Motion by Councillor Thornley**

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

“Council;

- 1) notes the recent changes made by Lothian Buses to its route network in response to current passenger numbers and wider challenges in the bus services market.
- 2) recognises how these changes have resulted in many passengers losing direct services and mean they must now take two services to get to and from their destination, increasing costs and potentially discouraging the use of using public transport in Edinburgh.

- 3) notes the findings of the Poverty Commission which identified the costs of public transport being a barrier to people accessing work and education.
- 4) notes the ticketing schemes in place in some other UK cities, such as London's 'hopper fare', whereby passengers can use any service within one hour for the price of a single fare.
- 5) believes a similar scheme in Edinburgh is worthy of consideration and would ensure those passengers who need to get two buses rather than one are not unfairly penalised.
- 6) therefore agrees that the Transport and Environment Convener should write to Lothian Buses to ask it to consider a similar 'one hour' scheme and for the response to be provided to all councillors."

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Thornley

- moved by Councillor Thornley, seconded by Councillor Younie

### **Amendment**

- 1) To add at point 1 of the motion by Councillor Thornley, after 'Lothian Buses', insert 'and McGill's.'
- 2) To add at point 6 of the motion, after 'Lothian Buses', insert 'and McGill's.'

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Work

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Thornley:

- 1) To note the recent changes made by Lothian Buses and McGill's to its route network in response to current passenger numbers and wider challenges in the bus services market.
- 2) To recognise how these changes had resulted in many passengers losing direct services and meant they must now take two services to get to and from their destination, increasing costs and potentially discouraging the use of using public transport in Edinburgh.
- 3) To note the findings of the Poverty Commission which identified the costs of public transport being a barrier to people accessing work and education.

- 4) To note the ticketing schemes in place in some other UK cities, such as London's 'hopper fare', whereby passengers could use any service within one hour for the price of a single fare.
- 5) To believe a similar scheme in Edinburgh was worthy of consideration and would ensure those passengers who needed to get two buses rather than one were not unfairly penalised.
- 6) To therefore agree that the Transport and Environment Convener should write to Lothian Buses and McGill's to ask it to consider a similar 'one hour' scheme and for the response to be provided to all councillors.

### **3 Support for Roseburn Businesses - Motion by Councillor Davidson**

---

#### **a) Deputation – Roseburn Traders**

The deputation indicated that they were under a great deal of pressure due to the on-going works with no passing trade and businesses having to close. They felt that the work was ill-timed and non-essential only putting unnecessary strain on the businesses in the area.

The deputation stressed that they needed support during the process and indicated that during July and August when work had stopped, business had picked up but since new barriers had been put in place in September custom had dropped dramatically. The deputation questioned how much longer the work would take to install the cyclepath and why the area had not been properly surveyed before the work commenced.

The deputation urged the Council to re-consider a compensation package for those businesses who had been seriously affected by the ongoing works.

#### **b) Motion by Councillor Davidson**

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that the Council Leader recently met with the owners and operators of businesses on Roseburn Terrace and heard about the negative impact that the ongoing CCWEL works had on their operations;
- 2) Further notes that many businesses have seen a sharp decrease in their takings throughout the programme of works and recognises the legitimate concerns that the resumption of construction activity will damage takings even further in the run up to the vital festive period;

- 3) Believes that these businesses represent the heart of the Roseburn community, and that the council should do everything within its powers to make sure they are able to survive the disruption caused by these works;
- 4) Recognises that infrastructure projects that take a significant period of time to complete often have a more acute impact on business than roadworks generally;
- 5) Understands that measures undertaken to help these businesses so far have proven to be insufficient and that more needs to be done to support them;
- 6) As such agrees to look into the possibility of setting up a compensation scheme for those businesses who have been adversely affected by the works to ensure they continue to operate over the coming months that the roadworks are in place.”

- moved by Councillor Davidson, seconded by Councillor Beal

### **Amendment 1**

To add to the motion by Councillor Davidson:

- “7) Agrees that the source of funding for any such scheme is made clear and that no other projects should lose funding as a result. If funding is being reallocated from existing budgets, affected workstreams and projects should be explicitly identified.
- 8) Agrees that the report will establish the principles by which all potential future schemes to compensate businesses for disruption from infrastructure projects could operate.”

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Frank Ross

### **Amendment 2**

To accept points 1-4 of the motion by Councillor Davidson

To replace points 5-6 of the motion as follows

- “5) Notes the information provided by the council to elected members and businesses on support for businesses during roadworks
- 6) Notes the documented benefits to businesses of improved walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure through increased footfall and spend

- 7) Calls for businesses along the route to continue their engagement with the project team to ensure all issues are picked up and the council supports businesses throughout project delivery.”

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Bandel

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Davidson:

- 1) To note that the Council Leader recently met with the owners and operators of businesses on Roseburn Terrace and heard about the negative impact that the ongoing CCWEL works had on their operations.
- 2) To further note that many businesses had seen a sharp decrease in their takings throughout the programme of works and recognise the legitimate concerns that the resumption of construction activity would damage takings even further in the run up to the vital festive period.
- 3) To believe that these businesses represented the heart of the Roseburn community, and that the council should do everything within its powers to make sure they were able to survive the disruption caused by these works.
- 4) To recognise that infrastructure projects that took a significant period of time to complete often had a more acute impact on business than roadworks generally.
- 5) To understand that measures undertaken to help these businesses so far had proven to be insufficient and that more needed to be done to support them.
- 6) As such to agree to look into the possibility of setting up a compensation scheme for those businesses who had been adversely affected by the works to ensure they continued to operate over the coming months that the roadworks were in place.
- 7) To agree that the source of funding for any such scheme be made clear and that no other projects should lose funding as a result. If funding was being reallocated from existing budgets, affected workstreams and projects should be explicitly identified.
- 8) To agree that the report would establish the principles by which all potential future schemes to compensate businesses for disruption from infrastructure projects could operate.
- 9) To note the information provided by the council to elected members and businesses on support for businesses during roadworks.

- 10) To note the documented benefits to businesses of improved walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure through increased footfall and spend.
- 11) To call for businesses along the route to continue their engagement with the project team to ensure all issues were picked up and the council supported businesses throughout project delivery.

## **4 Rent Freeze –Motion by Councillor Meagher**

---

### **a) Deputation – Living Rent**

The deputation felt that with the cost of living crisis, fuel poverty and the increased use of foodbanks there could be no justification for increasing rents. They indicated that people were already struggling and advice given to them by Changeworks was not helpful. They felt that the introduction of “Warm Banks” in community centres where people could go to keep warm was both demeaning and demoralising.

The deputation indicated that the third sector were struggling to get funding and therefore were unable to pass on help to those that needed it. They stressed that Edinburgh’s social rents were already the highest in Scotland and that a further increase seemed unfair especially since they felt that the housing stock was in a poor state and that the Council needed to justify why it could increase rents when not meeting its own contractual obligations to provide a safe and warm home for its tenants.

The deputation also outlined the lack of good quality rented accommodation within the private rented sector where there had also been large rent increases. The deputation stressed that the rent freeze was welcome it could not be allowed to end without permanent protections being in place as it would lead to an avalanche of rent increases in 2023.

The deputation urged the Council to explore all avenues and powers necessary to prevent Edinburgh residents plunging into poverty and becoming a city that was unlivable for all except the wealthiest. They also asked the Council to Consider expanding the rent freeze across 2024 and providing an allowance being made available for tenants moving across to privately rented accommodation. They indicated that they were willing to work with the Council to find solutions.

**b) Motion by Councillor Meagher**

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the Scottish Government’s intention to introduce emergency legislation which freezes rents for private and social rented homes until at least the end of March 2023.
- 2) Notes that planned consultation on rent policy with council tenants is imminent, with any agreed rent increase due to come into place on April 1st, 2023.
- 3) Notes that council rents in Edinburgh remain the highest in Scotland.
- 4) Agrees that given the above, and in the context of the cost-of-living crisis, that planned consultation with council tenants on a potential rent increase should be reconsidered.
- 5) Requests a report to the next Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on the implications of a rent freeze for council tenants in 2023/24.
- 6) Requests a report to the next Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on the implications of a rent freeze for Edinburgh Living tenants in 2023/24.
- 7) Agrees that the Council Leader will write to the Scottish Government requesting that the rent freeze across private and social rented homes is maintained until rent controls are in place.
- 8) Agrees that the Council Leader will write to the Scottish and UK Governments, detailing the scale of Edinburgh’s housing crisis, and requesting both emergency and long-term funding to allow the council to purchase and build more homes for social rent.”

**Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Meagher.

- moved by Councillor Meagher, seconded by Councillor Watt

**Amendment**

Adds after point 6 of the motion by Councillor Meagher:

- “7) Notes that detailed information on the financial status of the HRA has not been shared outwith the administration.

- 8) Agrees that that the reports outlined in points 5 and 6 include detailed information setting out the administration's financial strategy that will ensure:
- The council housebuilding programme continues as agreed in February 2022, with no reduction in the £1.2bn committed to new homes development and costs up until 2027.
  - That the EESSH 2 targets are met, retrofitting existing council homes to high energy efficiency standards and there is no delay in delivery of this programme in full by 2032.
  - That there will continue to be capacity to invest in the repairs service, improving service standards and the quality of repairs.

Renumbers points 7 and 8 of the motion accordingly.

- moved by Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Kumar

### **Amendment 2**

Replace 4) in the motion by Councillor Meagher with:

“Agrees that given the above, and in the context of the Cost of Living Crisis and the Climate Crisis, that the planned consultation with council tenants should be refocused on tenant's main financial challenges in relation to that crisis, which includes rent, energy, effective insulation and food, and that Living Rent members be included in the engagement exercise, the results of which can inform the Edinburgh Partnership and Poverty Commission.”

Replace 5) in the motion with:

“Requests a report to next Housing Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on the implications of a rent freeze for council tenants in 2023/24, and the subsequent impact of this freeze on the HRA across 2023/24, 2024/25, 2025/26.”

- moved by Councillor Rae, seconded by Councillor Parker

### **Amendment 3**

To delete:

Paragraph 7 of the motion by Councillor Meagher; and

The reference to the UK Government in Paragraph 8 as Housing is a wholly devolved matter.

- moved by Councillor Bruce, seconded by Councillor Mowat

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 was accepted as an addendum to the motion and Amendment 2 was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	40 votes
For Amendment 3	-	7 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Burgess, Caldwell, Cameron, Campbell, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Griffiths, Heap, Jenkinson, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, McVey, Meagher, Mumford, Nicolson, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Frank Ross, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie

For the amendment (as adjusted): Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro and Rust.)

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Meagher:

- 1) To note the Scottish Government's intention to introduce emergency legislation which froze rents for private and social rented homes until at least the end of March 2023.
- 2) To note that planned consultation on rent policy with council tenants was imminent, with any agreed rent increase due to come into place on April 1st, 2023.
- 3) To note that council rents in Edinburgh remained the highest in Scotland.
- 4) To agree that given the above, and in the context of the Cost of Living Crisis and the Climate Crisis, that the planned consultation with council tenants should be refocused on tenant's main financial challenges in relation to that crisis, which included rent, energy, effective insulation and food, and that Living Rent members be included in the planned engagement the results of which could inform the Edinburgh Partnership and Poverty Commission.
- 5) To request a report to next Housing Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on the implications of a rent freeze for council tenants in 2023/24, and the subsequent impact of this freeze on the HRA across 2023/24, 2024/25, 2025/26.
- 6) To request a report to the next Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on the implications of a rent freeze for Edinburgh Living tenants in 2023/24.
- 7) To note that detailed information on the financial status of the HRA had not been shared outwith the administration.

- 8) To agree that that the reports outlined in points 5 and 6 include detailed information setting out the administration's financial strategy that would ensure:
- The council housebuilding programme continued as agreed in February 2022, with no reduction in the £1.2bn committed to new homes development and costs up until 2027.
  - That the EESSH 2 targets were met, retrofitting existing council homes to high energy efficiency standards and there was no delay in delivery of this programme in full by 2032.
  - That there would continue to be capacity to invest in the repairs service, improving service standards and the quality of repairs.
- 9) To agree that the Council Leader would write to the Scottish Government requesting that the rent freeze across private and social rented homes was maintained until rent controls were in place.
- 10) To agree that the Council Leader would write to the Scottish and UK Governments, detailing the scale of Edinburgh's housing crisis, and requesting both emergency and long-term funding to allow the council to purchase and build more homes for social rent.

### **Declaration of Interests**

Councillors Beal, Booth, Dixon, Jones, Key, Miller and Whyte declared a financial interest as landlords of rented accommodation and left the meeting during the Council's consideration of the above item.

Councillors Bandel, Biagi, Dalglish, Hyslop, McKenzie and Thornley declared a financial interest as tenants in rented accommodation and left the meeting during the Council's consideration of the above item.

Councillor Rae made a transparency statement as a member of Living Rent.

Councillor Thornley made a transparency statement as a tenant of Edinburgh Living.

## **5 Minutes**

---

### **Decision**

To approve the minute of the Council of 25 August 2022 as a correct record.

## **6 Leader's Report**

---

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

- Thanks to all involved in Operation Unicorn
- Ukrainian refugees - update

- Scottish Government Plans for Tourist Levy – thanks to Councillor McVey and former Councillor Burns for work involved

The following questions/comments were made:

- |                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Councillor McVey      | - Ukrainian refugees   |
|                       | - Thanks to volunteers, staff and citizens during the past 2 weeks                                 |
|                       | - Plans for tourist tax – implementation of the policy as approved                                 |
| Councillor Young      | - Thanks to volunteers during past 2 weeks   |
|                       | - Work to continue to ensure the city remains clean  |
| Councillor Staniforth | - Protection of freedom of protest in Edinburgh  |
| Councillor Whyte      | - Liverpool City group buying scheme for solar panels – possible implementation in Edinburgh       |
| Councillor Faccenda   | - Costs of Operation Unicorn and effects across the City   |
| Councillor Work       | - Macrae’s Battalion Contalmaison – Council representation   |
| Councillor Younie     | - Ukrainian Refugees – additional funding  |
| Councillor Mumford    | - Old Tynecastle High School – Student accommodation – city plan delay                             |
| Councillor Doggart    | - Redress scheme – compensation for those who suffered abuse in the workplace                      |
| Councillor Arthur     | - Poverty Commission Report - Scottish Government inaction on tackling long term causes of poverty |
| Councillor Campbell   | - Macrae’s Battalion commemoration – funding   |
| Councillor Osler      | - Drylaw Neighbourhood Centre - award of funds   |
| Councillor Parker     | - Operation Unicorn - Council officers working 18 hours per day                                    |
| Councillor Miller     | - World car free day – events on 6 October 2022  |
| Councillor Bruce      | - Blocked gully clearing   |

## 7 Appointment to Committees, Boards and Outside Organisations etc

---

The Council had made appointments to a range of Committees and Outside Organisations. Details were provided on outstanding appointments and associated matters.

The Council was invited to confirm its outstanding appointments to Committees and Outside Organisations.

### Decision

- 1) To appoint Councillor Doggart to the Board of CEC Holdings.
- 2) To note that the Green Group had appointed Councillors Alys Mumford and Ben Parker as Co-Conveners, and agree that Councillor Mumford should receive the Group Leader's Senior Councillor Allowance from 22 September 2022 to 5 February 2023 and Councillor Ben Parker from 6 February to 22 June 2023.

(Reference – Act of Council No 8 of 19 May 2022 (resumed on 26 May 2022), Act of Council No 7 of 30 June 2022; report by the Interim Executive Director of Corporate Services, submitted.)

## 8 Provision of Sanitary Bins in Council Buildings - Response to Motion by Councillor Staniforth

---

In response to a motion by Councillor Staniforth, details were provided on how the Council could meet the commitment made in June 2022 to install sanitary bins in every toilet cubicle on all Council premises

### Motion

- 1) To note the information provided on the commitment to install sanitary bins in every toilet cubicle in all Council premises.
- 2) To note that the provision of additional sanitary bins would require an annual revenue budget of between £25,000 and £30,000 which was not currently available and would need to be considered as part of the 2023/24 budget setting process.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

### Amendment

- 1) To note the information provided on the commitment to install sanitary bins in every toilet cubicle in all Council premises.

- 2) To note that the provision of additional sanitary bins would require an annual revenue budget of between £25,000 and £30,000 which was not currently available and would need to be considered as part of the 2023/24 budget setting process.
- 3) To agree to proceed with the placement and servicing of sanitary bins in men's toilets across its estate, subject to funding being identified as part of the 2023/24 budget considerations.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Davidson

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To note the information provided on the commitment to install sanitary bins in every toilet cubicle in all Council premises.
- 2) To note that the provision of additional sanitary bins would require an annual revenue budget of between £25,000 and £30,000 which was not currently available and would need to be considered as part of the 2023/24 budget setting process.
- 3) To agree to proceed with the placement and servicing of sanitary bins in men's toilets across its estate, subject to funding being identified as part of the 2023/24 budget considerations.

(References – Act of Council No 18 of 30 June 2022; report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted.)

## **9 Young People's Assembly**

---

In response to a motion by Councillor Macinnes, details were provided on the mechanisms in place and being planned which could be developed to promote the participation of young people in the city and their ability to influence decisions that affected them.

### **Motion**

- 1) To note the range of youth participation work.
- 2) To instruct officers to continue with planned developments, incorporating feedback from third sector providers, elected members and young people.

- moved by Councillor Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Walker

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) Note and commends the range of youth participation work already being undertaken, described in the report.
- 2) To instruct officers to continue with planned developments, incorporating feedback from third sector providers, elected members and young people.
- 3) Instructs officers to bring forward a report within two cycles which meets the intention of the original motion, which was to create an effective forum for wide range of young voices to be heard on a wide range of Council/city topics, where policy proposals could be tested through the lens of young people's wants and needs, where young people could bring ideas and proposals and where their opinions about the direction of the city could be heard by officers and decision-makers and absorbed into policy development.

*“Requests a report within 2 cycles on how we can quickly set an effective Young Person’s Assembly in motion; what its objectives and parameters could be; how the Assembly should be structured to ensure equality in representation from all communities and a clear commitment to establishing a long term focus on young people’s needs and requests through this forum.” Motion, June 2022.”*

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Frank Ross

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the range of youth participation work.
- 2) To instruct officers to continue with planned developments, incorporating feedback from third sector providers, elected members and young people.
- 3) To instruct officers to develop a proposal on how to provide a single forum and engagement process for Committees and Boards, to involve young people in the development of policy making on key issues, either through an existing group as detailed in the report, or through any new mechanism that is established.

- moved by Councillor Young, seconded by Councillor Davidson

### **Amendment 3**

- 1) To note the range of youth participation work.
- 2) Notes that early involvement of participants in the design of participatory forums improves buy-in and trust in the process.
- 3) Requests officers to involve potential participants of the Young People’s Liaison Group in the design of the group, including but not limited to its membership,

purpose, and scope, and provide a written update on the group's development within two cycles.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Parker

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion and Amendment 3 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Griffiths:

- 1) To note and commend the range of youth participation work already being undertaken, described in the report by the Executive Director of Education and Children's Services.
- 2) To instruct officers to continue with planned developments, incorporating feedback from third sector providers, elected members and young people.
- 3) To instruct officers to bring forward a report within two cycles which met the intention of the original motion, which was to create an effective forum for wide range of young voices to be heard on a wide range of Council/city topics, where policy proposals could be tested through the lens of young people's wants and needs, where young people could bring ideas and proposals and where their opinions about the direction of the city could be heard by officers and decision-makers and absorbed into policy development.

*"Requests a report within 2 cycles on how we can quickly set an effective Young Person's Assembly in motion; what its objectives and parameters could be; how the Assembly should be structured to ensure equality in representation from all communities and a clear commitment to establishing a long term focus on young people's needs and requests through this forum." Motion, June 2022."*

- 4) To instruct officers to develop a proposal on how to provide a single forum and engagement process for Committees and Boards, to involve young people in the development of policy making on key issues, either through an existing group as detailed in the report, or through any new mechanism that was established.
- 5) To note that early involvement of participants in the design of participatory forums improves buy-in and trust in the process.

- 6) To request officers to involve potential participants of the Young People's Liaison Group and Young People's Assembly in the design of the group, including but not limited to its membership, purpose, and scope, and provide a written update on the group's development within two cycles.

(References – Act of Council No 26 of 30 June 2022; report by the Executive Director of Education and Children's Services, submitted.)

## **10 Annual Performance Report, 2021/22 – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee**

---

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report on the Annual Performance Report, 2021/22 to the City of Edinburgh Council for consideration.

### **Decision**

To note the report by the Policy and Sustainability Committee.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee, 30 August 2022 (item 10); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

## **11 Treasury Management: Annual Report 2021/22 – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

---

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred the Treasury Management: Annual Report 2021/22 to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval.

### **Decision**

To approve the report by the Finance and Resources Committee.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee, 8 September 2022 (item 6); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

## **12 Edinburgh Living LLPs: Acquisition of Homes 2022/2023 – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

---

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the Edinburgh Living LLPs: Acquisition of Homes 2022/2023 Unit to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of the recommendations at paragraph 1.1.4 of the original report by the Executive Director of Place (appendix 1 of the referral report).

### **Decision**

- 1) To agree to make available up to £4.9m from the Council Tax Discount Fund (CTDF) to support the purchase of homes at Fruitmarket at Market Value.

- 2) To agree to lend to the mid-market rent LLP to enable the purchase of all 94 homes.
- 3) To agree to provide corresponding capital advances from the Loans Fund based on a repayment profile using the funding/ income method, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee, 8 September 2022 (item 18); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

### **13 Millerhill Energy from Waste Plant Heat Offtake Unit – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

---

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the Millerhill Energy from Waste Plant Heat Offtake Unit to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of prudential borrowing totalling £5,200,00 to pay for addition of plant/equipment at the Millerhill Energy from Waste facility that would enable the facility to provide heat to the Midlothian Energy Heat Network.

#### **Motion**

To approve to prudential borrowing totalling £5,200,00 to pay for addition of plant/equipment at the Millerhill Energy from Waste facility that would enable the facility to provide heat to the Midlothian Energy Heat Network.

- moved by Councillor Watt, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

#### **Amendment**

- 1) To approve to prudential borrowing totalling £5,200,00 to pay for addition of plant/equipment at the Millerhill Energy from Waste facility that would enable the facility to provide heat to the Midlothian Energy Heat Network.
- 2) Notes that the council's waste reduction target, set in 2010, is for 5% of waste to be sent to landfill.
- 3) Notes that those reduction targets and the associated paper do not refer to or classify waste sent to Millerhill or incinerators more generally.
- 4) Agrees that for the purposes of waste reduction targets waste sent for incineration will be counted as landfill.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Mumford

#### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	51 votes
For the amendment	-	9 votes

(For the motion: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Cameron, Campbell, Dalglish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, McVey, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Frank Ross, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie.

For the amendment: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Watt.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee, 8 September 2022 (item 20); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

## **14 Proposed Changes to Charging Mechanism for Road Construction Consent Inspections – referral from the Transport and Environment Committee**

---

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report on the Proposed Changes to Charging Mechanism for Road Construction Consent Inspections to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of the amendment to current fees and charges.

### **Decision**

To approve the amendment to current fees and charges as detailed in the report by the Executive Director of Place.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee, 18 August 2022 (adjourned to 1 September 2022) (item 10); referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

## **15 Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Advertising of Phase 1 Traffic Order – referral from the Transport and Environment Committee**

---

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report on the Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 1 Traffic Order to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval to the amendment to the advertised charges.

## Decision

To approve the amendment to the advertised charges as detailed in the report on the Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 1 Traffic Order.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee, 18 August 2022 (adjourned to 1 September 2022) (item 12); referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

## 16 Safer Parks - Motions by Councillor Hyslop

---

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

“Council:

Believes that our parks should be safe public spaces for all to enjoy, and that the presence of cars and large vehicles is not consistent with that.

Notes that Council waste teams often have cause to drive through parks with larger vehicles.

Notes that many of Edinburgh’s Parks have vehicle access points that are not locked by the Council.

Believes that the safety of park users should be of utmost importance.

Notes instances across the city where park users and Friends of Parks groups have reported private cars driving along paths and green space through parks.

Requests that the Council produce a report which outlines current vehicular access into all of the City’s parks and examines how best to prevent vehicular access to each of these spaces. This report should also include detail on the cost and feasibility of implementing the following:

- 1) all park gates being padlocked where possible:
- 2) collapsible bollards installed where necessary, accessible only by Council vehicles and agreed third parties; and
- 3) the use of Council vehicles over 1.3 tonnes within parks being prohibited and replaced by a fleet of light-weight electric vehicles for use within parks across the city.

Furthermore, requests that the council produces a report outlining existing powers and a strategy for enforcement which can used to prevent and penalise unauthorised parking in public parks.”

## **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Hyslop

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

## **Amendment 1**

- 1) After 'best' at paragraph 6 in the motion by Councillor Hyslop add 'where appropriate'
- 2) Replace bullet point 3 in the motion with 'the limited use of council vehicles over 1.3 tonnes where essential for the maintenance of our parks, such as tractors for grass cutting, tree team vehicles and street lighting access platforms'.
- 3) After 'powers' at the last paragraph in the motion, add 'and any available enforcement powers that could be used to act against the drivers or owners of vehicles that access our parks and green spaces'.
- 4) Adds to the motion 'this report should come to the Culture and Communities Committee within two cycles (December 2022)'.

- moved by Councillor Walker, seconded by Councillor Cameron

## **Amendment 2**

Removes final point of the motion by Councillor Hyslop at "Furthermore, requests..." and inserts:

"Council notes that there are specific parks and areas within them where instance of unauthorised parking is especially high, and the corresponding dangers to safety and accessibility.

Council requests a further report including but not limited to, the following;

- What powers are available to the Council to enforce parking restrictions within parks.
- What powers the Council currently uses to enforce parking restrictions within parks
- What, if any, additional powers would the Council need to improve enforcement of parking restrictions within parks
- A strategy for the enforcement of existing parking restrictions, including tackling specific parks where the instance of unauthorised parking is particularly high
- Outlining any options to alter existing restrictions in these high-pressure areas in order to better prevent unauthorised parking

- Plans to engage with ‘Friends of...’ groups and/or relevant community groups in these high-pressure areas to develop the above options

Both reports to be brought to Culture and Communities Committee within two cycles.”

- moved by Councillor Thornley, seconded by Councillor Osler

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 2 was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	28 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	32 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, McVey, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Parker, Rae, Frank Ross, Staniforth and Work

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors. Arthur, Beal, Bruce, Caldwell, Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, McKenzie, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Neil Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.)

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor Walker:

- 1) To believe that our parks should be safe public spaces for all to enjoy, and that the presence of cars and large vehicles was not consistent with that.
- 2) To note that Council waste teams often had cause to drive through parks with larger vehicles.
- 3) To note that many of Edinburgh’s Parks had vehicle access points that were not locked by the Council.
- 4) To believe that the safety of park users should be of utmost importance.
- 5) To note instances across the city where park users and Friends of Parks groups had reported private cars driving along paths and green space through parks.

- 6) To request that the Council produce a report which outlined current vehicular access into all of the City's parks and examines how best where appropriate to prevent vehicular access to each of these spaces. This report should also include detail on the cost and feasibility of implementing the following:
  - a) all park gates being padlocked where possible:
  - b) collapsible bollards installed where necessary, accessible only by Council vehicles and agreed third parties; and
  - c) the limited use of council vehicles over 1.3 tonnes where essential for the maintenance of our parks, such as tractors for grass cutting, tree team vehicles and street lighting access platforms'.
- 7) Furthermore, to request that the council produce a report outlining existing powers and any available enforcement powers that could be used to act against the drivers or owners of vehicles that access our parks and green spaces' and a strategy for enforcement which can used to prevent and penalise unauthorised parking in public parks, this report should come to the Culture and Communities Committee within two cycles (December 2022)
- 8) To note that there were specific parks and areas within them where instance of unauthorised parking was especially high, and the corresponding dangers to safety and accessibility.
- 9) To request a further report including but not limited to, the following;
  - What powers were available to the Council to enforce parking restrictions within parks.
  - What powers the Council currently used to enforce parking restrictions within parks
  - What, if any, additional powers would the Council need to improve enforcement of parking restrictions within parks
  - A strategy for the enforcement of existing parking restrictions, including tackling specific parks where the instance of unauthorised parking was particularly high
  - Outlining any options to alter existing restrictions in these high-pressure areas in order to better prevent unauthorised parking
  - Plans to engage with 'Friends of...' groups and/or relevant community groups in these high-pressure areas to develop the above options.

Both reports to be brought to Culture and Communities Committee within two cycles.

## 17 Electric Vehicle Charging Points - Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

---

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

- “1) Notes that the way people, goods and services are moved around the city accounted for 31% of the city’s total emissions in 2020, according to the 2030 Climate Strategy.
- 2) notes the recognition within the City Mobility Plan on the importance of publicly available electric vehicle charging points towards meeting the Council’s transport goals and the commitment within the plan to create a comprehensive network of electric charging hubs.
- 3) agrees that publicly available electric vehicle charging points have an important role in reducing air pollution and facilitating the transition to net zero by encouraging residents and businesses to replace fossil fuel vehicles with electric vehicles, as noted in the 2030 Climate Strategy.
- 4) Notes and reaffirms the council’s existing policy to place EV charging units on the road and not the pavement.
- 5) notes that while the Council’s website hosts a link to the Charge Place Scotland map of publicly available electric vehicle charging points, it does not provide a clear process for people to suggest or request new electric vehicle charging point locations.
- 6) agrees that officers should follow the example of the Cyclehoop scheme, where residents are able to suggest new locations, and
  - a) create a facility to allow residents and businesses to suggest new sites for public electric vehicle charging points;
  - b) use the suggestions received to determine the locations of future charging points; and
  - c) report to the Transport & Environment Committee within two cycles.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Neil Ross.

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross, seconded by Councillor Osler

### **Amendment 1**

Replace Point 6 in the motion by Councillor Neil Ross with:

“Agrees that officers should consider following the example of the Cycle hoop scheme, where residents are able to suggest new locations, and report to the Transport & Environment Committee within two cycles (December 2022) on the feasibility of:

- a) creating a facility to allow residents and businesses to suggest new sites for public electric vehicle charging points; and,
- b) using the suggestions received as part of the information used to determine the locations of future charging points”.

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Cameron

### **Amendment 2**

To add to the motion by Councillor Neil Ross:

- “7) Understands the unique challenges and opportunities of Electric Vehicle Charging Point rollout in the UNESCO World Heritage site, and
- Notes that we may be able to learn from the City of Bath and other UNESCO cities who have already undertaken an EV scheme as detailed in the Bath Electric Charging Point Strategy.
  - Requests officers engage with heritage bodies and investigate sensitive solutions ahead of any future Electric Vehicle Charging Point rollouts in the Old or New Town.
  - Understands that this learning could also inform sensitive design solutions for other conservation areas in the City.
  - Requests a report to be produced detailing potential options for future implementations to be presented to the Transport and Environment Committee in three cycles.”

- moved by Councillor McFarlane, seconded by Councillor Nicolson

### **Amendment 3**

- 1) To add a new paragraph 4 to the motion by Councillor Neil Ross and renumber existing paragraphs accordingly:

“4) Notes that electric vehicles continue to contribute to congestion and recognises the need to reduce private car use and shift to alternative modes of travel more effective at reducing transport emissions such as walking, wheeling, and cycling.”

- 2) To add new paragraphs 6 and 7 to the motion and renumber existing paragraphs accordingly:
  - “6) Notes that placement by EV users of charging cables across pavements is not acceptable since it creates a trip hazard and is not permitted under the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, Part V Roads and Building Control and VII Interference and Damage without the permission of the roads authority.
  - 7) Notes the trial of various on-street charging technologies undertaken by Oxford City Council, Nottingham City Council and others, which trialled the installation of pavement cable channels to allow residents to charge an electrical vehicle using their household's electricity supply without creating a trip hazard.”
- 3) To add a new sub-paragraph 8 c) to the motion and renumber existing sub-paragraphs accordingly:
  - “8 c) ensure a robust enforcement regime to prevent the ad-hoc placement of charging wires across pavements to create a trip hazard, and investigate, in consultation with organisations representing pedestrians and disabled people, the feasibility of introducing a chargeable scheme to install pavement channels for charging cables;”

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Booth

#### **Amendment 4**

- 1) To add after point 4) of the motion by Councillor Neil Ross and re-number accordingly:

“Notes that there is a demand for electric vehicle charging points amongst city centre residents with access to shared gardens for communal use;
- 2) To add after letter b) in the motion and re-letter accordingly:

“Provide information on how residents could install communal electric charging or publicly accessible electric charging points on the edges of shared gardens, to include any funding streams and necessary regulatory permissions required;”

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 was accepted as an amendment to the motion and Amendments, 2, 3 and 4 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

## Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Neil Ross

- 1) To note that the way people, goods and services were moved around the city accounted for 31% of the city's total emissions in 2020, according to the 2030 Climate Strategy.
- 2) To note the recognition within the City Mobility Plan on the importance of publicly available electric vehicle charging points towards meeting the Council's transport goals and the commitment within the plan to create a comprehensive network of electric charging hubs.
- 3) To agree that publicly available electric vehicle charging points had an important role in reducing air pollution and facilitating the transition to net zero by encouraging residents and businesses to replace fossil fuel vehicles with electric vehicles, as noted in the 2030 Climate Strategy.
- 4) To note and reaffirm the council's existing policy to place EV charging units on the road and not the pavement.
- 5) To note that there was a demand for electric vehicle charging points amongst city centre residents with access to shared gardens for communal use.
- 6) To note that electric vehicles continued to contribute to congestion and recognise the need to reduce private car use and shift to alternative modes of travel more effective at reducing transport emissions such as walking, wheeling, and cycling.
- 7) To note that placement by EV users of charging cables across pavements was not acceptable since it created a trip hazard and was not permitted under the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, Part V Roads and Building Control and VII Interference and Damage without the permission of the roads authority.
- 8) To note the trial of various on-street charging technologies undertaken by Oxford City Council, Nottingham City Council and others, which trialled the installation of pavement cable channels to allow residents to charge an electrical vehicle using their household's electricity supply without creating a trip hazard.
- 9) To note that while the Council's website hosted a link to the Charge Place Scotland map of publicly available electric vehicle charging points, it did not provide a clear process for people to suggest or request new electric vehicle charging point locations.

- 10) To agree that officers should consider following the example of the Cycle hoop scheme, where residents were able to suggest new locations, and report to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles (December 2022) on the feasibility of:
  - a) creating a facility to allow residents and businesses to suggest new sites for public electric vehicle charging points;
  - b) using the suggestions received as part of the information used to determine the locations of future charging points; and
  - c) provide information on how residents could install communal electric charging or publicly accessible electric charging points on the edges of shared gardens, to include any funding streams and necessary regulatory permissions required.
  
- 11) To understand the unique challenges and opportunities of Electric Vehicle Charging Point rollout in the UNESCO World Heritage site, and
  - To note that we may be able to learn from the City of Bath and other UNESCO cities who had already undertaken an EV scheme as detailed in the Bath Electric Charging Point Strategy.
  - To request officers engage with heritage bodies and investigate sensitive solutions ahead of any future Electric Vehicle Charging Point rollouts in the Old or New Town.
  - To understand that this learning could also inform sensitive design solutions for other conservation areas in the City.

To request a report to be produced detailing potential options for future implementations to be presented to the Transport and Environment Committee in three cycles.

## **18 Playparks Investment - Motion by Councillor Thornley Campbell**

---

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

“Council:

- 1) Agrees that playparks are a vital community resource providing opportunities for exercise and socialisation, and that it is important that playparks are fit for purpose and accessible to all.
- 2) Notes that Council currently has responsibility for 165 playparks across the city, and that as of the Council’s meeting of 27th May 2021, only approximately 100 of them had surfaces suitable for wheelchair access.

- 3) Notes the commitment of funding from the Scottish Government to upgrade playparks, and that in the 2022/23 this will amount to £406,000, plus any unspent funds from the 2021/22 year.
- 4) Notes that Council does not currently receive a regular update on the state of playparks across the city, what investment is required and what works are planned.
- 5) Requests a report to Culture & Communities Committee, within two cycles, containing but not exclusive to:
  - a) The criteria against which playparks are judged when considering them for refurbishment, and how that affects prioritising locations for work.
  - b) Details of which playparks are currently considered most in need of refurbishment, and which playparks are being prioritised for repair over the next three years.
  - c) Which playparks are currently accessible including but not exclusive to; wheelchair accessible surfaces, adjacent disabled parking access and accessible play equipment.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Thornley

- moved by Councillor Thornley, seconded by Councillor Osler

### **Amendment 1**

- In 5 (a) in the motion by Councillor Thornley, after *work*, delete full stop
- Thereafter add “, *including information on whether areas with high levels of deprivation are prioritised for new playparks currently and, if not, how this may be done.*”

- moved by Councillor Heap seconded by Councillor Staniforth

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Thornley:

- 1) To agree that playparks were a vital community resource providing opportunities for exercise and socialisation, and that it was important that playparks were fit for purpose and accessible to all.

- 2) To note that Council currently had responsibility for 165 playparks across the city, and that as of the Council's meeting of 27th May 2021, only approximately 100 of them had surfaces suitable for wheelchair access.
- 3) To note the commitment of funding from the Scottish Government to upgrade playparks, and that in the 2022/23 this would amount to £406,000, plus any unspent funds from the 2021/22 year.
- 4) To note that Council did not currently receive a regular update on the state of playparks across the city, what investment was required and what works were planned.
- 5) To request a report to Culture and Communities Committee, within two cycles, containing but not exclusive to:
  - a) The criteria against which playparks were judged when considering them for refurbishment, and how that affected prioritising locations for work, including information on whether areas with high levels of deprivation were prioritised for new playparks currently and, if not, how this might be done.
  - b) Details of which playparks were currently considered most in need of refurbishment, and which playparks were being prioritised for repair over the next three years.
  - c) Which playparks were currently accessible including but not exclusive to; wheelchair accessible surfaces, adjacent disabled parking access and accessible play equipment.

## **19 Transient Visitor Levy - Motion by Councillor Day**

---

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

“Council notes at long last the Scottish Government will legislate for a transient visitor levy.

Edinburgh welcomes visitors and is a gateway for tourism that contributes to Edinburgh and Scotland's hospitality sector and wider economy. Sector statistics say that it supports around 30,000 local jobs, with overnight visitors spending over £1.9bn a year in the city. Sustaining this level of activity, whilst balancing the needs of residents and visitors, requires investment in services and infrastructure. A well designed, progressive visitor levy could generate over £15m which would contribute towards those costs.

Given the Council is facing continued cuts from the SNP/ Green Scottish Government, Council agrees the Council Leader should write to the Scottish government to make clear that this funding must be additional to base grants and brought forward at the earliest opportunity.

Council agrees officers will engage with Scottish Government officials and provide an update at the Policy and Sustainability Committee at its meeting on 1 November 2022 including a timeline of the process.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Day

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

### **Amendment 1**

Deletes all but the last paragraph of the motion by Councillor Day and replaces with:

Council welcomes the Scottish Government announcement, which was postponed due to COVID, to complete the legislative process for enabling powers to allow Edinburgh to progress a Transient Visitor Levy.

Edinburgh welcomes visitors and is a gateway for tourism that contributes to Edinburgh and Scotland’s hospitality sector and wider economy. Noting the sector supports around 30,000 local jobs, with overnight visitors spending over £1.9bn a year in the city. Further notes sustaining this level of activity, whilst balancing the needs of residents and visitors, requires investment in services and infrastructure.

Council Notes Edinburgh has designed a robust, progressive visitor levy which is supported by more than 90% of residents and which was developed in partnership with the sector which could generate around £15m to contribute towards ongoing costs and help invest in the future success of Edinburgh

Council notes the Public Finance Minister Tom Arthur as recently as last week confirmed that funding from discretionary taxation like TVL is additional finance to all funding formula calculations saying: "The levy is not intended to act as a substitute for local government funding or the annual budget process through which the local government settlement is determined."

Agrees the Council Leader should write to the Scottish Government to underline that these powers should be brought forward at the earliest opportunity to allow Edinburgh to progress with its well-established plans. Further agrees this will seek clarity from the Government on whether the planned areas of investment and spend developed in Edinburgh's plans will be within the scope of the new legislation.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor McFarlane

### **Amendment 2**

Replace in the motion by Councillor Day:

“Given the Council is facing continued cuts from the SNP/ Green Scottish Government, Council agrees the Council Leader should write to the Scottish

government to make clear that this funding must be additional to base grants and brought forward at the earliest opportunity.

Council agrees officers will engage with Scottish Government officials and provide an update at the Policy and Sustainability Committee at its meeting on 1 November 2022 including a timeline of the process.”

With:

“Given the Council is likely to face continued real-term cuts following the UK Government’s budget review and subsequent Scottish Government budget statement, Council agrees the Council Leader should write to the Scottish Government to make clear that this funding must be additional to base grants and brought forward at the earliest opportunity.

Council agrees officers will engage with Scottish Government officials and provide an update at the Policy and Sustainability Committee at its meeting on 1 November 2022 including a timeline of the process.

Council further agrees that this report should contain details about the potential revenue raised through using this scheme to its fullest extent, and outline what steps will be needed to ensure that the Council is in a position to initiate a scheme and collect income once legislation is in place.”

- moved by Councillor Mumford, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

### **Amendment 3**

Replace the third paragraph of the motion by Councillor Day with:

Given the Council is facing continued cuts from the SNP/ Green Scottish Government, Council agrees the Council Leader should write to the Scottish government to make clear that, should the Scottish Government legislate to introduce a TVL and a majority in the council agrees to progress it, the Scottish Government and the Council should agree that:

- this funding must be additional to base grants;
- that the principle of additionality of funding should remain in perpetuity; and

that the funding should be used to demonstrably improve core services throughout the City and not solely for services that benefit tourism, marketing, or areas frequented by high volumes of visitors.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

## **Amendment 4**

To add to the end of paragraph 4 of Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey:

“and agrees that the Scottish Government must stay true to this principle as final powers are implemented.”

- moved by Councillor Young, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 1 as adjusted by Amendment 4, Amendment 2 as adjusted and Amendment 3 in full were accepted as amendments to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendment 2 (as adjusted) and the whole of Amendment 4 were accepted as amendments to Amendment 1.

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	32 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	28 votes

For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors. Arthur, Beal, Bruce, Caldwell, Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Duggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, McKenzie, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Neil Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

(For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, McVey, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Parker, Rae, Frank Ross, Staniforth and Work.)

## **Decision**

- 1) To welcome the Scottish Government announcement, which was postponed due to COVID, to complete the legislative process for enabling powers to allow Edinburgh to progress a Transient Visitor Levy.
- 2) To note that Edinburgh welcomed visitors and was a gateway for tourism that contributed to Edinburgh and Scotland's hospitality sector and wider economy. To note the sector supported around 30,000 local jobs, with overnight visitors spending over £1.9bn a year in the city. To further note sustaining this level of activity, whilst balancing the needs of residents and visitors, required investment in services and infrastructure.
- 3) To note Edinburgh had designed a robust, progressive visitor levy which was supported by more than 90% of residents and which was developed in

- partnership with the sector which could generate around £15m to contribute towards ongoing costs and help invest in the future success of Edinburgh.
- 4) To note the Public Finance Minister Tom Arthur as recently as last week confirmed that funding from discretionary taxation like TVL was additional finance to all funding formula calculations saying: "The levy is not intended to act as a substitute for local government funding or the annual budget process through which the local government settlement is determined." and to agree that the Scottish Government must stay true to this principle as final powers were implemented.
  - 5) To agree the Council Leader should write to the Scottish Government to underline that these powers should be brought forward at the earliest opportunity to allow Edinburgh to progress with its well-established plans. To further agree this would seek clarity from the Government on whether the planned areas of investment and spend developed in Edinburgh's plans would be within the scope of the new legislation.
  - 6) To agree officers would engage with Scottish Government officials and provide an update at the Policy and Sustainability Committee at its meeting on 1 November 2022 including a timeline of the process.
  - 7) To further agree that this report should contain details about the potential revenue raised through using this scheme to its fullest extent, and outline what steps would be needed to ensure that the Council was in a position to initiate a scheme and collect income once legislation was in place.

## **20 Bikeability in all Primary Schools - Motion by Councillor Miller**

---

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

"Council:

- 1) Notes the benefits of cycle training for children and young people in addition to the life skill of cycling such as confidence and health, and recognises the model of Bikeability provision via schools, which Edinburgh has implemented, is considered best practice.
- 2) Notes the availability of free Bikeability training for all schools supported by Cycling Scotland and welcomes the provision of Bikeability by Active Schools across Edinburgh, resulting in Level 1 and Level 2 Bikeability offered in 40% of our primary schools.
- 3) Agrees that access to Bikeability Level 1 and 2 training for all children and young people should be the aspiration.

- 4) Calls for a report to the Education Children and Families Committee within 2 cycles outlining the path to 100% Bikeability for Edinburgh's primary schools, including but not limited to:
  - a) Support for Active Schools to promote Bikeability uptake by schools not currently offering both Level 1 and 2.
  - b) Work with Head Teachers and Active Schools to identify any barriers to uptake and providing recommendations on ways to address these.
  - c) Methods for re-communicating the scope and the benefit of the free offer to schools “

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Burgess

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Miller

## **21 The BIG Project - Motion by Councillor Dixon**

---

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

“Council recognises and congratulates The BIG Project on its recent awards:

Notes that Sascha Macleod, Director of The BIG Project, won the Lifetime Award and gained Fellowship of Youthlink Scotland in recognition of her hard work and dedication given to the Youth Work sector.

Notes that the awards were hosted and awarded by Youthlink Scotland, the national agency that represents more than 100 youth organisation members across Scotland.

Recognises that The BIG Project which operates in the Broomhouse area of Edinburgh, support children and young people aged five to 18 to "learn, achieve, have fun and feel good about themselves".

Wishes The BIG Project further success in promoting activities and interests targeted at Youth Development.

Notes that Margaret Halkett, volunteer at The BIG Project, won an Inspiring Volunteer award at the Lord Provost of Edinburgh's Award ceremony in summer 2022, for her dedication and passion to Youth Work.

Council agrees to request the Lord Provost celebrate this amazing athlete and world champion in an appropriate manner.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Cameron

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Dixon.

## **22 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 22 of 22 September 2022)

### QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Younie for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022

**Question** (1) What action is being taken to reduce the enormous waiting times for young people to receive appointments from Children and Adolescents Mental Health Services (CAMHS)?

**Answer** (1) CAMHS is an NHS service, the response provided is in relation to what the Council has in place in relation to waiting times.

The City of Edinburgh has put in place a £1.343m budget from the Scottish Government allocated across the four localities to successfully deliver mental health supports to divert children and young people from CAMHS, this should help CAMHS to reduce their waiting lists. Edinburgh is one of the few local authorities in Scotland to also create a profession of School Counsellors based in all 23 secondary schools who deliver services to our young people – to divert away from CAMHS referrals to again allow waiting lists to be addressed by CAMHS. Each secondary school also provided funding for a wellbeing hub.

Every school has also retained their Educational Psychologist with set levels of service, this does not happen in some other authorities. Psychological Services have worked with the NHS to establish Wellbeing Academies in 50 schools. We also deliver support to families via Barnardos, Children 1<sup>st</sup> and Canongate Youth through a programme called Edinburgh Together.

**Question** (2) What outsourcing is being utilised to address these unsustainable waiting times?

**Answer** (2) CAMHS have outsourced part of their waiting list to take forward Autism Diagnoses. Council outsourcing is to Third Sector organisations as detailed above.

**Question** (3) What support is being provided to care givers and parents to support them alongside those in their care

**Answer** (3) Edinburgh has established the *We Matter* team to address support for care experienced children and young people. This team has a manager, a psychologist and a teacher working to help the Care Experienced. Work is in progress to commission the services of a psychologist and two trainee psychologists to provide support across our residential estate and foster care services.

Social workers will offer direct support to children and their care givers. They will also link with third sector and voluntary organisations to identify other supports as well as linking with schools.

In situations of significant need we commission trained psychiatric nurses to support parents and children and to also support staff in our residential units and social work teams. We have also commissioned therapeutic supports for specific children on occasions.

We have been working with partner agencies in the four Locality Operational Groups (LOGs) to problem solve and to meet local needs. Since April 2020 they have dealt with 550 individual needs forms. 139 related to Mental health difficulties and 57 related to parents' mental health.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you for the answer to my question. As a supplementary I'd like to ask has there been a measurement of the impact of the school counsellors based in all the 23 secondary schools upon improving children and adolescent mental health?

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you for your supplementary, I don't have that information with me but I will get that information to you.

**QUESTION NO 2**

**By Councillor Flannery for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question**

Given we are 5 weeks into the new academic year, with regards the placement of Ukrainian Refugee Children can the Convener give figures for:

- a) How many children have been placed with a school, the names of the schools and the numbers each school has taken?
- b) How many are still on the waiting list?
- c) What contingency plans are in place for those waiting and for any future children coming to Edinburgh?

**Answer**

- a) Total number of children enrolled in schools = 492.

There are 319 children in temporary accommodation so far. This is from the 492 who have enrolled in our schools

SCHOOL	No of Ukrainian CYP enrolled
Abbeyhill PS	1
Balerno Community HS	5
Balgreen PS	2
Bonally PS	1
Boroughmuir HS	1
Broughton PS	7
Bruntsfield PS	3
Carrick Knowe PS	2
Castlebrae Community HS	32
Castleview Primary School	17
Clerminston	3
Colinton	1
Corstorphine	5
Craigeninney	1
Craigeninney EYC	1
Craiglockhart PS	4
Craigmillar EYC	3
Craigmount HS	2
Craigour Park PS	1

Craigroyston CHS	1
Ceamond PS	1
Currie CHS	2
Currie PS	3
Dalmeny PS	1
Dalry PS	5
Davidson's Main PS	3
Dean Park PS	1
Drummond CHS	13
Duddingston PS	3
East Craigs PS	3
Firrhill HS	1
Flora Stevenson PS	2
Fox Covert PS	1
Gracemount PS	2
Granton PS	3
Gylemuir PS	3
Hermitage Park PS	11
James Gillespie PS	7
Juniper Green PS	1
Leith Academy	102
Leith Primary School	10
Leith Walk PS	3
Liberton HS	1
Liberton PS	1
Lorne PS	20
Niddrie Mill PS	1
Oxgangs ELC	2
Oxgangs PS	1
Pentland PS	2
Parsons Green PS	1
Pirniehall PS	1
Portobellos HS	4
Preston Street PS	1
Queensferry Community HS	1
Roseburn PS	5
Royal Mile PS	4
Sciennes PS	5
St Andrew Fox Covert PS	1
St Augustines RC HS	3
St John Vianney PS	4
St Marys RC PS	27
St Peter's PS	7
St Thomas Aquin	2
Stockbridge PS	3
The Royal High School	4
Tollcross PS	2
Towerbank PS	2
Trinity Academy	9
Trinity PS	32
Tynecastle HS	10
Victoria PS	55
Victoria EYC	6

Viewforth EYC	1
TOTAL	492

b) As this figure is not held centrally we have to ask for a return from schools and will provide this snapshot before Council meets.

c) We have expanded the team supporting the Ukrainian children and young people, including more teachers, bilingual support assistants and a Senior Education Officer. Previously we had scoped out additional contingency arrangements such as creating a 'Ukraine School', creating flexible timetables and increased outdoor education. To date we have only taken the outdoor education work stream forward.

We will allocate future placement requests across the city until we are at capacity. We are now centrally enrolling all Ukrainian families by asking them to apply electronically for a school and ELC place. Places will be allocated within 5 days maximum.

**Supplementary Question**

Yes thank you very much Lord Provost. Just clarification because you mentioned there might be an update on snapshot figures for the waiting list so is there now figures?

**Councillor Griffiths**

My apologies but I didn't catch what you said.

**Councillor Flannery**

Right, okay - on b) it's about snapshot figures for the waiting list, so is there an update that there is now a figure or not?

**Supplementary Answer**

They will continue to monitor the waiting list and make sure that as the children come in and require a placement then that will be given as soon as possible.

**Councillor Flannery**

I think it just said that by next meeting so the update was really on where we are with it.

**QUESTION NO 3**

**By Councillor Parker for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question**

Given the decision at Transport & Environment Committee on 27th October 2015 to phase out the use of glyphosate by the council, what work has been done on this already, and how close are we to seeing all use of glyphosate ended?

**Answer**

Although the use of glyphosate is permitted for use by the SNP/Green Government, the Council has trialled the use of alternative chemicals, notably acid-based products that are increasingly coming onto the market.

At its meeting of [27 February 2020](#) Transport and Environment Committee considered introducing a trial of "Foamstream" in Balerno. This trial went ahead in 2021 with the conclusion that it was not a viable alternative on a city-wide basis for the treatment of street weeds. An update on the use of Glyphosate and the outcome of the trial in Balerno was reported to the Transport and Environment Committee on [31 March 2022](#).

This most recent update summarised the progress made in reducing the use of glyphosate across the city.

Officers are now progressing the steps outlined in the March update and hope to bring a report on the maintenance of cycle and footpaths to Transport and Environment Committee in December 2022 which will outline how an integrated approach to weed control can be further developed.

To reduce the use of chemicals even further, the most efficient long-term solution to tackle unwanted weed growth requires an integrated approach, including an increase in the frequency use of mechanical sweepers to remove the

build-up of organic detritus from road and pavement surfaces alongside people and communities weeding themselves, reducing the need for glyphosate to be applied. Viable alternatives and other developing products and methods will continue to be explored.

It must be noted, however, that many of the alternative approaches are more expensive. So whilst Edinburgh's administration has a desire to reduce glyphosate use to zero, we recognise that cuts the SNP/Green Gov are inflicting on our capital are a barrier to this. Nonetheless, I would welcome discussions on this issue ahead of the 2023/24 budget.

**QUESTION NO 4**

**By Councillor Staniforth for answer  
by the Convener of the Education,  
Children and Families Committee at a  
meeting of the Council on 22  
September 2022**

- Question** (1) Why was Abbeyhill Primary School shut down for two days on the 12th and 13th of September, creating severe disruption for some parents, despite access to the school being possible and the school being nowhere near the likely crowds created by the Queen's funeral procession?
- Answer** (1) The closures were included within the **City Wide Operation Unicorn Plan** which stated:
- *Schools Closures. Following extensive consultation, it has been agreed that only those schools inside the restricted areas will need to close for the duration of the Operation. The schools that will close from D+1 will be The Royal Mile Primary School, Abbeyhill Primary School and The Cowgate Nursery*
  - *Education and Children's Services will be notified via the Council notification and activation plan. Once notified, colleagues within the Department will notify the Headteachers of the 3 schools affected to activate the closure plan*
- Question** (2) Why was it not possible to have provision for vulnerable children, at least, in Abbeyhill rather than located at Leith Walk given some vulnerable children react badly to change?
- Answer** (2) We were instructed that the school could not open due to the absence of critical FM staff who were deployed for Operation Unicorn.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for the answers. Will the Convener assure us that in future her Department will work with facilities management to assure that when access to a school is not physically impossible it will still be granted to vulnerable children who require routine so that they can continue to attend their regular school?
- Supplementary Answer** Yes we'll make sure that the children can attend their regular school.

**QUESTION NO 5**

**By Councillor Thornley for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question** (1) What progress has been made on plans to upgrade the junction of Queensferry Road with Clermiston Road North?

**Answer** (1) A contract has been awarded for this project. However, the start date has been revised to address a conflict with utility works and other road improvement works in the area and elsewhere along the Queensferry Road corridor.

**Question** (2) When he expects work will begin on implementing these plans?

**Answer** (2) It is now proposed to undertake the work in early 2023, with specific dates being subject to contractor availability, school holiday dates, and road works registration and co-ordination requirements.

**Question** (3) Given this junction lies on the walking route for many pupils attending the Royal High, what discussions have been had with local residents to inform the plans?

**Answer** (3) The consultation for this scheme included discussions with the Parent Council at Royal High School. All of the issues raised have been considered as part of the design process, including in particular, crossing at this junction.

During the works a safe walking route will be maintained at all times. Temporary traffic lights including a pedestrian crossing phase will be in operation at times when the permanent signals are switched off. Following your question, I will ensure Ward Councillors and local residents are notified approximately two weeks before work commences.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for his answer and his commitment to keeping ward councillors and local residents updated in advance of the works finally beginning at Queensferry Road. It is disappointing to see a delay of six months now. Is he planning to rectify that going forward and ensure the Council is forthcoming with details when delays are.....

**Comment by  
the Lord  
Provost**

Is there a question

**Councillor  
Flannery**

That was a question

**Comment by  
the Lord  
Provost**

No that was a statement, we'll move on to 10 point 6

**QUESTION NO 6**

**By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

In 2018, the Housing and Economy Committee approved the Mixed Tenure Strategy which included Acquisitions & Disposals.

In September 2021, the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee approved the expansion of the Acquisitions and Disposals purchase criteria to include the purchase of homes in blocks where the Council owns 50% or more to increase the pool of homes that could be purchased to help address homelessness pressures.

This is reported on annually and most recently in July 2022.

- Question**            (1) Of the total number of Disposals since the scheme began, how many Disposed flats are ground floor accessible properties and as such, are of high importance to ensure the Council's housing stock is accessible to people with physical disabilities?
- Answer**            (1) Since the scheme began the Council has sold 20 ground floor properties in blocks where the Council was a minority owner. However, all ground floor properties are not necessarily fully accessible and may have steps leading into the property.
- Question**            (2) How many Disposed flats were in stairwells or high-rise blocks with lifts?
- Answer**            (2) The Council has disposed of five flats with lift access in blocks where the Council was a minority owner.
- Question**            (3) How many Acquisitions since the scheme begun are ground floor flats, or otherwise accessible without the need for a lift or stairs?
- Answer**            (3) Since the scheme began the Council has purchased 24 ground floor homes in blocks where it already owns at least 50% of the homes. The Council has also purchased 13 main door houses.

- Question** (4) Does the Convener agree with me that ground floor Council flats are of strategic importance in communities of high tenement density, such as Leith, Southside, Dalry and Stockbridge, where the stock of semi-detached properties is severely limited?
- Answer** (4) Ensuring Edinburgh has an adequate supply of affordable and accessible housing is very important. Before any homes are disposed of on the open market, ownership checks are carried out in the stair to determine whether any Registered Social Landlords currently have a presence and whether they would be interested in purchasing the home directly. If this is unsuccessful, the home is offered to the Council's Private Sector Leasing (PSL) delivery partner, Link Housing Association, prior to being sold on the open market. This is to ensure, wherever possible, homes can remain in the affordable sector.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost. In light of the answers given, would the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Convener be up for a site visit to include all councillors on the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee to these new acquisitioned flats?
- Supplementary Answer** Thank you Councillor Caldwell for your question and your supplementary and I'd be absolutely delighted to take part in that and invite others to join us, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 7**

**By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

On Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> September 2022, the Transport and Environment Committee approved the TRO and the report outlining an expansion of Controlled Parking Zones into the areas of Pilrig, Leith Walk, Abbeyhill, Craigentiny and Shandon, among others.

These new Controlled Parking Zones contain Statutory Conservation Areas such as Leith Walk and Pilrig, which are intended to preserve and enhance the character of the areas.

Can the Transport and Environment Convener please confirm;

**Question** (1) Will the Parking Review department maintain a strong working relationship with the Planning department to ensure that the character of these two Conservation Areas are not negatively impacted by the introduction of furniture, including ticket machines and new signage?

**Answer** (1) Yes. Although with parking signage there is often a legal requirement to identify parking restrictions, every effort will be made to minimise the introduction of any new signs and poles. Existing street furniture, such as lamp columns, will be used to accommodate any necessary signs where it is possible to do so. Officers will also be seeking permission from residents and businesses to erect signage on their property, such as on walls and railings, wherever possible. There will be significantly fewer ticket machines in comparison to existing parking zones as these are only being proposed for areas where there is likely to be a high demand for paid public parking.

**Question** (2) What considerations are being given to minimise new street furniture on pavements and make use of existing infrastructure, to ensure the Council continues our dedication to the 'Cut the Pavement Clutter project', alongside Living Streets UK and Paths for All?

**Answer** (2) Please see answer 1 above.

**QUESTION NO 8**

**By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

The Scottish Government have announced a proposed £150m of funding for Active Travel across the country, including proposals to double the funding of the National Cycle Network in 2023.

The semi-abandoned railway line between Saint Mark's Park and Abbeyhill could provide a vital path linking the areas to Pilrig, Leith Walk, Allanfield and Easter Road and signal a major expansion of the North Edinburgh Path Network to the east of the City and facilitate easier walking, wheeling and cycling.

The Council's Active Travel team are currently conducting a feasibility study which is due later this year.

Can the Transport and Environment Convener please confirm;

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| <b>Question</b> | (1) What additional resource have the Active Travel team been allocated to conduct the feasibility study?  |
| <b>Answer</b>   | (1) A dedicated project manager has been allocated to this study as part of the Council's Active Travel Investment Programme.                              |
| <b>Question</b> | (2) What representations have been made so far to national bodies, such as Transport Scotland, to deliver funding for the proposed project?                |
| <b>Answer</b>   | (2) To date, no direct representations have been made to Transport Scotland or any other national body about this project.                                 |
| <b>Question</b> | (3) What representations have been made so far to charities and third sector organisations, such as Sustrans, to deliver funding for the proposed project? |

**Answer** (3) The Council has been allocated funding from Sustrans' Places for Everyone programme for the Active Travel Investment Programme, which includes the feasibility study for the Powderhall Railway active travel route.

No representations have been made to any other charities/ third sector organisations as the only realistic source of this nature is Transport Scotland funding via Sustrans.

**Question** (4) Now the 'Spaces for People' and the 'Travelling Safely ETRO' consultations have concluded, can the Convener assure me that appropriate Officer time will be dedicated to the Powderhall Active Travel Project, which was first discussed by the North East Locality back in 2018?

**Answer** (4) Yes, as noted in question 1, a project manager is now dedicated to this important project.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost. Would the Convener agree with me that the proposed Powderhall Active Travel Route could be a good testing project for the results from the Women's Safety in Public Places consultation which raised many concerns about off-road cycle paths?

**Supplementary Answer** Yes, what I would say is as part of the circulation plan that is something we've been discussing internally as well about how we can use that to think about the safety of not just women but anybody travelling alone through the city, particular in the evening. On this route in particular I'd be happy to speak about the particular challenges there, it is a challenging route generally but no doubt we can look at these other things as well, so no problem, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 9**

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 22 September 2022**

The Council is currently facing soaring energy costs while working on its transition to net-zero.

**Question** (1) What action is the Council taking, in addition to previously announced plans, to further reduce its carbon footprint and its energy bill by implementing energy saving measures in its workplaces and public buildings?

**Answer** (1) A review of control schedules is already underway with the aim of trimming run hours of plant where possible, whilst meeting service requirements. To support this, core hours have been agreed with Education and Catering, and processes are in place to accommodate heating requirements for lets. Whilst this is standard energy management, increases in gas prices bring focus, and it is expected that there will be deliverable savings with minimal impact to services.

Further opportunities to deliver immediate savings on energy spend in operational buildings are also under consideration. This includes proposals to limit building temperatures (except in residential units and special schools).

**Question** (2) Will officers report on these actions to the Finance and Resources Committee?

**Answer** (2) These operational decisions do not require formal political approval, but an update will be included in a future Business Bulletin for Finance and Resources Committee.

The Energy Management Policy for Operational Buildings report will be taken to Policy and Sustainability Committee in January 2023 and wider activities in relation to the Council's net zero strategy will be covered in the Carbon Emissions Reduction Report going to Policy and Sustainability Committee in November 2022.

**Question** (3) If so, when is a report likely to be presented?

**Answer** (3) See above.

**QUESTION NO 10**

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 22 September 2022**

So much electricity is expended by keeping stair lights on in blocks of flats in the middle of the night when very few people are coming and going. I understand that, where the Council pays for the provision and maintenance of stair lighting, consideration is being given by officers to the installation of movement sensors so that lighting would be on only when people are moving in the stair.

**Question** (1) How many stairwells is the Council responsible for lighting?

**Answer** (1) The Council currently pays for the energy costs for common stair lighting in blocks of flats across the city. There is no data held on how many blocks this relates to.

The Council carries out repairs and maintenance of stair lighting in blocks where it has ownership of a property or properties. This means that the Council could carry out repairs and maintenance in around 4,500 blocks. The Council owns 100% of properties in 724 blocks.

**Question** (2) Would this be a suitable project to finance from the Council's Spend to Save fund?

**Answer** (2) I will look into this with officers and will report back to Councillors as soon as possible.

**Question** (3) If so, when is a proposal likely to be presented to the Finance & Resources Committee for consideration?

**Answer** (3) See response to Question 2 above.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by  
the Leader of the Council at a  
meeting of the Council on 22  
September 2022**

**Question**

Further to his supplementary answer to my question at full council of 25 August 2022, the council leader has again failed to answer the question. Can I give him another opportunity to answer the question: what were the reasons behind his proposal to reduce the size of the licensing board while also creating a new position of vice-convener?

**Answer**

The appointments of members to Committees, Boards and Joint Boards, including the Licensing Board were agreed at the Council meeting on 26 May 2022 (adjourned from 19 May 2022).

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Council Leader for his non answer. This is the fifth time that he's failed to answer this question, I didn't ask for the date of the decision I asked for the reasons, so can the Council Leader please clarify, given this is the fifth time he's failed to answer the question, what is he trying to hide?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Can I thank Councillor Booth for his supplementary question for the 5<sup>th</sup> time he's asked the same question, the answers were given every month, so the decision was made back in May and there was no questions asked. I'd much rather spend my afternoon congratulating and wishing Councillor Booth good luck in his marathon and his 50th birthday quite soon.

**QUESTION NO 12**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

Further to his answer to my question at full council of 25 August 2022, can the council leader outline:

**Question** (1) when he met with Bòrd na Gàidhlig, and what were the outcomes of that discussion?

**Answer** (1) Councillor Day will meet Shona Nicllinnein from Bòrd na Gàidhlig on 29/09/2022 at 4pm

**Question** (2) whether he has any plans to meet with members of the Gaelic community in Edinburgh?

**Answer** (2) Future meetings will be considered following the above meeting

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost. I thank the Council Leader for his answer which he has actually given this time but can he clarify, if he doesn't have any intention to meet with the Gaelic community how is he going to listen to what they say?

**Supplementary Answer** I thank Councillor Booth for the supplementary, maybe he's not read my answers, I will meet with the board on the 29th of September and depending on how that discussion goes we will then decide what other discussions need to happen in the Gaelic community.

**QUESTION NO 13**

**By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question** (1) What are the council's next steps in identifying a site for a GME High School?

**Answer** (1) There are currently no proposals for any further work to be carried out in relation to identifying a site for a GME secondary school. A statutory consultation proposal to establish a dedicated secondary school was submitted to Committee for consideration but it was not approved to progress. There are no sites available in the city centre for a GME secondary school therefore no more work is planned to develop that option.

**Question** (2) Will the council undertake a full options appraisal, including engagement with the Gaelic community, on the options identified so far as potential sites for a GME High School?

**Answer** (2) As there are no sites available in the city centre for a GME secondary school, there are currently no plans for any further work to be carried out on the options identified so far as potential sites for a GME secondary school.

**Question** (3) What are the council's plans to open a second GME primary school?

**Answer** (3) As there are no sites available in the city centre for a GME secondary school this means that a second primary school cannot be developed as there will be insufficient capacity in secondary provision. The decision to not go forward with statutory consultation means that the option of Liberton and the second primary was not able to be taken forward..

**Question** (4) What is the pupil capacity of the Darroch annex?

- Answer** (4) It is estimated that the notional capacity of James Gillespie's High School will be 1900 when the new annexe is open. The annexe provides about 450 places of this notional capacity. The capacity of any secondary school is only considered notional because the number of pupils a school can accommodate is not only determined by the size of a building but also by the number and type of spaces available, the way those spaces are timetabled, the courses offered, the number of staff and the way pupils are spread across year groups. Many schools regularly and consistently operate beyond their notional capacity.
- Question** (5) When will Darroch reach capacity, if Taobh na Pairce were to remain as the only GME primary school?
- Answer** (5) The current roll projections estimate that James Gillespie's High School notional capacity will be exceeded in 2025.
- Question** (6) What funding was received from the Scottish Government towards the Darroch refurbishment, and what conditions were attached to that funding?
- Answer** (6) £4m was received from the Scottish Government. The grant was made available to develop a Secondary Gaelic Annex at Darroch House in preparation for establishing a dedicated GME High School, establish a second GME Primary School and expand Early Years provision. A statutory consultation proposal to establish a dedicated secondary school and expand primary GME was submitted to Committee for consideration but it was not approved to progress. The Scottish Government have been fully informed that this is the current situation relating to the grant.
- Question** (7) What are the next steps in developing the council's strategy for Gaelic?
- Answer** (7) A report has been submitted to the Education, Children and Families Committee for consideration.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost. I thank the Convener for her answer which goes into some detail, can she clarify in relation to her response on Question 5, that is a different answer to the answer that Council officers were giving during the informal consultation, so can she clarify what has changed and specifically whether the Council intends to use Darroch for both Gaelic and English medium education?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary, I'm not aware of the difference but I will find out exactly what the change is, if there is any change and get back to you.

**QUESTION NO 14**

**By Councillor Aston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question** (1) Has the Transport and Environment Convener had any discussions on the reliability and accuracy of the bus tracker app since the formation of the administration?

**Answer** (1) Discussions have taken place with Lothian Buses in respect of the Lothian Buses bus tracker app since an issue was highlighted at the Council meeting on 25 August 2022. Lothian Buses have provided the following update:

*Our app shows the predicted real time arrival of any journey based on the timetable verses the location of the individual bus. The app can't predict congestion or other delays that may yet not have been encountered by the bus.*

*Additionally, if the bus has not moved for an extended time period, for example at a driver swap over where there is a knock-on effect of the relief driver having been delayed on their previous journey, the trip may revert to an estimated time until the bus is on the move again. Buses are occasionally removed from the app where the bus is no longer able to continue its journey for operational reasons*

**Question** (2) What steps has he taken to progress improvements, in conjunction with Lothian Bus, to improve the reliability and accuracy of the bus tracker app?

**Answer** (2) Lothian bus and tram app is in constant development both in terms of customer functionality and accessibility to ensure that it reflects the needs of digital customers.

Council officers are not aware of any on-going issues with the Lothian Buses bus tracker app but there are a number of apps (20+) available, which although the source data is the same, will provide information in slightly different ways and so may experience issues. I've based the answer on the Lothian Buses app – which is that one I use and trust.

Although the App is incredibly important, Edinburgh's Administration continues to support and invest in on-street information screens as part of a renewed commitment to support and expand public transport. Our aim is to transform the on-street system within 12 months:

1. The first 30 new screens will be installed on Princes Street, Queensferry Street and Shandwick Place.
2. The new screens will be full colour, and capable of showing multi operator real time information, as well as disruption information and emergency information.
3. The screens will also be capable of displaying other information from the Council.
4. It is planned to finish installing all 429 signs by mid-2023, with the creation of around 80 new sites in Edinburgh

Technology moves quickly within the industry and the Administration is committed to taking advantage of it where possible. We are exploring new technologies all the time one of which is the use of a SIRI SX data feed, which will allow operators to update our signs with live disruption information i.e. congestion or road diversions. This is in its infancy and not being used anywhere else in the country, but we hope that it can be used on our system.

**QUESTION NO 15**

**By Councillor Aston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question**

What engagement has the Transport and Environment Convener had with the UK Government regarding electric scooters?

**Answer**

None. I have also not engaged with the corporate entities lobbying myself and other Councillors on this issue.

I have little interest in these devices due to the many concerns regarding their use and storage raised by charities representing people with visual impairments.

The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association - *“Guide Dogs research shows that nearly 75% of people with sight loss who have encountered an e-scooter have had a negative experience. Visually impaired people are already being forced to change their behaviour because of e-scooters, with some changing their regular routes and others not leaving home alone.”*

I note, however, that at least one manufacturer is engaging with RNIB to understand how the challenges e-scooters represent may be addressed.

E-scooters are currently banned on public roads and footpaths in Scotland, and I share the concerns of many people about how this is being enforced.

Based on recent trials, more information is expected from the Department of Transport. This was expected in May 2022, but has not yet come forward. I support calls from The Guide Dogs for the Bind Association for the UK Government to publish their data ASAP:

<https://www.guidedogs.org.uk/blog/guide-dogs-responds-to-government-decision-to-extend-e-scooter-trials> .

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. So the Convener might not be interested that my constituents think they're a menace, my question is, is the Convener aware that the Westminster Transport Select Committee indicated that support for legalising e-scooters in October 2020, does he understand that it might well be legalised regardless of his lack of interest in e-scooters and will he now engage with the Westminster Government in relation to the regulation?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I thought perhaps I was being too subtle Councillor Aston. In terms of a lack of interest, what I mean is, I don't think Edinburgh's right yet for e-scooters to be used on the streets here and that's largely because of discussions I've had with people as I explained in my answer, people who represent disability charities and the challenges they have, so I have no intention of engaging in a process which would make them more likely to come here to be honest and I think officers do engage with the process but that's where we are with this.

**QUESTION NO 16**

**By Councillor Campbell for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 22 September 2022**

Following the strike action the administration has put in place plans for a clean-up. Constituents in Portobello Craigmillar have been in touch to say that their bins were missed during this period and some collections have not taken place for four or five weeks. To ask the convener:

**Question** (1) Why the administration's plan for the clean-up did not prioritise all grey bins being collected, at least once, ahead of second collections or other types of waste collections?

**Answer** (1) Council staff did an incredible job to get the collection system back on its feet following strike action which could have been avoided if the SNP/Green Government had entered constructive discussions earlier. Staff had to simultaneously restart and maintain existing collection schedules whilst also clearing a huge backlog during a short period of time between the end of the first strike action and the proposed second one starting.

Residents were advised that they could present excess waste alongside general and mixed recycling kerbside bins. Within the recovery plan, glass and garden collections remained suspended, to prioritise resources to both kerbside, communal general waste and mixed recycling bins.

However, given the late notice of the suspended strike action (confirmation that the second period of strike action was not going ahead on 6 September was received late on 2 September) there was not sufficient time to change plans, to inform staff and communicate to residents.

**Question** (2) Why the administration's plan has resulted in some bins not being collected for over a month?

**Answer** (2) Individual bins are collected on a fortnightly schedule – general waste one week and mixed recycling the next – therefore there is normally 14 days between collections. This meant that approximately 25% of kerbside properties would have waited 28 days for a collection.

**Question** (3) To ask, from the last collection prior to strike action;

a) How many kerbside grey bins did not have an uplift for 28 days or more?

b) How many communal general waste bins did not have an uplift for 28 days or more?

**Answer** (3) a) Approximately 23% of households would have waited 28 days – this includes my own household and many others in my Ward. Their last collection of general waste would have been on 4 and 5 August. Collections restarted on 30 August, with double collections of general waste and mixed recycling for affected properties. This was planned to take account of the second strike period planned to begin on 6 September.

b) Thanks to the hard work of staff, there was no communal collection that went more than 28 days between collections.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and to thank the Convener for his answers although they weren't answers to the questions that I asked, so would he commit to giving me an answer, how many waste collections were not uplifted for more than 28 days, not how many he estimates probably would have been at 28 days, but how many were longer. I certainly had constituents that waited five weeks or more.....

**Comments by the Lord Provost** I think your question's finished.

**Councillor Campbell** Sorry Provost just to finish, so will he give us that information and if he will not give us that information can explain why he will not?

**Supplementary Answer** As far as I'm concerned the question was answered, but if you want clarification please just e-mail me and I'll address it, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 17**

**By Councillor Campbell for answer  
by the Convener of the Culture and  
Communities Committee at a  
meeting of the Council on 22  
September 2022**

The review of Lifelong Learning was launched on 8 June and the formal consultation process has now concluded. Councillors were not briefed ahead of the review and there was no report to committee. Can the convener confirm:

**Question** (1) Was she briefed ahead of the review?

**Answer** (1) Following my appointment as Convener of Culture and Communities I was verbally briefed by officers on the Lifelong Learning Review on June 16th.

**Question** (2) Did she agree that it was not politically sensitive and so councillors did not need to be informed?

**Answer** (2) Organisational Reviews are always taken forward at officer level.

**Question** (3) Who made the decision that it was not politically sensitive?

**Answer** (3) The preparation for this organisational review began in 2019 and, in recognition of the political interest in the services affected by the review, the proposed realignment of responsibilities was reported to the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 25 February 2020 (B Agenda). The organisational review consultation commenced shortly after this date but was paused due to the outbreak of Coronavirus (COVID-19). The review consultation restarted in early June 2022 and followed the Council's policy for Managing Change.

**Question** (4) Have any management committees yet had discussions on future arrangements?

**Answer** (4) All Community Centre Management Committees were informed about the review.

**Question** (5) If not, when does she expect these discussions to commence?

**Answer** (5) While the formal consultation with staff has now closed, the structure and associated changes of responsibilities have not yet been finalised. Once this has been completed, staff will go through a period of matching and assignment to appoint them into roles within the new structure. Conversations with stakeholders, including management committees, will commence once the future service structures are in place.

**Question** (6) When will a report come in front of councillors to set out any changes to the relationship between management committees and CEC lifelong learning staff based in community centres?

**Answer** (6) I have asked officers to bring a report to Culture and Communities Committee as early as possible, updating members on how the Council will work with Community Centres going forward.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost. So thank you to the Convener for her answer, she pointed me to a report of two and a half years ago, in that report said the committee were kept updated as elected member engagement will continue throughout the consultation period. Given that she wasn't even informed that the consultation was starting after a two and a half year pause, does she feel that the promise in that report has been met?

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you for your supplementary. I'm going to find out a bit more about this and get back to you either by e-mail or if you prefer we could discuss.

**QUESTION NO 18**

**By Councillor Dobbin for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question** (1) Why was the Agenda Planning Meeting for the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work committee rearranged three times?

**Answer** (1) The APM was rearranged due to leave in exceptional circumstances and when Monday 19<sup>th</sup> was declared as a bank holiday following the death of HM the Queen.

**Question** (2) Does the convener recognise that with many members working part time, rearranging with short notice could be a barrier to participation?

**Answer** (2) Every attempt will be made to retain scheduled APM dates.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for the answers to the questions. Given that a number of members were not able to attend the rescheduled APM on Tuesday past, would not be prudent to appoint a Vice Convener so that in such circumstances in future the APM business can proceed according to the required notice allowing full member participation?

**Supplementary Answer** Can I thank Councillor Dobbin for his supplementary question. These postponements happened as he knows, in extremely exceptional circumstances, I'm not entirely sure either that it's within my gift to make an agreement of the kind that you're suggesting so I would respectfully decline to do such, so thank you.

**QUESTION NO 19**

**By Councillor Kumar for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

It is well known that both James Gillespie's and Boroughmuir are over-subscribed but this is also the case for residents living within the catchment area. The knock on effect of this means that 'new' residents within the catchment area are not able to get a place.

To ask the convener:

**Question** (1) How many schools are oversubscribed across the city?

**Answer** (1) A total number of seven primary schools were oversubscribed when the waiting lists were passed to schools at the start of session and had catchment children on waiting lists.

A total number of two secondary schools were oversubscribed when the waiting lists were passed to schools at the start of session and had catchment children on waiting lists.

**Question** (2) How many placing requests are refused for residents within catchment areas (this is to include new residents)?

**Answer** (2) Please note that children who are in the catchment are by 24 December of each year are guaranteed places. Thereafter, children are placed on waiting lists.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and can I thank the Convener for her answers as well. As a point of clarity does the Convener know the number of pupils on waiting lists within each of the over-subscribed schools and secondly does she know the number of pupils on the waiting list who have not been guaranteed a place in their own catchment area, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer** Thank you for your supplementary, I don't have that information at the moment but I can get that information to you.

**QUESTION NO 20**

**By Councillor Macinnes for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question** (1) How much has the council spent on contractors and agency staff since the start of the administration?

**Answer** (1) Recorded spend on agency staffing in the period between April and August 2022 was £8.2m, representing around 3% of the Council's overall paybill, inclusive of on-costs.

**Question** (2) Is the total spend expected to increase this financial year compared to the last year?

**Answer** (2) Expenditure in the year to date is higher than at the equivalent point in 2021/22. This increase needs to be seen, however, in the light of exceptional labour market pressures for permanent staffing and significant unforeseen and continuing external demands, such as support for the Council's response in the resettlement of Ukrainian refugees, alongside delivery of other key services.

The overall position for the year will reflect the impact of the remedial actions noted in the response to Question (3).

**Question** (3) What action is the convener taking to reduce the levels of contracted and agency staff?

**Answer** (3) Given external recruitment challenges, a targeted approach with additional promotional methods has been successful in filling cleaning vacancies thus reducing dependency on agency and overtime spend. A similar approach is being explored to target pressures in Waste and Cleansing. On-going implementation of organisational reviews should also contribute positively to avoiding any unplanned use of agency staffing.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you very much Lord Provost. thank you to the Convener and officers for an informative answer. Although I suspect the Convener will be disappointed to see that the amount that we've spent on contractors and agency staff has gone up since the election, I wonder if she can provide any expected timescales and performance targets in relation to the answer number 3?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Macinnes. So, a lot depends on what the needs of the city are, for instance it may well have increased during the time of the Queen's funeral, so there's often circumstances beyond our control which do come up and where it's essential that we do use extra workers of course I support the Council having as many as possible fully accredited workers but yes I believe we have regular reporting of this already to Finance and Resources Committee, I will double check in case my recollection's not correct, but my understanding is that we do already have reporting of this, so thank you.

**QUESTION NO 21**

**By Councillor Macinnes for answer  
by the Leader of the Council at a  
meeting of the Council on 22  
September 2022**

**Question**

How many meetings has the Council Leader had which were also attended by Conservative Group Leader Councillor Iain Whyte since the formation of the administration in May 2022?

**Answer**

Councillor Whyte has been afforded the same opportunities to meet with me as all other group leaders including the questioners. I hope group leaders take the opportunity to work constructively with me.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you very much Lord Provost, unfortunately the Leader has avoided answering the question. I wonder if he could now provide the specific information requested in the original question?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Could I thank Councillor Macinnes for a repetition of her question. I have met with the other leaders, all the leaders being invited to all the meetings I have had, I've had no additional meetings with any other parties, if the SNP Leaders don't want to turn up to meetings that will be their choice.

**QUESTION NO 22**

**By Councillor Macinnes for answer  
by the Leader of the Council at a  
meeting of the Council on 22  
September 2022**

**Question**

At the June Full Council it was unanimously agreed by Council, following my motion which was constructively amended by Green and Liberal Democrat contributions, that we would receive a report on the establishment of a Young Person's Assembly within two committee cycles. Can the Leader tell us what interventions he has made, before receiving this question, to ensure that this vital contribution to effective policymaking and implementation will be brought forward?

**Answer**

I am aware of numerous actions and interventions which ensure young people's voice contributes to policy-making. Some are past with current influence, some remain current, and some are new. They include:

- What Kind of Edinburgh, Youth Talk and Young Edinburgh Action.
- the Rights Respecting Schools programme.
- Scottish Youth Parliament - Eleven MSYPs attend City of Edinburgh Council schools, eight are young women and three are from a Black and Minority Ethnic background.
- All schools have pupil councils, or equivalent, with a range of approaches in place to ensure pupil voice plays a key part in school life and in decision-making.
- We hosted a Youth Climate Action Summit in February 2020 with more than 100 S1-S3 young people. 12 students from six high schools participated in an online session to gauge views on COP26 and climate change. Funded by YouthLink Scotland, Edinburgh schools have developed 1.5 Max - an international online and classroom-based climate education initiative.

- All schools have a Pupil Equalities Co-ordinator and in June 2022, young people in pupil-led equalities groups met to share ideas and explore what support they need.
- In November 2020, 21 senior phase students from 14 high schools took part in an online consultation about COVID.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Yes thank you Lord Provost, my apologies, I should note my question was obviously submitted before we knew that the report was coming forward so my apologies for the repetition, however, again the question that I asked has not been responded to correctly in the written response, so instead of merely listing other albeit valuable activity can the Leader please answer the question directly?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Can I thank Councillor Macinnes for her supplementary, my colleague Councillor Griffiths who leads on Education Children and Families has been leading on this for many months since her time in her post, meeting as she said earlier, schools pupils' from across the Council's estate discussing amongst them many many issues in the school including how to widen youth participation across the city. What we don't want to do is force an adult led bureaucracy onto young people we'd rather work with young people, so I commit to continue working alongside Councillor Griffiths to deliver that.

**QUESTION NO 23**

**By Councillor Nicolson for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question**

As a Council we have previously recognised the extreme difficulties caused for some residents as a result of flooding following major rainfall events, something we are seeing happen more frequently as a result of climate changes. One practical issue which has emerged is the supply of sandbags at appropriate times for some elderly or disabled residents who cannot collect them in person from fire service stations, as is the current practice.

What solutions to this would the Convener suggest that can be implemented effectively ahead of the winter season?

**Answer**

There can be no doubt that Climate Change is resulting in an increased frequency of short, intense rainfall events which often lead to surface water flooding in the city.

Recent years have shown these can happen during summer or winter seasons. During a flood event, Council Officers work hard to prioritise collective measures to reduce the risk of flooding to large numbers of homes, such as closing flood gates, clearing culvert grilles, and erecting barriers when required.

I have spoken to two groups of residents this month who are facing flood risk – one community is recognised as being at “high” risk of surface flooding by SEPA. For them, this really is a “Climate Emergency”. I can assure you they are not interested in free sandbags, they want the Council to take steps to reduce and manage runoff in partnership with Scottish Water. They recognise, however, that SNP/Green Government cuts to Edinburgh’s budget make this increasingly difficult. I would welcome discussions with all political groups on this issue ahead on the 2023/24 budget process.

Additionally, many other residents are concerned about the amount of sewage being discharged to Edinburgh’s rivers

from Scottish Water's overloaded network during rainfall events. Indeed, it has been reported that Portobello Beach was found to be contaminated by sewage in July & August: <https://theferret.scot/sewage-pollution-scottish-beaches/>

Nonetheless, I would encourage all residents to understand their own flood risk (check the SEPA flood map here: <https://map.sepa.org.uk/floodmaps>) and to prepare accordingly using the Council's advice: <https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/flooding>

This may involve enlisting help from friends, family or neighbours where sandbags are required. These should be collected from fire stations in advance of heavy rain. However, whilst a lack of funding means it is not possible to commit to individual deliveries of sandbags to homes, if individual residents have no alternative support available to them, I will ask that Council officers endeavour to assist where sufficient notice is given, and consider the proactive issue of synthetic sandbags where people have mobility issues. Ahead of this winter season, I will ensure the Council will use various sources of communication to inform residents of the support available, being mindful that not everyone has access to the internet or social media.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you for the response to my question Convener, it didn't really answer my question. I note that you say there's a funding shortfall preventing us from providing sandbags to those who have no way of collecting them, could you explain how much this would cost, define what is meant by a lack of funding and tell me how you established that a shortfall exists?

**Supplementary Answer**

There will be a budget position reported to the next Transport Committee but that'll be looking back, going forward next year we're expecting a £60m-£70m cut to the council's budget, I mean that's what we're facing so I get that people want the Council to do more but to do more in some aspects we have to do much less in others and that's where we are at. This is a really important issue and I do make clear Councillor Nicholson in my response that if people do need the support I will try my best to make sure the Council

does provide it, I do say that towards the bottom of my reply and that's absolutely genuine.

I think you're in the same ward as Councillor Osler and I was speaking to her this week about the issues in your ward because I've got very similar issues in my own ward and I think what we're thinking of doing is bringing together some sort of summit because I think there's lots of Councillors have got issues and concerns around this, they want better advice from Scottish Water in terms of what they're doing but they also want their MSPs to engage in that process as well because people don't always feel that some of the MSPs are fully engaged in this arena.

So there's a suggestion that we will run this summit, will bring all these parties together, we'll figure out what the issues in Edinburgh are and we'll see what we can do about them, but the funding will be distributed inside the council but I think if we work together with these other partners let's hope we can make some progress, in your ward, in my ward and in all others where we face problems in the city, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 24**

**By Councillor McFarlane for answer  
by the Leader of the Council at a  
meeting of the Council on 22  
September 2022**

**Question** (1) What assurances has the Leader had from BT about the removal of the unnecessary street clutter represented by redundant BT phone boxes?

**Answer** (1) I met with BT in July. BT confirmed they are removing the obsolete phone boxes. Others have been used to frequently make emergency calls and will remain while planning applications have been submitted to convert others to BT Plus points.

**Question** (2) By what deadline does he expect the work to have been undertaken?

**Answer** (2) Council officers have been in on-going discussions with BT on this issue and an agreement is being sought. BT have a legal duty to provide payphone coverage and their view is that phone boxes are not redundant and are required meet demand and to support household WIFI infrastructure.

Officers are investigating all channels that will allow partnership working with BT to improve the appearance of phone boxes and encourage rationalisation of assets on street.

I have contacted BT to provide me with an update including timescales.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thanks to the Council Leader for his initial answers. I would just like to ask what specifically he sees as the relationship between BT's plans to introduce Hubs, Street Hubs, and with their entirely separate roll out work of removing the redundant phone boxes is, what exactly is that relationship in his eyes?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Can I thank Councillor McFarlane for his supplementary. I've had a further discussion with BT Scotland this week and have agreed to meet them every three months to progress on these issues. The applications for changing some of these BT phone boxes into BT hubs' is a planning issue which I can't interfere with and I hope some of them do transform them to these new BT hubs because they also provide free calls, free w-fi, and in hotspots where there's a lower service requirement across the city. There were 55 jobs identified and they have all been done apart from 13 but I'm happy to follow these up with BT and go back to Councillor McFarlane for an update.

**QUESTION NO 25**

**By Councillor Aston for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 22 September 2022**

**Question**

- (1) Given the impact of winter conditions on the city's transport, roads and infrastructure, what actions has the Transport and Environment Convener taken to ensure that the winter maintenance programme is being prepared effectively and what further actions does he plan to take between now and the beginning of the winter?

**Answer**

- (1) I recognise that residents are concerned that insufficient roads and footpaths are treated in response to cold weather, and this can result in increased hospital admissions.

Whilst the Edinburgh's Administration aspires to increase funding to this service as part of the 2023/24 budget, residents understand that this will be challenging given the scale of the cuts the SNP/Green Government are inflicting on Edinburgh.

In terms of winter 2022/23, the Roads Operations team are preparing a Winter Readiness Bulletin for elected members, and will issue this to coincide with October's Transport and Environment Committee.

If desired, a presentation for Elected Members on the winter maintenance plan can be arranged at Bankhead Roads Depot.