

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 31 August 2023

Present:

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Robert Aldridge

COUNCILLORS

Scott Arthur
Danny Aston
Jule Bandel
Alan C Beal
Fiona Bennett
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 Dixon
Stuart Dobbin
Phil Duggart
Katrina Faccenda
Pauline Flannery
Catherine Fullerton
Neil Gardiner
Fiona Glasgow
Margaret A Graham
Joan Griffiths
Dan Heap
Euan Hyslop
Stephen P Jenkinson
Tim Jones

David Key
Simita Kumar
Kevin Lang
Lesley Macinnes
Martha Mattos Coelho
Finlay McFarlane
Ross McKenzie
Amy McNeese-Mechan
Jane E Meagher
Claire Miller
Max Mitchell
Jo Mowat
Alys Mumford
Marie-Clair Munro
Vicky Nicolson
Adam Nols-McVey
Hal Osler
Ben Parker
Tim Pogson
Susan Rae
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 Emergency Motion by Councillor Cowdy – Josh Kerr

The Lord Provost ruled that the emergency motion submitted by Councillor Cowdy in terms of Standing Order 17 not be considered as a matter of urgency and submitted to the next meeting of the Council for consideration.

2 Point of Order – Standing Order 22.15 (40 Minute Rule)

Motion

To suspend Standing Order 22.15 (40 minute rule) during consideration of Item 7.1 on the Agenda (Religious Representatives – Voting Rights).

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Rust

Amendment

To not suspend Standing Order 22.15 (40 minute rule) during consideration of Item 7.1 on the Agenda (Religious Representatives – Voting Rights).

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Nols-McVey

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (to suspend Standing order 22.15)	-	13 votes
For the amendment (not to suspend Standing Order 22.15)	-	48 votes
Abstentions	-	1

(For the motion (to suspend Standing order 22.15): Councillors Arthur, Bruce, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Doggart, Graham, Jenkinson, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.

For the amendment (not to suspend Standing Order 22.15): Lord Provost, Councillors Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Campbell, Dagleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, ,Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McKenzie, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie.

Abstentions: Councillor Faccenda.)

Decision

To approve the amendment not to suspend Standing Order 22.15 and that the 40 minute rule would apply.

3 Deputations

**a) School Pupils for St Peter's RC Primary School and St Thomas of Aquins RC High School
(in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives – Voting Rights)**

The deputation disagreed with the proposal to remove the vote for religious representatives on the Education, Children and Families Committee and indicated that they felt privileged to be able to attend a school that had pupils from a wide range of faiths. They felt that there had been no reasonable explanation as to why the vote should be removed and that having the right to vote was crucial as it enabled individuals on the Committee to have a say in matters that could affect them.

The deputation stressed that denying the votes to religious representatives diminished the significance of the catholic community's voice and it was therefore essential to ensure fair representation on the Council.

(see item 7 below)

**b) Church of Scotland
(in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives – Voting Rights)**

The deputation indicated that faith communities in the city covered a wide range of people and communities who had had a long interest in, and involvement with, the education of young people which was something that they had cherished and appreciated. They felt that it was a privilege that was deeply valued as a sign that the contribution faith communities had made, were making and would make was not only respected and trusted, but also valued by the city.

The deputation stressed that their perception was that this was not a voting rights issue that was underlying here but the place of religious representation in its entirety across the church. They felt that to remove representation altogether. was likely to damage significantly the relationship and respect, which they believed was important on several ecumenical and interfaith fronts across the city.

(see item 7 below)

**c) The Archdiocese of St Andrews and Edinburgh
(in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives –
Voting Rights)**

The deputation indicated that church representatives had had the right to vote in Council until now and had remained a remarked and unremarkable for many years because it was an expression of democracy. They felt that our democracy had found various solutions in its search for participative government. and they believed that church representatives vote as an example of that, and it's a good one.

The deputation stressed the presence or voting of church representatives in Council had not given any motive for concern that they were aware of and that their schools had been entrusted to the Council for the benefit of a portion of the community. They felt that it was only right and just that they retained not a veto, not a special voice, not special treatment, but simply an active voice in Council over the governance of part of their heritage that was presently in the care of the Council.

(see item 7 below)

**d) Edinburgh Interfaith Association
(in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives –
Voting Rights)**

The deputation were very concerned at the plan to take away the voting rights of faith community representatives on the 'Education, Children and Families Committee and were concerned to promote respect and understanding for the different faith groups and their contributions to Edinburgh. They indicated that no faith representative would want to be on the committee unless they were a full member with voting rights.

The deputation stressed that faith communities all made a significant contribution to the city including through charitable work and felt that through this latest proposal there was an attempt to devalue the importance, value and significance of the faith communities and to take some of their rights away.

(see item 7 below)

**e) Edinburgh Sikh Community
(in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives –
Voting Rights)**

The deputation were concerned about the possibility that the religious voting rights from the Education Board in Edinburgh may be removed. They

indicated that across Edinburgh many families, including many families from the Sikh community chose to send their children to faith schools as they believed their children would benefit from the moral values taught in faith schools as they were similar to their own beliefs and faith.

They felt that to deprive Faith Representatives of voting rights on the 'Education, Children and Families Committee' where they sat on behalf of parents, children and young people, cast into serious doubt the commitment of some of the elected representatives to the future of faith schools in Edinburgh and urged the Council to support the request that these voting rights be retained.

(see item 7 below)

**f) Muslim Community
(in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives – Voting Rights)**

The deputation urged the Council for the preservation of what they felt was a cornerstone of the democratic process as they served as the conduit through which a tapestry of diverse voices, including those rooted in religious beliefs, collectively contributed to shaping the educational landscape of the city.

They indicated that they championed values of respect, inclusivity, and understanding and acknowledged that approximately half of Scotland's population shared this recognition of religion's pivotal role in their lives—an intricate source of ethical guidance, moral compass, and an essential framework for navigating the intricacies of existence. This commitment to their beliefs existed harmoniously alongside their active participation in secular society and relentless pursuit of prosperity.

The deputation urged the Council to thoughtfully weigh the potential consequences of a decision that might inadvertently marginalise the voices of faith communities and retain the role of faith representatives as advocates for parents, children, and young individuals, thereby contributing to a comprehensive and enriching educational experience.

(see item 7 below)

**g) Scottish Hindu Foundation
(in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives – Voting Rights)**

The deputation expressed concern at the proposal to deprive faith representatives of voting rights on the Education, Children and Families Committee. They indicated that the Hindu community valued education

deeply and placed great importance on nurturing the spiritual and cultural aspects of our children's development and that the participation of faith representatives in committee decisions was essential for safeguarding the rights and interests of parents, children, and young people who were part of faith-based schools.

The deputation urged the Council to retain the voting rights for religious representatives on the Education, Children and Families Committee.

(see item 7 below)

h) The Archdiocese of St Andrews and Edinburgh – Church Representative (in relation to item 7.1 on the agenda – Religious Representatives – Voting Rights)

The deputation indicated that, as the church representative for the Diocese of St Andrews and Edinburgh, the role was to ensure that the faith community had a say in decisions which affected their schools, and removing the right to vote meant this could not be done effectively.

The deputation urged the Council to listen to their constituents who were speaking out loudly and clearly to retain the voting rights.

(see item 7 below)

i) UNISON (in relation to Items 7.3 and 7.4 on the agenda –

Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes Capital Works – Corporate Leadership Team Urgency Decision – Report by the Interim Chief Officer, Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership

Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes – Transfer Update - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee)

The deputation thanked the lead officer for the smooth transfer of staff and premises which had provided a more enlightened way of working, a workforce that would go above and beyond for their new employer. They indicated that this hands-on approach had not just given a new motivation to staff, but had revitalised residents and given their families confidence that their loved ones were now being better looked after which they felt had been a real achievement.

The deputation felt that, regardless of costs, investment in these properties would be a real boon for the city which could provide older people with a safe and comfortable environment to live in but also stressed that there was a

problem recruiting in this area. They urged the Council to ensure that their employees were properly and meaningfully supported during this difficult time.

(see items 9 and 10 below)

**j) Keep Edinburgh Childcare 4 All
(in relation to item 8.1 on the agenda – Motion by Councillor Griffiths –
Childcare 4 All)**

The deputation indicated that they had been advised at the beginning of the month that the funds that were enabling children to go to after-school care was being taken away. They had tried to challenge this decision as they knew how important this fund was and presented a petition to the Lord Provost.

The deputation asked the Council to respect the special children, with fairness and dignity, and respect that their help and support looked different to that of other children. They stressed that it wasn't something that they should have to fight for or should be grateful for. They urged the Council to listen to children and young people who were also their constituents and to families who were advocating for them and protect this vital service, not just for their children, but for the children that would follow them and really benefit from the support that was available.

(see item 16 below)

**k) Maryhill Integration Network
(in relation to item 8.7 on the agenda – Motion by Councillor Mattos
Coelho - Employment Support for Refugees)**

The deputation indicated that they had been campaigning for the Right to Work for people seeking asylum in our communities and had been a member of the Lift the Ban coalition since 2019. They recognised and understood the significance of providing the right to work for people seeking asylum which would allow people to become part of the community, use their skills, contribute to the economy and pay their taxes. They stressed that having the Right to Work would have a positive impact for people seeking asylum, for the community and for society.

(see item 22 below)

4 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 22 June 2023 as a correct record.

5 Leader's Report

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

- Short Term Lets Legislation
- Edinburgh Festival - success
- Brunstane Primary School update
- Filmhouse Edinburgh Ltd
- Review Group – Slavery and Colonialism
- Ukraine Independence Day
- Congratulations – Councillor Nols-McVey

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Nols-McVey	-	Risk assessment of schools and displacement of pupils
Councillor Lang	-	Short Term Lets Licensing
Councillor Rae	-	Short Term Lets Licensing – Scottish Government
Councillor Whyte	-	Street cleanliness
Councillor McKenzie	-	Short Term Lets Licensing
Councillor Jenkinson	-	Fair Pay Award – Strikes in schools
Councillor Campbell	-	Pay Award
Councillor Ross	-	Short Term Lets Licensing - applications
Councillor Parker	-	Portraits of Charles Windsor to hang in public buildings - costs
Councillor Bruce	-	Noise levels at music events at Ingliston showground
Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron	-	Organ donation week

Councillor Dobbin	-	Housing crisis – affordable homes pipeline, council build programme and increase in void property numbers
Councillor Dijkstra-Downie	-	Low emissions zone in Glasgow – legal challenge – minimum standards
Councillor Bandel	-	Edinburgh Military Tattoo – fly past
Councillor Cowdy	-	City fibre project – suspension of fibre network rollout
Councillor Nicolson	-	Welfare Benefit advice - access
Councillor Davidson	-	International Overdose Prevention Day – overdose prevention centre
Councillor Mumford	-	Childcare 4 All – lack of communications
Councillor Aston	-	Freeport, Budget, Short Term Lets and Leadership
Councillor Faccenda	-	Chilean Community – extending solidarity for those involved
Councillor Gardiner	-	DM Sub – financial costs of running recent planning hearing
Councillor McFarlane		Taking festivals into schools - continued funding

6 Appointment to Committees etc

Decision

- 1) To appoint Councillor Kumar to the Committee on Pupil Student Support in place of Councillor Key.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Glasgow to the Consultative Committee with Parents in place of Councillor Key.
- 3) To appoint Councillor Hyslop to the Gaelic Implementation Steering Group in place of Councillor Key.

7 Religious Representative – Voting Rights

Details were provided on the outcome of discussions which had taken place with the faith community and other stakeholders which had resulted in an Integrated Impact Assessment being carried out on the removal of voting rights for religious representatives.

The Council had heard several deputations on this issue (see items 3(a) – 3 (h) above).

Motion

Council notes the report from the Education, Children and Families Committee.

Council agrees that no decision on changing the status of religious representatives on the Education Committee should be made until such time as the Scottish Government either issues clear guidance to local authorities or makes any changes to education legislation.

Council agrees to reconsider this issue when the Scottish Government clarifies its position.

- moved by Councillor Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Jenkinson

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the integrated impact assessment.
- 2) welcomes the contribution made by religious representatives to relevant discussion on the Education, Children and Families Committee, as it does for parent representatives.
- 3) notes that the review of committee decisions over 2021-2023 showed only three instances of religious representatives voting on motions, none of which related to religious matters in education.
- 4) believes that those deciding on council policy should be elected by the public to ensure democratic accountability and representation, and that this extends to decisions taken by the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 5) agrees that voting rights be solely reserved to elected councillors serving on the Education, Children and Families Committee.
- 6) therefore agrees to amend the Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions by adding in Part B at the end of 3.1.6 the words “(non-voting)”.

- 7) agrees that officers should review the ways religious representatives can engage with officers and elected members in advance of committee meetings in order to facilitate greater discussion on priority educational issues, and agrees that the outcome of this review should be reported back to the committee.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Kumar

Amendment 2

Council;

- 1) Notes the consultation and impact assessment report on religious representative voting rights;
- 2) Believes that those who take decisions over council Education services should be those who have been elected by the voters of Edinburgh and who are directly accountable to those voters;
- 3) Notes from the integrated impact assessment that whilst there have been no issues of religious education before the Education, Children & Families committee in recent times, religious representatives have voted several times on non-religious matters;
- 4) Notes that religious representatives would continue to have places on the Education committee and be able to take an active part in discussion and decision making – something not open to other education stakeholder groups;
- 5) Therefore, agrees that in future voting on matters before the Education, Children and Families committee should be carried out by elected members only and requests that committee services actions this change in council standing orders.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Rae

Amendment 3

Council notes the Report by the Executive Director of Children, Education and Justice Services and accompanying Equality Impact Assessment and agrees to maintain the current position which is to retain the Voting Rights for Religious Representatives.

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Munro

At this point in the proceedings, Amendment 2 was withdrawn.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	12 votes
For Amendment 1	-	40 votes
For Amendment 3	-	9 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Arthur, Lezley Marion Cameron, Dalglish, Day, Faccenda, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Meagher, Pogson, Walker and Watt.

For Amendment 1: Lord Provost, Councillors Aston, Bandel, Beal, Biagi, Bennett, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Campbell, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, McVey, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Osler, Parker, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Work, and Younie.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Lang.

(References – Act of Council No 4 of 2 May 2019; Act of Council No 7 of 30 May 2019; Act of Council No 1 of 22 August 2019; report by the Executive Director of Children, Education and Justice Services, submitted)

Declaration of Interests

The Lord Provost made a transparency statement as a Trustee of the Edinburgh Interfaith Association.

Councillor Beal made a transparency statement as a member of the Church of serving on a voluntary work team with one of the existing religious representatives.

Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron and Graham made transparency statements as members of the Church of Scotland.

Councillors McFarlane and Munro made transparency statements as members of the Archdiocese of St Andrews and Edinburgh.

Councillor Ross made a transparency statement as a member and elder of the Church of Scotland.

Councillor Jones made a transparency statement as a members of the Scottish Episcopalian Church

Councillor Young declared a financial interest as a celebrant of the Humanist Society of Scotland and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

8 Rolling Actions Log – May 2015 – June 2023

Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:
 - **Action 1(b)** – Added Members and Voting Rights on the Education, Children and Families Committee – Legal Opinion
 - **Action 2** - Added Members and Voting Rights on the Education, Children and Families Committee
 - **Action 4** - Champion Roles - Motion by Councillor Fullerton
 - **Action 6** - Motion by Councillor Nicolson – Self-Directed Support
 - **Action 7** - Appointment to Working Groups
 - **Action 8** - Decision Making Framework 2023
 - **Action 9** - Drumbrae Care Home
 - **Action 10** - Drug and Alcohol Recovery Services in Niddrie and Craigmillar - Motion by Councillor Campbell
 - **Action 11** – Drumbrae Care Home - Status Report
 - **Action 12** - Improving the Budget Process – Motion by Councillor Staniforth
 - **Action 13** - Charging for Visitor Access to St Giles' Cathedral
 - **Action 14** - Tourism Tax – Motion by Councillor Day
 - **Action 15** - Heathervale Care Home Service – Motion by Councillor Key
 - **Action 16** - Special Needs Swimming Sessions in Braidburn School Pool - Emergency Motion by Councillor Arthur
 - **Action 17(2)** – Scheme of Delegation

- **Action 20** - Consideration of Private Business – Motion by Councillor Lang
- **Action 21** - EDI Training – Motion by Councillor Kumar
- **Action 22** - Lifelong Learning Review – Motion by Councillor Campbell
- **Action 23** - Heathervale Children’s House
- **Action 24** - Family Swim Sessions in Braidburn Pool

2) To otherwise note the remaining outstanding actions.

(Reference: Rolling Actions Log – May 2015 – June 2023, submitted)

9 Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes Capital Works – Corporate Leadership Team Urgency Decision

Details were provided on a decision of the Corporate Leadership Team to progress capital works in Castlegreen and North Merchiston care homes under urgency.

The Council had heard a deputation from UNISON on this issue (see item 3(i) above).

Motion

To note the urgency decision made by the Council corporate Leadership Team to progress urgent capital works at Castlegreen and North Merchiston care homes, which were transferred from Four Seasons Healthcare to the City of Edinburgh Council on 22 May 2023, and were being managed through the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.

- moved by Councillor Watt, seconded by Councillor Pogson

Amendment

- 1) To note the urgency decision made by the Council corporate Leadership Team to progress urgent capital works at Castlegreen and North Merchiston care homes, which were transferred from Four Seasons Healthcare to the City of Edinburgh Council on 22 May 2023, and were being managed through the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.
- 2) Thanks employees at Castlegreen and North Merchiston care homes for their work and their commitment to residents, and reaffirms the terms agreed with them during the process to transfer both care homes into the Council.

- 3) Thanks officers for preparing and circulating a confidential briefing note to the Policy and Sustainability Committee members after questions were raised regarding visa sponsorship which could not be fully discussed in public session at the committee meeting on 22 August.
- 4) Notes that a number of issues regarding the Council's policy on visa sponsorship remain outstanding and asks that the upcoming report to Policy & Sustainability Committee include:
 - a) Detailed information on the number of Council employees by visa status, noting any gaps or uncertainty in our information.
 - b) Details of any current support and/or signposting provided to our employees regarding visas, and consideration of how support might be provided to any employee concerned about visa related issues.
 - c) Noting the challenging recruitment environment, in particular within the care sector, consideration of options and approaches towards international recruitment and visa sponsorship.
 - d) In relation to private sector providers commissioned by the Council, a summary of their visa sponsorship policies and any conditions or standards set by the Council regarding their support or treatment of employees with visas.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor McKenzie

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 Watt:

- 1) To note the urgency decision made by the Council corporate Leadership Team to progress urgent capital works at Castlegreen and North Merchiston care homes, which were transferred from Four Seasons Healthcare to the City of Edinburgh Council on 22 May 2023, and were being managed through the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.
- 2) To thank employees at Castlegreen and North Merchiston care homes for their work and their commitment to residents, and reaffirm the terms agreed with them during the process to transfer both care homes into the Council.
- 3) To thank officers for preparing and circulating a confidential briefing note to the Policy and Sustainability Committee members after questions were raised

regarding visa sponsorship which could not be fully discussed in public session at the committee meeting on 22 August.

- 4) To note that a number of issues regarding the Council's policy on visa sponsorship remained outstanding and ask that the upcoming report to Policy and Sustainability Committee include:
 - a) Detailed information on the number of Council employees by visa status, noting any gaps or uncertainty in our information.
 - b) Details of any current support and/or signposting provided to our employees regarding visas, and consideration of how support might be provided to any employee concerned about visa related issues.
 - c) Noting the challenging recruitment environment, in particular within the care sector, consideration of options and approaches towards international recruitment and visa sponsorship.
 - d) In relation to private sector providers commissioned by the Council, a summary of their visa sponsorship policies and any conditions or standards set by the Council regarding their support or treatment of employees with visas.

(References: report by the Interim Chief Officer, Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership, submitted)

10 Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes – Transfer Update - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report on the on the current position with the Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes which were transferred from Four Seasons Healthcare (FSHC) to the City of Edinburgh Council on the 22 May 2023, and managed by Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership, to the Council for decision.

The Council had heard a deputation from UNISON on this issue (see item 3(i) above).

Motion

- 1) To note the report by the Interim Chief Officer, Edinburgh /health and Social Care Partnership and the latest position of the Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes, which were transferred from Four Seasons Healthcare to the City of Edinburgh Council on 22 May 2023, and were being managed through the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.

- 2) To note the update associated with the request to highlight any challenges associated with the presumption of the care homes being maintained internally.
- 3) To note the progress made on pursuing funding associated with dilapidations, under and overpayment.

- moved by Councillor Watt, seconded by Councillor Pogson

Amendment

- 1) To note the report by the Interim Chief Officer, Edinburgh /health and Social Care Partnership and the latest position of the Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes, which were transferred from Four Seasons Healthcare to the City of Edinburgh Council on 22 May 2023, and were being managed through the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.
- 2) To note the update associated with the request to highlight any challenges associated with the presumption of the care homes being maintained internally.
- 3) To note the progress made on pursuing funding associated with dilapidations, under and overpayment and requests that the upcoming report to the Finance and Resources Committee will include a detailed explanation of the difference between the overpayment amount reported to members in previous reports and briefings versus £87k which has been agreed and paid to the Council.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

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 Watt:

- 1) To note the report by the Interim Chief Officer, Edinburgh /health and Social Care Partnership and the latest position of the Castlegreen and North Merchiston Care Homes, which were transferred from Four Seasons Healthcare to the City of Edinburgh Council on 22 May 2023, and were being managed through the Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership.
- 2) To note the update associated with the request to highlight any challenges associated with the presumption of the care homes being maintained internally.

- 3) To note the progress made on pursuing funding associated with dilapidations, under and overpayment and requests that the upcoming report to the Finance and Resources Committee will include a detailed explanation of the difference between the overpayment amount reported to members in previous reports and briefings versus £87k which has been agreed and paid to the Council.

(References: Policy and Sustainability Committee of 22 August 2023 (item 12); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

11 Response to Critical Risk Motion

In response to a motion by Councillor Mowat, details were provided on the City of Edinburgh Council's response to the critical risk categories (Workforce and Service Delivery) as reported to the Governance Risk and Best value Committee on 2 May 2023.

Motion

To note the response to the motion on Critical Risks (16) raised at the meeting of Full Council on 1 June 2023.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Pogson

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the response to the motion on Critical Risks (16) raised at the meeting of Full Council on 1 June 2023.
- 2) Council thanks Officers for the Report and notes that the plan is focussed on a strategic response to recruitment challenges with references to the refreshed People and Workforce Strategic Workforce Plan for 2024 – 2029 and, whilst recognising this will form part of the solution, is concerned that any actions will only deliver over the long term.
- 3) Council recognises that a critical risk requires immediate actions to provide mitigation and risk reduction and asks officers to detail what work is ongoing to reduce the pressures on staff in the short term, this being the purpose of asking Councillors to exercise restraint in their questions and motions to officers.

- 4) Council agrees that, given there is little evidence of such restraint by Councillors to date, officers should prepare a report for the next Full council detailing how much officer time is taken in responding to questions from Councillors and how many additional reports have had to be prepared in response to motions.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the response to the motion on Critical Risks (16) raised at the meeting of Full Council on 1 June 2023.
- 2) Council thanks Officers for the Report and notes that the plan is focussed on a strategic response to recruitment challenges with references to the refreshed People and Workforce Strategic Workforce Plan for 2024 – 2029 and, whilst recognising this will form part of the solution, is concerned that any actions will only deliver over the long term.
- 3) Council recognises that a critical risk requires immediate actions to provide mitigation and risk reduction and asks officers to detail what work is ongoing to reduce the pressures on staff in the short term, and that details of how much officer time is taken responding to questions from Councillors be provided in the next risk report to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.

- moved by Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Nols-McVey

Decision

To approve Amendment 2 by Councillor Campbell.

(References: Act of Council No 16 of 1 June 2023; report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, submitted.)

12 The Edinburgh Award

Details were provided on the nomination criteria for the Edinburgh Award which had been reviewed by the Panel chaired by the Lord Provost and proposed the extension of the pool of potential awardees by including individuals who had ‘a substantial association with Edinburgh’.

Motion

To agree the amendment to the Edinburgh Award nomination criteria as set out in paragraph 4.5 in the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Amendment

- 1) To agree the amendment to the Edinburgh Award nomination criteria as set out in paragraph 4.5 in the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) Revises the membership of the award panel to be chaired by the Lord Provost and made up of the Leader of each political group on the Council, or their substitute, as well as the Chief Executive of the Chamber of Commerce and the Chief Executive of the Edinburgh Voluntary Organisation Council.
- 3) Notes the severe gender imbalance and overall diversity deficit of previous Edinburgh Award Winners and therefore adds criteria that:

“The Edinburgh Award Panel pay due consideration to the diversity of the present makeup Edinburgh Award Alumni as part of the criteria when considering future recipients, including but not limited to the gender of the previous year’s winner.”

- moved by Councillor McFarlane, seconded by Councillor Work

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	34 votes
For the amendment	-	27 votes
Abstentions	-	1

(For the Motion: Lord Provost, Councillors. Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 2 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.

Abstentions: Councillor McKenzie.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by the Lord Provost:

- 1) To agree the amendment to the Edinburgh Award nomination criteria as set out in paragraph 4.5 in the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 2) To note the severe gender imbalance and overall diversity deficit of previous Edinburgh Award Winners and therefore adds criteria that:

“The Edinburgh Award Panel pay due consideration to the diversity of the present makeup Edinburgh Award Alumni as part of the criteria when considering future recipients, including but not limited to the gender of the previous year’s winner.”

(Reference: report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, submitted.)

13 Lauriston Castle Trust – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had a referred a report on the approach of applying to the Court of Session to use the *nobile officium* to approve the winding up of the Lauriston Castle Trust and the transfer of assets to the council to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval.

Decision

To agree to the approach of applying to the Court of Session to use the *nobile officium* to approve the winding up of the Lauriston Castle Trust and the transfer of assets to the council.

(References: Finance and Resources Committee of 20 June 2023 (item 41); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.).

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Staniforth declared a financial interest as a performer at Lauriston Castle and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

14 Update regarding Community Council Scheme and Boundary Review 2023 and Community Council Elections 2024

An update was provided on the Community Council Scheme and boundary review which was being progressed during 2023 and Community Council elections which were intended to occur in summer 2024 (unless a national election is announced for May 2024 in which case the Community Council elections would be rescheduled to later in the year).

Decision

- 1) To note the update and timescales for the Community Council Scheme and Boundary Review which had commenced and would progress throughout 2023.
- 2) To agree the timescale for Community Council elections to be held in 2024 and that this timescale could change if a national election was announced.

(Reference: report by the Executive Director of Corporate Service, submitted.)

15 Chief Officer Appointments

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

Details were provided on the outcome of the recruitment processes in respect of the roles of Chief Officer, Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership and Integration Joint Board and Service Director, Performance, Quality, Governance and Improvement and Chief Social Work Officer(CSWO)

Motion

- 1) To approve Pat Togher as the permanent appointment made by the IJB Recruitment Panel to the role of Chief Officer, Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership and Integration Joint Board.
- 2) To appoint Rose Howley to the role of Service Director, Performance, Quality, Governance and Improvement and Chief Social Work Officer.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

Amendment

- 1) To approve Pat Togher as the permanent appointment made by the IJB Recruitment Panel to the role of Chief Officer, Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership and Integration Joint Board.
- 2) To appoint Rose Howley to the role of Service Director, Performance, Quality, Governance and Improvement and Chief Social Work Officer.
- 3) Regrets that the Recruitment Committee were not afforded a choice of candidates and notes panel members raised concerns through the process about the limited options being progressed.
- 4) Notes the work being progressed in the refresh of People Strategy and requests this has an additional focus on succession within the Workforce Plan to enable internal applicants to be in a position to compete for senior roles and requests this work is prioritised by the Chief Executive.
- 5) Notes the Recruitment Committee has requested a review of the process of senior officer recruitment to ensure issues such as interviewing only 1 candidate is addressed and agrees this review will come to Council within 2 cycles.
- 6) Agrees to receive a briefing to elected members to provide assurance that the recruitment process is being applied fairly and consistently for all chief officer candidates.

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To approve Pat Togher as the permanent appointment made by the IJB Recruitment Panel to the role of Chief Officer, Edinburgh Health and Social Care Partnership and Integration Joint Board.
- 2) To appoint Rose Howley to the role of Service Director, Performance, Quality, Governance and Improvement and Chief Social Work Officer.

- 3) To note the work being progressed in the refresh of People Strategy and requests this had an additional focus on succession within the Workforce Plan to enable internal applicants to be in a position to compete for senior roles and request this work be prioritised by the Chief Executive.

(References: report by the Chief Executive, submitted.).

16 Childcare 4 All – Motion by Councillor Griffiths ASN Childcare Provision – Motion by Councillor Davidson After School Care Funding – Motion by Councillor Jones

Point of Order

Councillor Nols-McVey raised a point of Order under Standing Order 18.1, requesting that the members be allowed to refer to information provided in the confidential briefing note on this item which had been circulated to members at the start of the meeting.

The Lord Provost ruled that reference could not be made to information provided in the confidential briefing note.

Motions

Motions on the provision of After School Care Funding had been submitted by Councillors Griffiths, Davidson and Jones in terms of Standing Order 17.

The Council had heard a deputation from Keep Edinburgh Childcare 4 All and Edinburgh Community Climate Network (see item 3(j) above).

Motion

“Council:

Requests an urgent report on the needs of the families who were receiving support and how these needs can now be supported.”

- moved by Councillor Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 1

“Council: deletes all of the motion by Councillor Griffiths and replaces with:

Notes:

- 1) An operational decision was made to discontinue contract for providers of after school support for children with additional support needs.

- 2) Regret delay in communication with parents, carers, and families came approximately two weeks before new school term starts causing a lot of worry and stress for vulnerable families. Further regrets that elected members were not made aware of this decision in a timeous manner.
- 3) Some provision has been reinstated for pupils who were in receipt of support will now get this from Council in-house resource for the next year.

Agrees:

- 4) This is a vital service and makes a commitment to continue to provide this ASN support, both as one to one provision for individual children, and through capacity building for after school clubs and childcare providers for this financial year at the financial level provided in previous financial years.
- 5) All existing support arrangements will be honoured within the existing budget.
- 6) That the scheme will continue to be open to new applicants within existing budget.
- 7) That although this amount of spending falls within delegated authority for officers it is clearly of strategic importance for some of the most vulnerable children in the city and therefore is politically sensitive, and any future decision about funding of this scheme must be explicitly brought in front of councillors by a report to ECF committee.
- 8) To provide an update (verbally or in Business Bulletin) from the service director to next week's Education, Children and Families committee updating members on provision for affected families with a full report to come to the following meeting detailing:
 - a) Number of pupils impacted by the removal of this service (including new starts).
 - b) Outline of KPIs and outcomes detailed in service provider contracts and to explain how Council ensured that public funds delivered best value.
 - c) Detail of how decisions were made culminating into service withdrawal including a timeline and any engagement and support offered to service providers.
 - d) What assurances have parents, carers, and families received around continuity of support and alternative arrangements.
 - e) How this programme can be reinstated, including timelines to ensure provision is in place for all children and young people affected.

- f) To request what advice, training, and support is in place and will be shared with providers to enable them to offer a full service for all families.
 - g) Include a copy of equalities impact assessment.
 - h) Review of lessons learnt to protect future provisions.
- 9) Agrees to provide a further report to Governance, Risk and Best Value by the end of the year examining the various governance and best value issues surrounding this contract and the decision to end it.

- moved by Councillor Kumar, seconded by Councillor Campbell

Amendment 2

“Council

Notes that:

- 1) The contract with Capability Scotland for additional ASN after school care provision was ended by officers on 31 July due to concerns that it was not delivering value for money. This followed two previous contract extensions.
- 2) Despite repeated extensions to the contract due to limited information being provided no update was provided to members of the Education, Children and Families Committee before the decision to end the provision was taken.
- 3) At the point of the contract ending the council did not have a list of families in receipt of support via the contract therefore many of the service users were not notified before the decision to end the contract was taken.
- 4) That the decision to end this support represents a significant change in service delivery and therefore committee members should have been brought into the discussion before a decision was taken.
- 5) That families of children with ASN often face multiple challenges and have complex lives therefore any changes to services supporting them should be communicated clearly and efficiently.
- 6) That the council has a duty to ensure that taxpayers' money is being spent efficiently therefore external contracts should always be scrutinised regularly to ensure value for money

Therefore requests:

- 7) A verbal update from the service director to next week's Education, Children and Families committee updating members on provision for affected families with a full report to come to the following meeting.
- 8) A further report to Governance, Risk and Best Value by the end of the year examining the various governance and best value issues surrounding this contract and the decision to end it."

- moved by Councillor Davidson, seconded by Councillor Young

Amendment 3

"Council notes:

- The local authority entered into a contract with Capability Scotland in 2009 to support children with ASN (Additional Support Needs).
- The annual cost of this contract was £190,000.
- This contract was renewed every 3 years and the end date of the most recent contract was 31 March 2022
- The contract was extended to 30/06/23 and again to 31/07/23.
- The contract with Capability Scotland has not now been renewed and this has impacted adversely on a number of families.

Council regrets that those families affected only found out that the service is no longer available at a very late stage, leaving them unable to make alternative childcare arrangements in time for the beginning of the school year and causing great anxiety.

Council requests a Report in one cycle –

- 1) to explain why the contract with Capability Scotland was terminated and why officers took so long to inform families.
- 2) to explain how the monies allocated to Capability Scotland were spent over each three-year period from the start date of the contract being awarded.
- 3) to detail what specific outcomes were achieved from the funding allocated to Capability Scotland.
- 4) to explain how Council ensured that public funds delivered best value.
- 5) to recommend what actions Council can take to help families access alternative services to provide their childcare needs.

6) to request what advice, training, and support is in place and will be shared with providers to enable them to offer a full service for all families.”

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

Point of Order

At this stage in the proceedings, Councillor Jones apologised and withdrew his remarks regarding officers of the Council.

Following further discussions, the Motion by Councillor Griffiths, and Amendment 2 by Councillor Davidson were withdrawn.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For Amendment 1	-	53 votes
For Amendment 3	-	9 votes

(For Amendment 1: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, McVey, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie

For Amendment 3: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Duggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Kumar.

17 Co-operative Council – Motion by Councillor Day

The following motion by Councillor Day was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17 and verbally adjusted in terms of Standing Order 22(5):

“Council:

notes that the Co-operative Councils’ Innovation Network is a collaboration between local authorities who are committed to finding better ways of working for, and with, local people for the benefit of their local community.

Further notes that this is a non-party political association of likeminded local authorities focused on policy development, innovation and advocacy.

Understands that the network acts as vehicle for helping councils translate co-operative policy and principles into practice existing documentation; is funded by modest membership subscriptions from its member councils; is open to all UK Councils with a shared belief that working co-operatively with communities holds the key to tackling today's challenges; and is a Special Interest Group registered with the Local Government Association, to promote innovation in local government.

Council believes that as the lowest per head funded local authority in Scotland and at a time of reduced funding from the Scottish Government, that being a Co-operative Council would help maximise our impact to improve services for the residents and the city.

Council agrees to ask the Chief Executive to bring forward a report in two cycles with a detailed breakdown of the specific actions necessary to realise this aspiration. This report will include what actions will be necessary to:

- a) Ensure that future procurement practices confirm to the ethical commitments contained in the membership of the network and
- b) Align the priorities of the Council to those of the network, plus any other germane considerations.

Arrange for a briefing to elected members on the principles of the Co-operative Councils Innovation Network.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Day

- moved by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron, seconded by Councillor Dalgleish

Amendment 1

Delete all of the motion by Councillor Day and replace with:

“Notes that on the website of the Co-operative Councils’ Innovation Network it is clear that the City of Edinburgh Council is already listed as a full member.

Reaffirms support for its aims, in particular regarding community wealth building, and affirms support for maintaining the current position.”

- moved by Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Biagi

Amendment 2

Inserts in the motion by Councillor Day, after b)

“c) join the network in terms of costings and officer time. Should also include an estimate of any travel time and costs.”

- moved by Councillor Beal, seconded by Councillor Bennett

Amendment 3

Council agrees the motion by Councillor Day, subject to the following changes:

1) At the start inserts:

“Council notes that the City of Edinburgh Council joined the Co-operative Councils Network in 2016 and remains listed as a Full Member on the Network’s website.

2) In the fifth paragraph delete the words:

“agrees in a shared aspiration to become a Co-operative Council and”

as it is premature to make this commitment pending the detail of the report called for in that paragraph.

And adds at the end of the paragraph:

“c) the report should detail the current and projected costs of membership of the Network, the costs expended on membership since 2016 and outline the benefits achieved for Edinburgh residents at taxpayers’ expense since 2016, should any exist.”

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 3 and 3 were adjusted and accepted as addendums to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	44 votes
For Amendment 1	-	18 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Booth, Bruce, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalglish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham,

Griffiths, Heap, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, McKenzie, Meagher, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Mumford, Munro, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Rust, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 1: Councillors Aston, Biagi, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, McVey, Nicolson, and Work.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

- 1) To note that the Co-operative Councils' Innovation Network was a collaboration between local authorities who were committed to finding better ways of working for, and with, local people for the benefit of their local community.
- 2) To further note that this was a non-party political association of likeminded local authorities focused on policy development, innovation and advocacy.
- 3) To understand that the network acted as vehicle for helping councils translate co-operative policy and principles into practice existing documentation; was funded by modest membership subscriptions from its member councils; was open to all UK Councils with a shared belief that working co-operatively with communities held the key to tackling today's challenges; and was a Special Interest Group registered with the Local Government Association, to promote innovation in local government.
- 4) To believe that as the lowest per head funded local authority in Scotland and at a time of reduced funding from the Scottish Government, that being a Co-operative Council would help maximise the impact to improve services for the residents and the city.
- 5) To agree to ask the Chief Executive to bring forward a report in two cycles with a detailed breakdown of the specific actions necessary to realise this aspiration. This report would include what actions would be necessary to:
 - a) Ensure that future procurement practices confirm to the ethical commitments contained in the membership of the network and
 - b) Align the priorities of the Council to those of the network, plus any other germane considerations.
 - c) join the network in terms of costings and officer time. Should also include an estimate of any travel time and costs.

- d) the report should detail the current and projected costs of membership of the Network, the costs expended on membership since 2016 and outline the benefits achieved for Edinburgh residents at taxpayers' expense since 2016, should any exist.
- 6) To arrange for a briefing to elected members on the principles of the Co-operative Councils Innovation Network.

18 Edinburgh Leisure Must Pay the Real Living Wage – Motion by Councillor Campbell

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

“Notes that Edinburgh is a Living Wage City.

Further notes, with sadness, that Edinburgh Leisure, an arm's length external organisation (ALEO) of the council, is no longer paying the real living wage to all staff.

Council agrees that this is unacceptable and resolves to take action so that every member of staff working for an organisation owned by the council is paid at least the real living wage as agreed by the Living Wage Foundation.

Council therefore asks the Chief Executive to bring forward a proposed route by which the council can, as shareholder, instruct Edinburgh Leisure to pay the real living wage to all staff, backdated to the start of this financial year. This should be reported to the next Policy and Sustainability committee for ratification.

Council further instructs the chief executive to bring a report in two cycles to Policy and Sustainability which sets out the levers available to the council currently to ensure that all ALEOs pay the real living wage, and a plan for how this can be embedded in shareholder agreements as these are updated through the governance work being done on ALEO reform.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Campbell.

- moved by Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Kumar

Amendment 1

To add to the motion by Councillor Campbell:

“Council notes that, since May 2022, the Real Living Wage Foundation has accredited four Edinburgh Council ALEOS as Real Living Wage employers, namely Edinburgh Trams, Capital Theatres, Transport for Edinburgh, and Edinburgh International Conference Centre.

Further notes that as of August 2023, all but 2 of the Council’s ALEOs are accredited, one of which, Lothian Buses, does pay the living wage to its own staff but is in discussion with the Living Wage Foundation on potential future full accreditation.”

- moved by Councillor Meagher, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Amendment 2

To delete from “Council agrees” to the end of the motion by Councillor Campbell and insert:

“Council recognises how this decision was taken as a result of a major funding shortfall at Edinburgh Leisure, and concern at the cuts which would be required to services if the organisation paid the real living wage to all staff.

“Council notes the substantial shareholder representation on the Board of Edinburgh Leisure in the form of five elected councillors who, together with other Board members, are tasked each year with considering and agreeing the company’s pay structure and budget. Council believes it is best for it to use its influence on Edinburgh Leisure through this representation on the Board.

“Council requests a report to the December 2023 meeting of the Culture & Communities Committee which sets out:

- a) The additional funding which would be necessary to allow Edinburgh Leisure to pay the real living wage to all staff without impacting on service delivery.
- b) The detail of what services would need to be cut if Edinburgh Leisure was required to pay the living wage to all staff without any additional funding.”

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Thornley

Amendment 3

In the motion by Councillor Campbell:

- 1) After ‘backdated to the start of this financial year’ add:

“while ensuring that all venues remain open.”

2) after ‘ALEO reform’ add:

“Additionally, this report should set out the levers available to the council to ensure that ALEOs are in line with other key council commitments including those around equality and access, workers’ rights, and the climate and nature emergencies.”

- moved by Councillor Mumford, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

Amendment 4

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

“Council notes that Edinburgh is a Living Wage City and committed to paying the Scottish Local Government Living Wage as agreed by COSLA.

Further notes:

- That Edinburgh Leisure (EL), an Arm’s Length External Organisation (ALEO) of the council, is no longer paying the Real Living Wage (RLW) to all staff.
- That EL’s Board state an aspiration and desire to pay the Real Living Wage (RLW) and did pay the RLW in 2021/22 and 2022/23.
- The EL Board agreed a deficit budget of £736,000 for 2023/24 and a pay award of 4%. The full year cost of paying the RLW for 2023/24 is an additional £473K and would require a deficit budget of over £1m.
- The cost of paying the RLW for 1 year equates to closing three of the Victorian Swim Centres or substantial job losses.
- Paying the RLW is not a one-year liability and will require funding every year.

Council acknowledges:

- That EL’s annual funding from CEC has reduced year on year from 2015/16 to 2020/21 and has remained at the same level since 2021/22 to 2023/24 (excluding Covid support funding).
- To date there have been no reductions to services or closure of venues.
- The organisation is facing financial challenges from high energy costs, inflation, reduction in consumers’ disposable income, and changes in consumer behaviour.

That charges for the majority of EL’s services increased by circa 10% in 2023/24 but there was no increase to those services targeting low-income household and people experiencing health inequalities.

Council recognises that all employers are bound to pay the statutory minimum wage, that paying the Real Living Wage is a voluntary decision for employers, and that

Arm's Length External Organisations are, by definition, independent bodies that need to be in control of their own decision making, including terms of employment.

Council resolves to take action to help organisations, owned by the council, pay at least the Scottish Local Government living wage as agreed by COSLA.

Council therefore asks the Chief Executive to bring a report, in one cycle, to Policy and Sustainability Committee setting out:

- 1) How the Council could help Edinburgh Leisure pay at least the Scottish Local Government Living Wage to all staff without them suffering job losses or leading to cuts in services.
- 2) What impact this would have on future Council Revenue Budgets.
- 3) How these options could be funded.

Council further instructs the chief executive to bring a report in two cycles to Policy and Sustainability which sets out the levers available to the council currently to help ALEO's pay the Scottish Local Government Living Wage, and whether it would be feasible to embed these in shareholder agreements as these are updated through the governance work being done on ALEO reform. Together with the impact this would have on Future Council Revenue Budgets and how these options could be funded."

- moved by Councillor Cowdy, seconded by Councillor Bruce

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 1 and 3 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	39 votes
For Amendment 2	-	12 votes
For Amendment 4	-	9 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalgleish, Day, Dobbin, Faccenda, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Mechan, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Staniforth, Walker, Watt and Work.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Lord Provost, Councillors Beal, Bennett, Caldwell, Davidson, Flannery, Lang, Osler, Ross, Thornley, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 4: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Campbell:

- 1) To note that Edinburgh was a Living Wage City.
- 2) To further notes with sadness, that Edinburgh Leisure, an arm's length external organisation (ALEO) of the council, was no longer paying the real living wage to all staff.
- 3) To agree that this was unacceptable and resolve to take action so that every member of staff working for an organisation owned by the council was paid at least the real living wage as agreed by the Living Wage Foundation.
- 4) To therefore asks the Chief Executive to bring forward a proposed route by which the council could, as shareholder, instruct Edinburgh Leisure to pay the real living wage to all staff, backdated to the start of this financial year while ensuring that all venues remained open. This should be reported to the next Policy and Sustainability Committee for ratification.
- 5) To further instruct the Chief Executive to bring a report in two cycles to the Policy and Sustainability Committee which set out the levers available to the council currently to ensure that all ALEOs paid the real living wage, and a plan for how this could be embedded in shareholder agreements as these were updated through the governance work being done on ALEO reform. Additionally, this report should set out the levers available to the council to ensure that ALEOs were in line with other key council commitments including those around equality and access, workers' rights, and the climate and nature emergencies.
- 6) To note that, since May 2022, the Real Living Wage Foundation had accredited four Edinburgh Council ALEOS as Real Living Wage employers, namely Edinburgh Trams, Capital Theatres, Transport for Edinburgh, and Edinburgh International Conference Centre.
- 7) To further note that as of August 2023, all but 2 of the Council's ALEOs were accredited, one of which, Lothian Buses, did pay the living wage to its own staff but was in discussion with the Living Wage Foundation on potential future full accreditation.

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Dikstra-Downie and Dixon declared a non-financial interest as members of Edinburgh Leisure and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron made a transparency statement as a member of Edinburgh Leisure.

19 Council Tax – Motion by Councillor Lang

The following motion by Councillor Lang was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17 and verbally adjusted in terms of Standing Order 22(5):

“Council

- 1) notes that the SNP was first elected to government in 2007 on a pledge of ‘scrapping the unfair council tax’ but, 16 years on and despite holding a working majority in the Scottish Parliament for over half of its time in office, it has failed to deliver on this promise.
- 2) notes the new consultation from the SNP / Green coalition government on changes which, rather than scrapping council tax, would further embed council tax through an increase on bands E-H.
- 3) notes that, if implemented, people living in four in ten households in Edinburgh would see a rise in their council tax bills, some by as much as £800 every year.
- 4) notes how national policy means Edinburgh would only retain 55% of the additional money raised from these changes and that further ongoing cuts to the Council’s central grant means Edinburgh is unlikely to be any better off financially.
- 5) therefore calls on SNP and Green Party Ministers to scrap their proposals and instead respect the important role of local councils in delivering key services by ruling out any further cuts to local council grant funding, and begin a process of reversing the cuts they have chosen to impose on Edinburgh and other councils over recent years.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Younie

Amendment 1

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

“Notes that the Liberal Democrats, alongside their Conservative coalition partners who formed the UK government in 2010, were the architects of austerity which continues to this day.

Notes that on July 9th 2023 the UK Labour Party has pledged to continue the Conservative party’s spending plans offering Edinburgh no hope to reverse this damage while staying within the UK.

Recognises that the Liberal Democrat Edinburgh Council budget has resulted in some of the worst cuts this Council has ever seen including cuts to education welfare officers, as agreed by the administration parties, and stealth cuts like the reduction in support for disabled children and young people.

Agrees the Council Leader should use his leverage with his Conservative and Labour colleagues to call for an end to austerity at Westminster which is the single biggest determinant of how much money can be spent on public services in Scotland, until Scotland becomes an independent country.”

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor Campbell

Amendment 2

Deletes all and replaces with:

- 1) Notes that the SNP was first elected to government in 2007 on a pledge of ‘scrapping the unfair council tax’, and believes that this should remain a goal for all political parties;
- 2) Believes that Council Tax is regressive, and supports its replacement with a new residential property tax that is related to actual value rather than outdated valuations;
- 3) Notes that work is underway, both nationally through the *Joint Working Group on Sources of Local Government Funding and Council Tax Reform* and within Edinburgh Council following a Green amendment at Finance & Resources Committee, to explore alternatives to Council Tax as well as immediate changes which can achieve improvements in the shorter term;
- 4) Nevertheless, believes that all possible opportunities should be taken to redistribute wealth within the city and that the joint consultation from the Scottish Government and CoSLA on Fairer Council Tax represents one such opportunity to tackle inequality and redistribute wealth for the good of

everyone in Edinburgh by proposing increases in Council Tax payable by those in the most valuable properties;

- 5) Notes that there are options available to people to challenge and mitigate increases where there is good reason, including revaluation requests, reductions and exemptions, and notes that, as above, options are being explored for mitigations at a local level too, and encourages all Parties to engage with this in the run up to the Council's budget process;
- 6) Therefore, Edinburgh Council supports the proposed changes in the Fairer Tax Consultation;
- 7) Additionally, Council instructs the Council Leader to write to CoSLA and the Scottish Government communicating Edinburgh Council's support for an alternative system to Council Tax which ensures fair redistribution of wealth and maximises the revenue raising powers of local government;
- 8) Finally, calls on the UK and Scottish Governments to provide fair funding for Edinburgh in line with the demands of the joint Trade Union pledge, as supported by the Labour, Green and SNP groups in this Council."

- moved by Councillor Mumford, seconded by Councillor Parker

Amendment 3

To delete Paragraphs 2, 3, 4 and 5 in the motion by Councillor Lang and replace with:

- "2) Agrees that Council Tax is a regressive instrument which should be replaced with a tax that redistributes wealth and urges the Scottish Government to expedite the process of "deliberative engagement on sources of local government funding, including Council Tax, that culminate in a citizens' assembly" as agreed in the 'draft policy programme'.
- 3) Notes that no political party has come forward with a workable proposal for the replacement of Council Tax since it was introduced in 1993, and recognises that the political will to replace council tax with a redistributive alternative is lacking and that the absence of serious proposals means we are stuck with Council Tax for the foreseeable future.
- 4) Notes the proposed changes in the 'Fairer Council Tax: consultation' which would increase Council Tax Band E to H multipliers.
- 5) Welcomes any attempt to make the current system fairer by redistributing wealth and notes that the vast majority of the 4,365 Edinburgh properties in Band H are valued at over £1million.

- 6) Recognises that some low-income households may be adversely affected by the proposed changes, particularly in Band E.
- 7) Therefore, agrees to support the changes proposed in the 'Fairer Council Tax: consultation', which are projected to raise an additional £14.1 million of revenue to CEC, on the proviso that work is done to analyse any impacts on low-income households and to expand access to the Council Tax Reduction scheme if required.

- moved by Councillor McKenzie, seconded by Councillor Biagi

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Amendments 2 and 3 were accepted as addendums to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	33 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	29 votes

(For the Motion: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lang.

20 After School Support for Pupils with Additional Support Needs (ASN)

Decision

To note that Councillor Kumar had withdrawn her motion.

21 Asylum Seekers Right to Work – Motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho

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

“Council recognises that [Lift the Ban](#) is campaigning to restore the right to work for everyone waiting for more than 6 months for a decision on their asylum claim.

Council further recognises that all people seeking protection in the UK should be able to work and make the most of their potential, to provide for themselves and their families, similar to Ukrainian refugees who do already have the right to work.

Council further believes restrictions on right to work can lead to extremely poor mental health outcomes and waste of potentially invaluable talents and skills, both for the local economy and wider society.

Council notes that since March this year the council’s own risk register has had workforce at critical and that this is unprecedented, with only one previous incidence during the height of the pandemic.

Council believes that allowing people seeking asylum the right to work would lead to positive outcomes for individuals as well as benefiting public and private sector organisations in the city who are struggling with recruitment and retention.

Council further notes that [Scotland’s Urban AGE 2022 report](#) supported by the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce alongside Glasgow and Aberdeen, called for immigration policy to be devolved to ensure cities and regions have access to the workforce they need to prosper and meet their workforce needs.

Council welcomes that in 2022 the [Shortage Occupational List was expanded](#) to include positions like social care, nursing, opening the possibility of employment for people seeking asylum. Council also welcomes the [UK Migration Advisory Council report in March 2023 into labour shortages in the construction and hospitality sectors](#) and the potential use of the immigration system as a response, with a further report following a call for evidence due to be published this autumn.

Council therefore agrees:

- To confirm support for the Lift the Ban campaign and our belief that the right to work is a fundamental human right;
- To formally join the Lift the Ban coalition alongside other local authorities, following the lead of Glasgow who joined earlier this year.

- To request the Council Leader write to the UK Government to request that they give people seeking asylum the right to work, setting out the significant workforce pressures Edinburgh is currently facing.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho.

- moved by Councillor Mattos Coelho, seconded by Councillor Campbell

Amendment

To take no action on the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	52 votes
For the amendment	-	9 votes

(For the motion: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, 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 Mattos Coelho.

22 Employment Support for Refugees – Motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the serious issues from the UK Government affecting asylum seekers and refugees' ability to access employment but agrees the Council can help mitigate some of these impacts.
- 2) Notes the additional challenges faced by those who have fled their previously country or been displaced including but not limited to accessing proof of experience, qualifications, criminal record checks and some basic forms of ID.
- 3) Agrees therefore that the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee will receive a report in 3 cycles outlining the direct Council support open to asylum seekers and refugees to access employment and what scope there is for respective Council teams to identify and support refugees and asylum seekers overcome some of the likely barriers faced.”

The Council had heard a deputation from Maryhill Integration Network (see item 3(j) above).

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho.

- moved by Councillor Mattos Coelho, seconded by Councillor Nols-McVey

Amendment 1

- 1) To insert in the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho:
 - “3) Notes the Council’s agreed ‘Equality and Diversity Framework 2021 to 2025’ contained an ‘Access to facilities and support’ section which aims to improve access to support for refugees.”

The original 3) in the motion becomes 4)
- 2) To insert at the end of the motion;
 - “5) Requests that the report also provides a brief progress and monitoring update on the specific priority activities that were outlined on the

framework to reduce digital exclusion for vulnerable individuals including refugees.”

- moved by Councillor Caldwell, seconded by Councillor Flannery

Amendment 2

To add to the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho:

- “4) Notes that in response to a motion brought by Councillor Mumford entitled “Standing up for migrants and refugees”, on 4th May 2023 Council requested “a briefing note to be circulated to all Elected Members before Summer recess updating them on engagement with Edinburgh City of Sanctuary and future plans for embedding our commitment as a ‘city of sanctuary’ throughout Council operations” which would include information around employment support, and regrets that this has not yet been received;
- 5) Agrees that this briefing note will be circulated urgently or – if this is not possible – for officers to engage with party spokespeople about how best to disseminate this information and/or incorporate it into the report at 3) to broaden its scope beyond just looking at employment and employability measures.”

- moved by Councillor Parker, seconded by Councillor Bandel

Amendment 3

- 1) To delete paragraph 1) in the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho
- 2) To reword and renumber paragraphs 2) and 3) to read:
 - “1) Notes that there can be challenges for those who have fled their previous country or been displaced and who have been given refugee or other status allowing them to remain and work in the UK which include, but are not limited to, accessing proof of experience, qualifications, criminal record checks and some basic forms of ID.
 - 2) Agrees therefore that the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee will receive a report in three cycles outlining the direct Council support open and already provided to refugees to access employment and what further scope there is for respective Council teams to identify and support refugees to overcome some of the likely barriers faced.”

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Rust

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	52 votes
For Amendment	-	9 votes

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

For Amendment 3: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho:

- 1) To note the serious issues from the UK Government affecting asylum seekers and refugees' ability to access employment but agrees the Council could help mitigate some of these impacts.
- 2) To note the additional challenges faced by those who had fled their previous country or been displaced including but not limited to accessing proof of experience, qualifications, criminal record checks and some basic forms of ID.
- 3) To note the Council's agreed 'Equality and Diversity Framework 2021 to 2025' contained an 'Access to facilities and support' section which aimed to improve access to support for refugees
- 4) To agree therefore that the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee would receive a report in 3 cycles outlining the direct Council support open to asylum seekers and refugees to access employment and what scope there was for respective Council teams to identify and support refugees and asylum seekers overcome some of the likely barriers faced.
- 5) To request that the report also provide a brief progress and monitoring update on the specific priority activities that were outlined on the framework to reduce digital exclusion for vulnerable individuals including refugees.

- 6) To note that in response to a motion brought by Councillor Mumford entitled “Standing up for migrants and refugees”, on 4th May 2023 Council requested “a briefing note to be circulated to all Elected Members before Summer recess updating them on engagement with Edinburgh City of Sanctuary and future plans for embedding our commitment as a ‘city of sanctuary’ throughout Council operations” which would include information around employment support, and regret that this had not yet been received;
- 7) To agree that this briefing note would be circulated urgently or – if this was not possible – for officers to engage with party spokespeople about how best to disseminate this information and/or incorporate it into the report at 4) to broaden its scope beyond just looking at employment and employability measures.

23 School Holidays Committee Meetings – Motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho

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

“Council notes that work is in progress to improve equal representation of elected members, with equality and diversity workshops taking place as well as several motions passed in this chamber, at least, since the beginning of this council term;

Council agrees that carers, parents and grandparents of school age children should be able to balance their personal life with the demands of being a councillor, in order to give a much needed voice on policy making;

Council therefore asks officers, when preparing the next council diary, to look to avoid any committee meetings within school holidays;

Council further requests that officers review the current diary for the rest of the year and, where possible, bring back recommendations to alter the 3 committees meeting dates that clash with holiday periods:

18 September 2023 - Lothian Valuation Joint Board (Provisional)

7 May 2024 - Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee

20 May 2024 - Licensing Sub-Committee

Council also asks conveners and committee services to avoid scheduling APMs during school holidays wherever possible.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho.

- moved by Councillor Mattos Coelho, seconded by Councillor Kumar

Amendment 1

- 1) After paragraph 2 in the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho, insert;

“Council nevertheless recognises how individuals often rely on specific decisions from certain committees, including on quasi-judicial matters, and that it is not always fair or feasible to hold up such decision-making during school holiday periods”.
- 2) In the paragraph of the motion beginning “Council therefore asks officers...”, delete “committee”, and insert “full Council and executive committee”.
- 3) Delete remainder of the motion.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Young

Amendment 2

- 1) To agree Paragraph 1 of the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho;
- 2) To add at the end of Paragraph 2 of the motion:

“That caring responsibilities are not only restricted to childcare and that further compressing the Council diary can increase the frequency of meetings for all Councillors, that this may further restrict those who can participate as Councillors and must be part of the considerations when proposing alterations to the Council diary and therefore:

Deletes Para 3 and inserts:

Calls for a Report covering the following information:

Recognises that substitutes are allowed for all Committees and that Councillors, and their Political Groups require to manage the occasional clashes that occur.”

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Jones

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion - 27 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) - 34 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor Lang:

- 1) To note that work was in progress to improve equal representation of elected members, with equality and diversity workshops taking place as well as several motions passed in this chamber, at least, since the beginning of this council term.
- 2) To agree that carers, parents and grandparents of school age children should be able to balance their personal life with the demands of being a councillor, in order to give a much needed voice on policy making.
- 3) That caring responsibilities are not only restricted to childcare and that further compressing the Council diary could increase the frequency of meetings for all Councillors, that this might further restrict those who could participate as Councillors and must be part of the considerations when proposing alterations to the Council diary.
- 4) To nevertheless recognise how individuals often relied on specific decisions from certain committees, including on quasi-judicial matters, and that it was not always fair or feasible to hold up such decision-making during school holiday periods.
- 5) To therefore ask officers, when preparing the next council diary, to look to avoid any full Council and executive committee meetings within school holidays.

- 6) To recognise that substitutes were allowed for all Committees and that Councillors, and their Political Groups required to manage the occasional clashes that occurred.

24 Gorgie Farm Update Rights – Motion by Councillor Heap

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

“Council notes:

- 1) That the Council invited the Edinburgh Council of Voluntary Organisations (EVOG) to develop a sustainable vision Gorgie Farm in March 2023.
- 2) The welcome work done so far by EVOG and the project Steering Group it has convened, including the appointment of a Project Manager and maintenance to the site.
- 3) Six months will shortly have passed since the project started.

Council believes that:

- 4) It has a major interest in the project as it has been commissioned by the Council, is supported by Council funding; the farm is a Council-owned site, and also because the Farm is a much-loved institution across Edinburgh and beyond.
- 5) Councillors, therefore, should have regular updates on the work of the farm and opportunities to scrutinise work on the future of the farm done on behalf of the Council.
- 6) Local community groups and residents should have an opportunity to comment on the project’s work so far, and to speak to Councillors about their vision for the future of the Farm.

Council therefore requests that:

- 7) Officers work with EVOG and the Gorgie Farm Steering Group to develop an update report to be presented to the Culture and Communities Committee meeting scheduled for October 2023, with the report to include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) Details of any maintenance of the farm site done since the commencement of the project.
 - b) How the Project’s Steering Group was formed.

- c) The work of the Steering Group.
 - d) Engagement with the local community.
 - e) How a new model for the farm is being developed.
 - f) When and how the Steering Group intends to recommend a way forward for the farm.
 - g) When the Farm is likely to re-open to the public.
 - h) How Council funding has been spent.
- 8) Officers invite a suitable representative(s) from EVOC and/or the Steering Group to speak to the report at the same meeting.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Heap.

- moved by Councillor Heap, seconded by Councillor Mumford

Amendment 1

Council:

- 1) Changes point 7 in the motion by Councillor Heap to read:
“7) An urgent briefing of ward councillors, group leaders and Culture & Communities committee members on points 7a-7h.”
- 2) Leaves 7a- 7h unchanged and keeps point 8) in the motion.
- 3) Adds new point 9) at end:
“9) A report to Culture & Communities in two cycles setting out progress on points 7a- 7h, any other matters raised from the briefing of elected members and the likely timeline for the reopening of Gorgie Farm.”

- moved by Councillor Thornley, seconded by Councillor Osler

Amendment 2

Insert the following after (2) in Section 1 of the motion by Councillor Heap, and renumber accordingly:

“3) Recent work by EVOC to update the community on developments, including a blog and a poster displayed outside the farm.”

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Heap:

- 1) To note that the Council invited the Edinburgh Council of Voluntary Organisations (EVOC) to develop a sustainable vision Gorgie Farm in March 2023.
- 2) To welcome work done so far by EVOC and the project Steering Group it had convened, including the appointment of a Project Manager and maintenance to the site.
- 3) To note the recent work by EVOC to update the community on developments, including a blog and a poster displayed outside the farm.
- 4) To note that six months would shortly have passed since the project started.
- 5) To believe that the Council had a major interest in the project as it had been commissioned by the Council, was supported by Council funding; the farm was a Council-owned site, and also because the Farm was a much-loved institution across Edinburgh and beyond.
- 6) To believe that Councillors, therefore, should have regular updates on the work of the farm and opportunities to scrutinise work on the future of the farm done on behalf of the Council.
- 7) To believe that local community groups and residents should have an opportunity to comment on the project's work so far, and to speak to Councillors about their vision for the future of the Farm.

- 8) To request an urgent briefing of ward councillors, group leaders and Culture and Communities Committee members on points 7a-7h:
 - a) Details of any maintenance of the farm site done since the commencement of the project
 - b) How the Project's Steering Group was formed
 - c) The work of the Steering Group
 - d) Engagement with the local community
 - e) How a new model for the farm is being developed
 - f) When and how the Steering Group intends to recommend a way forward for the farm
 - g) When the Farm is likely to re-open to the public
 - h) How Council funding has been spent
- 9) To request that officers invite a suitable representative(s) from EVOC and/or the Steering Group to speak to the report at the same meeting.
- 10) To request a report to the Culture and Communities Committee in two cycles setting out progress on points 7a- 7h, any other matters raised from the briefing of elected members and the likely timeline for the reopening of Gorgie Farm.

25 Reversing Damaging Council Cuts – Motion by Councillor Nols- McVey

The following motion by Councillor Nols-McVey was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

- "1) Notes the Council's budget is now carrying a deficit of £600,000 following the cancellation of the change to the no compulsory redundancy policy approved in the February 2023 budget vote. Further notes the "best value service review" will show in-housing waste services is the most cost-effective and efficient method of waste collections delivering the best service for residents. This will add a further £500,000 deficit to the budget that will therefore mean a £1.1m additional gap is being funded through other actions either at the corporate or departmental level.
- 2) Further notes there are additional budget proposals in the Liberal Democrat budget, such as the decimation of the Education Welfare Officer team, which

will remove support from the hardest to reach families across Edinburgh and agrees to treat this budget line the same way as the redeployment change that was passed in February.

- 3) Agrees the £400,000 cut to Education Welfare Officer (EWOs) must be reversed just as other budget proposals have been.
- 4) Agrees to receive a report on what actions the Chief Executive has taken to balance the budget, including any details of in-year savings requested of Directorates and any proposals that have come forward.
- 5) Agrees this report will set out how the cut to Education Welfare Officers can be reversed, along with a status report on the implementation of all other budget savings approved in the Liberal Democrat to enable Councillors to take further decisions to cancel damaging cuts.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey.

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor Aston

Amendment 1

“Deletes all from 2) in the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey, and replaces as follows:

- “2) Notes that council budgets always require some in-year flexing to accommodate changes; and that these changes are routinely reported to Finance & Resources Committee and to other Committees, as appropriate.
- 3) Regrets the many impacts on jobs and services caused by the SNP Scottish Government’s cuts to council funding. Since 2012/13, Edinburgh Council has had to find reductions of £429m to maintain expenditure in line with income; and expressed on a like-for-like basis, cash-terms core grant funding has decreased by 13.1% over the period.
- 4) Notes that the EIJB, in common with several other IJBs in Scotland, has a significant in-year deficit and that the Scottish Government has refused to address this funding issue, thereby placing further strain on council budgets that are already stretched to breaking point.
- 5) Asks that the Council Leader writes, yet again, to the Scottish Government Ministers reiterating the case for the EIJB and Edinburgh Council to be fairly funded, thereby enabling Councillors to take further decisions to cancel “damaging cuts”.

- moved by Councillor Watt, seconded by Councillor Dalgleish

Amendment 2

Deletes all of the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey and replaces with:

“Council believes the best method to avoid damaging council cuts is for SNP and Green Ministers in the Scottish Government to stop cutting the Council’s Central Grant.”

- moved by Councillor Ross, seconded by Councillor Younie

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	27 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	34 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor Watt:

- 1) To note the Council’s budget was now carrying a deficit of £600,000 following the cancellation of the change to the no compulsory redundancy policy approved in the February 2023 budget vote. To further note the "best value service review" would show in-housing waste services was the most cost-effective and efficient method of waste collections delivering the best service for residents. This would add a further £500,000 deficit to the budget that would therefore mean a £1.1m additional gap was being funded through other actions either at the corporate or departmental level.
- 2) To note that council budgets always required some in-year flexing to accommodate changes; and that these changes were routinely reported to Finance and Resources Committee and to other Committees, as appropriate.

- 3) To regret the many impacts on jobs and services caused by the SNP Scottish Government's cuts to council funding. Since 2012/13, Edinburgh Council had had to find reductions of £429m to maintain expenditure in line with income; and expressed on a like-for-like basis, cash-terms core grant funding had decreased by 13.1% over the period.
- 4) To note that the EIJB, in common with several other IJBs in Scotland, had a significant in-year deficit and that the Scottish Government had refused to address this funding issue, thereby placing further strain on council budgets that were already stretched to breaking point.
- 5) To ask that the Council Leader write, yet again, to the Scottish Government Ministers reiterating the case for the EIJB and Edinburgh Council to be fairly funded, thereby enabling Councillors to take further decisions to cancel "damaging cuts
- 6) To believe the best method to avoid damaging council cuts was for SNP and Green Ministers in the Scottish Government to stop cutting the Council's Central Grant.

26 Tram Project – Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

"Council notes that the Tram project has been completed in the sense that trams are running the full length of the track from the Airport to Lindsay Road, but that there is outstanding work to be done and areas of road that have been affected by additional traffic carried because of works to permit the tram diversions and calls for:

A report to Transport and Environment Committee in 3 cycles detailing:

- 1) To which Committee the outstanding defects will be reported; and how completion of these and tracking who is responsible for their remedy will be monitored, and who is picking up the bill;
- 2) An inspection of roads used by traffic carried because of tram diversions – what is their condition, is restoration needed; if so, who will pay for this and when the work is to be programmed;
- 3) The report schedule for the above matters to be considered by Committee."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Munro

Amendment 1

” to add to the motion by Councillor Mowat:

“4) Requests that the report Requested in 2) also includes an inspection from the Road Signage and Markings teams to ensure said street layouts outwith TTN’s direct scope reflect the new layout, changed traffic levels and any Loading/Parking changes.”

- moved by Councillor Caldwell, seconded by Councilor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment 2

To add a clause 2 to the motion by Councillor Mowat as follows:

“2) Outstanding snagging and defect resolution of footways, cycleways, and the public realm;”

And reorder accordingly.

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Rae

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 Mowat:

1) To note that the Tram project had been completed in the sense that trams were running the full length of the track from the Airport to Lindsay Road, but that there was outstanding work to be done and areas of road that had been affected by additional traffic carried because of works to permit the tram diversions and call for:

A report to Transport and Environment Committee in 3 cycles detailing:

a) To which Committee the outstanding defects would be reported; and how completion of these and tracking who was responsible for their remedy would be monitored, and who was picking up the bill.

- b) Outstanding snagging and defect resolution of footways, cycleways, and the public realm.
- c) An inspection of roads used by traffic carried because of tram diversions – what was their condition, was restoration needed; if so, who would pay for this and when the work was to be programmed.
- d) The report schedule for the above matters to be considered by Committee.
- e) To request that the report requested in c) also include an inspection from the Road Signage and Markings teams to ensure said street layouts outwith TTN's direct scope reflected the new layout, changed traffic levels and any Loading/Parking changes..

27 Placing in School Appeals – Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council notes

That in 2019 there was an Internal Audit carried out into School Admissions, Appeals and Capacity Planning which was reported to GRBV in July 2020.

There were 3 red rated findings reported and whilst there are no outstanding actions being reported currently via GRBV, given the concerns expressed about the appeals process for this session including:

- 1) the lateness of hearing appeals this year – which did not start being heard until after the start of the summer holidays and therefore after the transition days had taken place increasing the stress for pupils, families and schools;
- 2) the resignation of a long-standing Chair who expressed grave concerns in their resignation letter about how the process was serving families and children;
- 3) the difficulty recruiting to the panels.

Therefore, calls for a follow up report to Education, Children and Families Committee in one cycle detailing:

- a) whether all actions identified in the Audit have been completed and embedded in practice and what evidence supports this;
- b) Why the appeals did not begin to be heard until after the start of the summer holidays this year;

- c) A timescale for appeals for admission into 2024/2025 school year so that this year's debacle can be avoided in the next academic session.

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

Amendment

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

“Further to this that a wider review into both the Placing in Schools Process and the Placing in Schools Appeal Process is undertaken with a report to follow within two cycles.”

- moved by Councillor Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Graham

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 Mowat:

- 1) To note that in 2019 there was an Internal Audit carried out into School Admissions, Appeals and Capacity Planning which was reported to GRBV in July 2020.
- 2) To note there were 3 red rated findings reported and whilst there were no outstanding actions being reported currently via GRBV, given the concerns expressed about the appeals process for this session including:
 - a) the lateness of hearing appeals this year – which did not start being heard until after the start of the summer holidays and therefore after the transition days had taken place increasing the stress for pupils, families and schools;
 - b) the resignation of a long-standing Chair who expressed grave concerns in their resignation letter about how the process was serving families and children;
 - c) the difficulty recruiting to the panels.

- 3) Therefore, to call for a follow up report to Education, Children and Families Committee in one cycle detailing:
 - a) whether all actions identified in the Audit have been completed and embedded in practice and what evidence supports this;
 - b) Why the appeals did not begin to be heard until after the start of the summer holidays this year;
 - c) A timescale for appeals for admission into 2024/2025 school year so that this year's debacle can be avoided in the next academic session.
- 4) Further to this that a wider review into both the Placing in Schools Process and the Placing in Schools Appeal Process be undertaken with a report to follow within two cycles.

28 Illegal Parking Disrupting Tram Operations – Motion by Councillor Rae

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that there were 22 incidents of trams being delayed by illegally or irresponsibly parked vehicles in the period 7 June to 31 July 2023, and there have been further incidents in August;
- 2) Agrees that it unacceptable for illegally or irresponsibly parked vehicles to impede the city's public transport infrastructure, that these incidents can have a significant negative impact on the reliability and journey times of our public transport network and can bring significant inconvenience to public transport users;
- 3) Notes that the council's removal trucks are currently unable to operate near the tram line because of the overhead power cables;
- 4) Notes that, while the cost of a penalty charge notice (parking ticket / PCN) recently rose to £100, or £50 if paid within 14 days, that issuing a parking ticket does not remove the obstruction from the tram network;
- 5) Notes there are numerous designs of tow trucks in use in municipalities around the world, including wheel lift, hook and chain or flatbed trucks, which do not require an overhead lift and therefore may be safely operated near overhead lines;

- 6) Agrees that officers will urgently arrange to procure the use of one or more suitable vehicles to allow uplift of illegally or irresponsibly parked vehicles obstructing tram lines, and will ensure this service is available during tram operational hours;
- 7) Agrees that consideration will be given to additional measures to address the problem, including, but not limited to, consideration of:
 - a) installation of physical barriers, such as bollards, correctly installed Sheffield cycle stands or planters at the worst-affected areas to prevent parking outside of a designated parking bay;
 - b) increased use of parking attendants along the tram route, including travelling on trams, to facilitate enforcement;
 - c) streamlined processes to allow members of the public to report potential breaches, and for this information to be passed timeously to parking attendants to allow enforcement;
 - d) streamlined processes to allow photos and videos submitted by members of the public to be used in enforcement;
- 8) Agrees that Transport spokespeople and Leith and Leith Walk councillors will be offered a briefing from parking officers within the next month outlining progress to resolve this issue;
- 9) Agrees to receive a report to the next meeting of Transport and Environment Committee outlining progress to resolve this issue, and considering all the proposals outlined at paragraph 7) above, and considering whether the council's Parking Enforcement Protocol needs to be further updated to address this issue;
- 10) Agrees the Transport Convenor will write to Scottish Ministers requesting that powers to set penalty charge notices, powers to use CCTV installed on trams for enforcement, and powers to allow local authorities to use mobile phone footage submitted by the public for enforcement, should all be devolved to local authorities."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rae

- moved by Councillor Rae, seconded by Councillor Bandel

Amendment 1

- 1) Append to paragraph 5 in the motion by Councillor Rae:

“Notes that Council Officers are working with contractors and Edinburgh Trams on this – there are numerous practical and H&S issues to consider when working near live cables. Officers are considering solutions which have proven successful in other cities operating tram systems, and recognise the importance of identifying an option that safely removes vehicles without damaging public/private property.”

- 2) Append to paragraph 6 in the motion:

“Notes that Council Officers hope to have a trial solution prior to the current enforcement contract expiring. Notes that this solution will require additional funding, resources and training – none of which has been allocated.”

- 3) Append to paragraph 7 in the motion:

“Notes that the September TEC Business Bulletin is due to include an update on parking enforcement, cycle parking and the performance of pedestrian crossings along the TTN route. Notes that points a to c are being considered, progressed or have actually been delivered via the Tram APOG and discussions at TEC, but welcomes the opportunity for scrutiny the motion brings. Point d is not supported by the Scot Gov.”

- 4) Append to paragraph 8 in the motion:

“Given the public concern, agrees that a written briefing should be forwarded to all Councillors in a form that can be shared with residents.”

- 5) Replace paragraph 9 in the motion with:

“Notes that the September TEC Business Bulletin is due to provide an update on parking enforcement, planters, cycle parking and the performance of pedestrian crossings along the TTN route. Agrees that any points from the motion not covered in the September TEC Business Bulletin will be provided via an update to the October TEC.”

- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Faccenda

Amendment 2

Adds at end of point 9 of the motion by Councillor Rae:

“And identifies whether further powers are required beyond the suite of enforcement options already available and considers whether it is necessary to write to the UK

Government asking them to bring forward legislation to create a new road traffic offence of blocking a tramway with a parked vehicle.”

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 3

1) Adds at the end of Point 9) of the motion by Councillor Rae;

“This report should be considered alongside the results of the formal monitoring of parking along Leith Walk due at the next Transport and Environment committee, as to allow committee an objective overview of the scale of the issue and types of locations where parking issues appear most prevalent.

2) Adds to the motion:

“10) That an update on new potential loading bay provision is included in this report.” and 10) in the motion becomes 11).

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

Amendment 4

1) Deletes current point six in the motion by Councillor Rae and replaces with:

“6) Agrees that officers will investigate the costings associated with procuring the use of one or more suitable vehicles to allow uplift of illegally or irresponsibly parked vehicles obstructing tram lines, to determine the value in providing this service during tram operational hours;”

2) Deletes point eight in the motion and replaces with

“8) Agrees that Transport spokespeople, and Leith and Leith Walk councillors will be provided a written briefing note from parking officers within the next month outlining progress to resolve the issue;”

3) Deletes point nine in the motion and replaces with:

“9) Agrees to receive a report within two cycles to the Transport and Environment Committee detailing the consideration of proposals outlined above in paragraph seven, including any associated costs, and equalities impact assessments for physical interventions to ensure that pedestrians are not disadvantaged by any interventions, in addition to consideration of whether the council's Parking Enforcement Protocol needs to be further updated to address this issue;”

- moved by Councillor Munro, seconded by Councillor Mowat

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12) Amendments 1 and 4 were adjusted and accepted as amendments to the motion and Amendments 2 and 3 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Rae:

- 1) To note that there were 22 incidents of trams being delayed by illegally or irresponsibly parked vehicles in the period 7 June to 31 July 2023, and there had been further incidents in August.
- 2) To agree that it was unacceptable for illegally or irresponsibly parked vehicles to impede the city's public transport infrastructure, that these incidents could have a significant negative impact on the reliability and journey times of the public transport network and could bring significant inconvenience to public transport users.
- 3) To note that the council's removal trucks were currently unable to operate near the tram line because of the overhead power cables.
- 4) To note that, while the cost of a penalty charge notice (parking ticket / PCN) recently rose to £100, or £50 if paid within 14 days, that issuing a parking ticket did not remove the obstruction from the tram network.
- 5) To note there were numerous designs of tow trucks in use in municipalities around the world, including wheel lift, hook and chain or flatbed trucks, which did not require an overhead lift and therefore may be safely operated near overhead lines, to note that Council Officers were working with contractors and Edinburgh Trams on this – there were numerous practical and Health and Safety issues to consider when working near live cables. Officers were considering solutions which had proven successful in other cities operating tram systems, and recognised the importance of identifying an option that safely removed vehicles without damaging public/private property.
- 6) To agree that officers would urgently investigate the costings associated with procuring the use of one or more suitable vehicles to allow uplift of illegally or irresponsibly parked vehicles obstructing tram lines, to determine the value in providing this service during tram operational hours, to note that Council Officers hoped to have a trial solution prior to the current enforcement contract expiring. To note that this solution would require additional funding, resources and training – none of which had been allocated.

- 7) To agree that consideration would be given to additional measures to address the problem, including, but not limited to, consideration of:
- a) installation of physical barriers, such as bollards, correctly installed Sheffield cycle stands or planters at the worst-affected areas to prevent parking outside of a designated parking bay;
 - b) increased use of parking attendants along the tram route, including travelling on trams, to facilitate enforcement;
 - c) streamlined processes to allow members of the public to report potential breaches, and for this information to be passed timeously to parking attendants to allow enforcement;
 - d) streamlined processes to allow photos and videos submitted by members of the public to be used in enforcement;

To further note that the September TEC Business Bulletin was due to include an update on parking enforcement, cycle parking and the performance of pedestrian crossings along the TTN route. To note that that points a) to c) were being considered, progressed or had actually been delivered, but welcome the opportunity for scrutiny the motion brought.

- 8) To agree that Transport spokespeople and Leith and Leith Walk councillors would be provided a written briefing note from parking officers within the next month outlining progress to resolve this issue, and, given the public concern, to agree that a written briefing should be forwarded to all Councillors in a form that could be shared with residents.
- 9) To agree to receive a report to the October meeting of Transport and Environment Committee outlining progress to resolve this issue, and considering all the proposals outlined at paragraph 7) above which had not already been considered as part of the parking enforcement update to September TEC, including any associated costs, and equalities impact assessments for physical interventions to ensure that pedestrians were not disadvantaged by any interventions, in addition to consideration of whether the council's Parking Enforcement Protocol needed to be further updated to address this issue, and identify whether further powers were required beyond the suite of enforcement options already available and consider whether it was necessary to write to the UK Government asking them to bring forward legislation to create a new road traffic offence of blocking a tramway with a parked vehicle. This report should be considered alongside the results of the formal monitoring of parking along Leith Walk due at the next Transport and Environment Committee, so as to allow committee an objective overview of

the scale of the issue and types of locations where parking issues appeared most prevalent.

- 10) That an update on new potential loading bay provision be included in this report.
- 11) To agree the Transport Convener would write to Scottish Ministers requesting that powers to set penalty charge notices, powers to use CCTV installed on trams for enforcement, and powers to allow local authorities to use mobile phone footage submitted by the public for enforcement, should all be devolved to local authorities.

29 Heart of Midlothian Football Club – Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council:

Celebrates the 150th anniversary of Heart of Midlothian Football Club in 2024.

Acknowledges the huge impact Heart of Midlothian Football Club have made to sport in the city and across the whole country, as the largest fan-owned club in the UK.

Notes the positive economic impact the club provides for the city and the extensive charitable endeavours it undertakes including the Foundation of Hearts not for profit organisation, the Big Hearts Community Trust and the Hearts Memorial Garden, which offers a peaceful, contemplative space in which to remember those who have passed on.

Agrees that Council officers work with officials from Heart of Midlothian Football Club to celebrate the 'Maroon Mile' which runs from the iconic war memorial at Haymarket to Tynecastle Park and arrange a programme of engagement and activities in recognition of this milestone.

Calls for a report to the Transport and Environment Committee in one cycle to provide a detailed breakdown of this engagement.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Amendment 1

- 1) Insert after the third point in the motion by Councillor Day, the following additional point:

“Notes that it is hoped that the Maroon Mile will be funded by a Heritage Lottery Fund and will highlight the local social, economic, and sporting histories which are intertwined in the area.”

- 2) Insert in fourth point of the motion, after “milestone”:

“, including opportunities for people to develop traditional and digital skills, and an oral history project to capture the intangible heritage of Gorgie and Dalry”

- 3) Insert in last point of the motion, after “engagement”:

“,and also how the Maroon Mile can integrate with and complement the work of the Gorgie Dalry 20 Minute Neighbourhood project and foster inclusion within the Gorgie Dalry community of marginalised groups”

- moved by Councillor Heap, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

Amendment 2

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

“The report should provide detail on works surrounding the Heart of Midlothian War Memorial at Haymarket, including any barriers to the works being completed in time for this year’s Haymarket Remembrance Service, with input from planning officers if required.”

- moved by Councillor McKenzie, seconded by Councillor Miller

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 Day:

- 1) To celebrates the 150th anniversary of Heart of Midlothian Football Club in 2024.
- 2) To acknowledge the huge impact Heart of Midlothian Football Club have made to sport in the city and across the whole country, as the largest fan-owned club in the UK.

- 3) To note the positive economic impact the club provided for the city and the extensive charitable endeavours it undertook including the Foundation of Hearts not for profit organisation, the Big Hearts Community Trust and the Hearts Memorial Garden, which offered a peaceful, contemplative space in which to remember those who had passed on.
- 4) To note that it was hoped that the Maroon Mile would be funded by a Heritage Lottery Fund and would highlight the local social, economic, and sporting histories which were intertwined in the area
- 5) To agree that Council officers work with officials from Heart of Midlothian Football Club to celebrate the 'Maroon Mile' which runs from the iconic war memorial at Haymarket to Tynecastle Park and arrange a programme of engagement and activities in recognition of this milestone, including opportunities for people to develop traditional and digital skills, and an oral history project to capture the intangible heritage of Gorgie and Dalry.
- 6) To call for a report to the Transport and Environment Committee in one cycle to provide a detailed breakdown of this engagement and also how the Maroon Mile could integrate with and complement the work of the Gorgie Dalry 20 Minute Neighbourhood project and foster inclusion within the Gorgie Dalry community of marginalised groups.
- 7) The report should provide detail on works surrounding the Heart of Midlothian War Memorial at Haymarket, including any barriers to the works being completed in time for this year's Haymarket Remembrance Service, with input from planning officers if required.

30 Edinburgh's Circular Economy – Motion by Councillor Parker

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

“Council:

- 1) Welcomes the work of the Scottish Government and new legislation, the Circular Economy (Scotland) Bill, that will introduce new powers to reduce waste and grow a green economy – namely additional enforcement powers to crack down on fly tipping and littering from cars.
- 2) Notes the Transport & Environment Committee approved a response to the Scottish Government's consultation which closes on 1st September 2023.
- 3) Further notes existing work by the Council to identify circular economy opportunities within the Economy Strategy, Edinburgh's 2030 Climate Strategy and the upcoming Local Heat and Energy Efficiency Strategy.

- 4) Understands that a circular economy is part of the solution to our climate and nature emergencies, shifting lifestyles and businesses away from a 'make, use, dispose' mindset.
- 5) Agrees that more work should be done now to ensure we meet our local recycling targets, reduce household and business waste and drastically reduce our city's carbon footprint.
- 6) Holds a roundtable discussion open to all interested members and relevant officers on how the city will deliver a circular economy including, but not limited to, the following:
 - a) How we can establish closer links with the Circular Edinburgh scheme and ensure communication and dissemination of circular initiatives including outputs from the Scottish Business Sustainability Partnership
 - b) How we will work closely with stakeholders, such as Edinburgh Remakery, Fresh Start, SHRUB (Zero Waste Hub), Zero Waste Scotland, to share best practice and accelerate progress to a circular economy.
 - c) How we can work with appropriate enterprises to re-use or re-home ICT equipment, furniture, lighting and other electric products that would otherwise be sent to landfill
 - d) How we can reduce our single-use plastic use in hospitality, events and festival settings and work with ALEOs and arms-length organisations to do the same.
 - e) How we can use the space at the Forth Freeport to encourage and develop circular business models being established.
- 7) Following the discussion, requests a briefing for all elected members on how a circular economy can be delivered and how members can further promote, facilitate and enable a transition to a circular economy."

- moved by Councillor Parker, seconded by Councillor Mumford

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Parker.

31 Short Term Let Licensing Deadline– Motions by Councillors Ross, Rae and Nols-McVey

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

The following motions by Councillors Ross, Rae and Nols-McVey were submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

Motion by Councillor Ross

“Council

- 1) Notes the deadline of 1 October 2023 for existing landlords to apply for a license for a short term let.
- 2) Notes the unanimous decision of all members of the Regulatory Committee on 6 February 2023 to “regret” the Scottish Government’s decision to delay the start date for STL licensing for existing landlords from 1st April to 1st October 2023.
- 3) Believes that a proper system of licensing is important to help address the significant issues within the short-term rental market which is why there was such strong cross-party agreement for a robust system of regulation.
- 4) Therefore, regrets the comments made by the Council Leader on BBC Radio Scotland on 23 August 2023, which might have led operators to assume or believe that the Council Leader, and by extension the Council, was open to a further extension to the 1 October 2023 start date when no such position has been taken, either by the Regulatory Committee or full Council.
- 5) Believes these comments, despite further clarifications, were damaging to the ongoing hard work of officers to encourage landlords to meet the 1 October 2023 start date by suggesting a dilution of this Council’s commitment to the proper and fair regulation of the short term let market in Edinburgh.

Therefore, for total clarity on the matter:

Council

- 6) reaffirms its existing commitment to the licensing of short term lets, expresses its opposition to any further extension to the start date for licensing of existing short term let landlords and requests that this position be communicated strongly through the Council's communications channels.”

Motion by Councillor Rae

Council:

- 1) Notes the unanimous decision of Regulatory Committee of 6 February 2023, expressing regret at the decision of the Scottish Government to delay the Short Term Lets (STL) licensing deadline by six months to 1 October 2023;
- 2) Notes the comments of the council leader on Radio Scotland on 23 August 2023 that an extension to the 1 October 2023 STL licensing deadline is "something we would be supportive of", which were later retracted on social media with the comment that the decision of Regulatory Committee on 6 February "remains the council's position";
- 3) Believes that the Council Leader's comments during the Radio Scotland interview were out of step with a previous democratically agreed council position, were unhelpful in that they created uncertainty, and that he should apologise for them;
- 4) Reiterates the council's opposition to any further delay to the STL licensing deadline, and agrees that the council leader will write to Scottish Ministers to convey that opposition, and further welcomes recent comments from the First Minister and the Economy Minister that there will be no further extension to the 1 October deadline;
- 5) Calls on all existing STL operators to ensure they submit a licensing application ahead of the 1 October 2023 deadline.

Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey

- “1) Council regrets and condemns the chaotic mess that the Council Leader made of Edinburgh’s position on Short Term Lets when he inaccurately stated the Council supported a further delay to implementation.
- 2) Reaffirms the Council’s commitment to short term let regulation beginning on the 1st of October and opposed any further delay.
- 3) Agrees the outstanding briefing outlining the state of readiness of the Council to process applications and by October 1st 2023 will be circulated to Councillors before the Finance and Resource Committee meeting of September 21st 2023 to align with budget considerations. Further agrees this will include state of readiness to enforce non-compliance from this date.”

Motion

Council:

- 1) Notes the deadline of 1 October 2023 for existing landlords to apply for a license for a short term let (STL).
- 2) Notes the unanimous decision of all members of the Regulatory Committee on 6 February 2023 to “regret” the Scottish Government’s decision to delay the start date for STL licensing for existing landlords from 1st April to 1st October 2023.
- 3) Believes that a proper system of licensing is important to help address the significant issues within the short-term rental market which is why there was such strong cross-party agreement for a robust system of regulation.
- 4) Therefore, regrets the comments made by the Council Leader on BBC Radio Scotland on 23 August 2023, which might have led operators to assume or believe that the Council Leader, and by extension the Council, was open to a further extension to the 1 October 2023 start date when no such position has been taken, either by the Regulatory Committee or full Council.
- 5) Believes these comments, despite further clarifications, were damaging to the ongoing hard work of officers to encourage landlords to meet the 1 October 2023 start date by suggesting a dilution of this Council’s commitment to the proper and fair regulation of the short term let market in Edinburgh.

Therefore, Council:

- 6) Reaffirms its existing commitment to the licensing of short term lets, expresses its opposition to any further extension to the start date for licensing of existing short term let landlords and requests that this position be communicated strongly through the Council's communications channels.
- 7) Agrees that the Council Leader will write to Scottish Ministers to convey that opposition and further welcomes recent comments from the First Minister and the Economy Minister that there will be no further extension to the 1 October start date.
- 8) Calls on all existing STL operators to ensure they submit a licensing application ahead of the 1 October 2023 start date.
- 9) Agrees the outstanding briefing, outlining the state of readiness of the Council to process applications by 1 October 2023, will be circulated to Councillors before the Finance and Resources Committee meeting of 21 September 2023 to align with budget considerations. In addition, a draft copy of the STL

Enforcement report due to be presented to the 2 October Regulatory Committee should be circulated on a confidential basis to all councillors also before 21 September Finance & Resources Committee meeting.

- moved by Councillor Ross, seconded by Councillor Rae

Amendment

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Rust

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	52 votes
For the amendment	-	8 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the composite motion as moved by Councillor Ross.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Whyte made a transparency statement as his partner was likely to be applying for a home sharing licence under the STL Licensing Scheme at some point in the future.

32 Fair Pay For Council Staff – Emergency Motion by Councillor Jenkinson

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

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

“Council:

Notes Unison's call for a fair pay settlement for all Catering, Pupil Support, Administration and Janitorial staff in Edinburgh and their members recent overwhelming support for industrial action.

Calls on and encourages urgent talks between COSLA and the Scottish Government to find a swift resolution to avert potential strike action and agree a local government pay settlement.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Jenkinson.

- moved by Councillor Jenkinson, seconded by Councillor Walker

Amendment 1

To add to the motion by Councillor Jenkinson:

“In the words of Unison agrees that the council leader takes a lead in the meetings that he attends at COSLA and, further, that he reports back to this council with detail of work undertaken to progress towards a meaningful and swift settlement for our staff.”

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor Campbell

Amendment 2

Deletes point 1 in the motion by Councillor Jenkinson and replaces with:

- 1) Notes that Unison members Schools and Early Years have voted to reject the latest pay offer of 5% and are prepared to take industrial action on behalf of all non-teaching staff in respect to the local government pay claim;

- 2) Notes that the overwhelming nature of this support – with over 62% voting in favour, joining 23 other Councils in Scotland where ballots received over 50% of the vote – demonstrates a strength of feeling among workers in Edinburgh that Councillors should reflect on;
- 3) Notes that a majority of parties in Edinburgh Council signed up to the Trade Union Pledge committing to:
 - i) No compulsory redundancies.
 - i) Keep public services publicly owned.
 - iii) Demand more funding from the Scottish & UK governments for our City Council
- 4) Calls on the Council Leader to use their voice at COSLA to support a local government pay settlement which reflects these aims and prioritises workers' pay;
- 5) Encourages Council Officers – should industrial action occur – to continue to uphold respect for striking workers and picket lines, and refrain from any attempts to undermine strikes by employing agency staff or external agencies with early and good faith engagement taking place between Council officers and Union representatives around operational matters.

And to retain point 2 of the motion (now point 6).”

- moved by Councillor Mumford, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

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

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

At this point in the meeting the following Amendment 3 was proposed:

Amendment 3

To approve the motion as originally submitted by Councillor Jenkinson.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Young

Voting

First Vote

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	22 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	17 votes
For Amendment 3	-	13 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Bandel, Booth, Burgess, Lezley Marion Cameron, Dalgleish, Day, Faccenda, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Jenkinson, McKenzie, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Staniforth, Walker and Watt.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Biagi, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Hyslop, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Mechan, Nols-McVey, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, and Work.

For Amendment 3: Lord Provost, Councillors Beal, Bennett, Caldwell, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Flannery, Lang, Osler, Ross, Thornley, Young and Younie.)

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

Second Vote

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	22 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	17 votes
Abstentions	-	13

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Arthur, Bandel, Booth, Burgess, Lezley Marion Cameron, Dalgleish, Day, Faccenda, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Jenkinson, McKenzie, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Staniforth, Walker and Watt.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Biagi, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Hyslop, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Mechan, Nicolson, Nols-McVey and Work.

Abstentions: Lord Provost, Councillors Beal, Bennett, Caldwell, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Flannery, Lang, Osler, Ross, Thornley, Young and Younie.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Jenkinson:

- 1) To note that Unison members Schools and Early Years had voted to reject the latest pay offer of 5% and were prepared to take industrial action on behalf of all non-teaching staff in respect to the local government pay claim;
- 2) To note that the overwhelming nature of this support – with over 62% voting in favour, joining 23 other Councils in Scotland where ballots received over 50% of the vote – demonstrated a strength of feeling among workers in Edinburgh that Councillors should reflect on;
- 3) To note that a majority of parties in Edinburgh Council signed up to the Trade Union Pledge committing to:
 - a) No compulsory redundancies.
 - b) Keep public services publicly owned.
 - c) Demand more funding from the Scottish & UK governments for our City Council
- 4) To call on the Council Leader to use their voice at COSLA to support a local government pay settlement which reflected these aims and prioritised workers' pay;
- 5) To encourage Council Officers – should industrial action occur – to continue to uphold respect for striking workers and picket lines, and refrain from any attempts to undermine strikes by employing agency staff or external agencies with early and good faith engagement taking place between Council officers and Union representatives around operational matters..
- 6) To call on and encourage urgent talks between COSLA and the Scottish Government to find a swift resolution to avert potential strike action and agree a local government pay settlement.

33 LGBT Youth Scotland – Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council:

Council notes the fantastic work of LGBT Youth Scotland in supporting equalities and inclusiveness across the City, by the provision of quality youth work to LGBTI young people that promoting health and wellbeing.

Further notes the charity act as Scotland’s national charity for LGBTI young people, working with 13–25 year olds across the country and also deliver the LGBT Charter programme to schools, organisations and businesses.

Supports the goal of LGBT Youth is to make Scotland the best place to grow up for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and intersex young people.

Notes that LGBT Youth recently opened their ‘Youthspace’ giving young people a safe space to meet and celebrate.

Commends the work of LGBT Youth Scotland as they celebrate 20 years of support to the LGBT community and asks the Lord Provost to congratulate the charity in an appropriate way.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

34 Reverend Calum MacLeod, Minister of St Giles – Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council:

Congratulates the work of the Reverend Calum MacLeod, Minister of the High Kirk of St Giles for his work presiding over the Memorial Service following the death of Her Late Majesty Queen Elizabeth II and the National Service of Thanksgiving and Dedication to His Majesty King Charles III;

Understands the Rev. MacLeod was the first new Minister at St Giles in 40 years and has been committed to referencing the role the High Kirk has played throughout Scotland in its almost 900-year history and to welcome those from all over the world;

Believes the Rev. Macleod has acted as a positive role model for the city of Edinburgh during both high profile events;

Agrees that the Lord Provost commends the dedication and service of the Rev. MacLeod in an appropriate manner.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

35 Tinderbox Collective – Motion by Councillor McFarlane

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

“Council notes that Tinderbox Orchestra have just completed a sell-out run of performances at Edinburgh’s Central Library, featuring many musicians who got into music through the youth work and access to instruments provided by Tinderbox Collective.

Council further notes that their instrument drive is still open, and donations of instruments in all conditions are welcome and will add to the growing collection available to be borrowed by young people from libraries across Edinburgh.

Council understands that the event and wider programme has been supported by collaboration with CEC Community Librarian and poet Hannah Cooke who performed alongside the orchestra her new work inspired by community activist Dr. Helen Crummy who is remembered through a statue outside Craigmillar Library for her historic tireless campaign for access to music education for the children of Niddrie and Craigmillar.

Council recognises the outstanding success of putting music and instrument provision in our cities libraries and commends Hannah for fostering the relationship between Tinderbox Collective and her library in addition to positively representing the work of the City of Edinburgh’s Library Service at the Edinburgh Festival Fringe.

Council requests that the Lord Provost commends Tinderbox Collective for their success and community work in Edinburgh, in addition to recognising Hannah Cooke for her exemplary advocacy and work appropriately.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Walker.

36 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 36 of 31 August 2023)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question

In March 2023, ward councillors were told the works to install the new junction at Craigs Road and Maybury Road would start in "late May / early June". No works have yet commenced.

When is the reconfiguration of the Craig's Road / Maybury Road junction now expected to commence?

Answer

Designs have been prepared for the new junction which will allow buses to access the West Craigs sites from Maybury Road. Discussions have been ongoing with the housing developer for the neighbouring site regarding it. These discussions are expected to conclude soon. Once these are completed, works on the junction are expected to commence.

Supplementary Question

Can the convener clarify the outstanding issues that prevented the works proceeding in late May / early June as was suggested to ward councillors earlier in the year?

Supplementary Answer

Due to the complexities of the legal agreement in place, the information provided by the developer for the road has taken longer for officers to consider than originally anticipated.

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 31 August 2023**

Further to his answer at 10.13 at the 4 May 2023 Council meeting:

- Question** (1) When will the traffic orders for the Davidson's Mains roundabout be formally advertised?
- Answer** (1) It is expected that the advertising of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order and Redetermination Order will commence by the end of September 2023. The orders advertisement will run for a period of 3 weeks.
- Question** (2) What issues are holding up the formal advertisement of the orders?
- Answer** (2) Officers are preparing a revised plan and documents to reflect the necessary redetermination as this needs to be revised to reflect the removal of the pedestrian refuge islands. Unfortunately, this was omitted from the original plans.
- Question** (3) How many individuals and organisations responded to the first stage consultation on the traffic orders in May 2023
- Answer** (3) Representation was received from four individuals or organisations.

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

At the February 2023 meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee, report 7.7 on the Queensferry Town Centre Project stated the traffic regulation orders and redetermination orders would be promoted from March 2023. However, this has yet to happen.

Question (1) When will the necessary orders be formally advertised?

Answer (1) Unfortunately, the development of the required documentation has been delayed. A timeline is currently being finalised, but it is anticipated that the necessary orders will be advertised by the end of this calendar year. Local ward Councillors will be kept updated once the documentation is completed.

Question (2) What is the current funding arrangements for the project, especially in light of construction inflation?

Answer (2) When fully completed, the overall project cost is currently expected to be approximately £3m.

£1.05m has been allocated from the Place Based Improvement Fund over 2023/24 and 2024/25. However, further funding will need to be confirmed in order to deliver the proposed Town Centre project in full.

Supplementary Question Can the convener clarify why there was a delay in the development of the required documentation?

Supplementary Answer Until now this project has not had a dedicated project manager and therefore this has resulted in some delays in progressing the actions required, where other operational issues have regrettably had to take precedence. Recognising the importance of the scheme, arrangements are now being made to dedicate a project manager to progressing the scheme.

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Thornley for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Can the Convener please confirm:

Question (1) How many 'Wee Forests' have been planted in the last 12 months?

Answer (1) There were two Wee Forests planted in the last 12 months in West Granton Crescent Park and Redbraes Park.

Question (2) How many are planned for the coming 12 months?

Answer (2) There is one planned.

Question (3) In what locations are they planned?

Answer (3) Gyle Park.

Question (4) What engagement has taken place with 'Friends of' groups, local schools and other relevant organisations regarding planting?

Answer (4) Granton Primary School were engaged and involved in the planting at West Granton Crescent Park. A community flyer was produced for social media and there was also a press release.

At Redbraes Park, Edinburgh and Lothians Greenspace Trust had a community planting day engaging the Gaelic School, Pilrig Park Special School and Broughton Primary School.

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Kumar for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

In relation to the withdrawal of services for after school support for pupils with additional support needs:

- Question** (1) When was the first contract awarded and what was the contract management agreement? (Including KPIs)
- Answer** (1) We cannot respond to this in public. A confidential briefing note will be sent to members.
- Question** (2) There are approximately 4600 pupils who attend out of school clubs. How many pupils have additional support needs?
- Answer** (2) As above.
- Question** (3) What conversations have taken place between council officers and contract provider prior to 31st March 2022 to performance manage and monitor contract?
- Answer** (3) As above.
- Question** (4) When was the contract provider first made aware of officer's concerns around performance and what support was given to help improve this
- Answer** (4) As above.
- Question** (5) Breakdown of number of pupils supported by contract provider per annum since start of contract.
- Answer** (5) As above.
- Question** (6) Did senior management agree that this would deliver an in-year budget saving? If so, by how much?
- Answer** (6) As above.

QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor McFarlane for answer
by the Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 31 August
2023**

Question

Can she respond to reports that Lifelong Learning Staff based at the Southbridge Resource Centre found out about the preliminary plans to long-lease the building in the press instead of being briefed ahead of the reports publication as was promised at a meeting of stakeholders?

Answer

In advance of a report to Finance and Resources Committee on 25 April 2023 and following a hybrid meeting with all ward councillors, Council officers and members of the Fringe Society on 28 March:

On 19 April 2023 an email was issued to the Lifelong Learning colleagues who are based in South Bridge Resource Centre and whose programmes run from the building. This email provided an update on the note of interest received from the Edinburgh Festival Fringe Society and confirmed that a report would be presented to Finance and Resources Committee on 25 April 2023. The email explained that Committee would be asked to approve entering into formal discussions with the Society. The email sought to reassure colleagues that the discussions did not affect current or upcoming programmes, that the report to Committee did not seek a decision on the future of South Bridge Resource Centre and that the Council was committed to maintaining its extremely successful Adult Education. This email was sent with high importance to staff, for cascading to tutors and participants.

The importance of communication and coordinating this with the Fringe Society was emphasised at the meeting. A Fringe Society press release was embargoed until 19 April, with both the email and press release scheduled for release on the same day.

A further email was circulated on 28 June 2023 to confirm that the Edinburgh Festival Fringe Society would be carrying out surveys in early July as part of their feasibility assessment on the potential of the building.

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Aston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question

Can the Transport and Environment Convener detail what measurable progress has been made in the last year in reducing car usage in Edinburgh towards the target of a 30% reduction car kilometres by 2030?

Answer

Your attendance as a member of the Transport and Environment Committee has been commendable, so I am sure you will recall the progress which has been made in terms of policy.

Reduction in car kilometres is measured as part of the City Mobility Plan (CMP) Key Performances Indicators (KPIs). Progress against all the KPIs will be reported to Transport and Environment Committee in February 2024 as part of the CMP review process.

Since the baseline year (2019) up until August 2022 there has been a 7% reduction in car kilometres in Edinburgh. Information is provided by the Department for Transport's traffic count data annually and the next update is expected in summer 2024.

Supplementary Question

Given the Council collects the data, can it please be published annually, starting with releasing the data for 2022-23?

Supplementary Answer

As a review of the CMP is undertaken every two years and the results will be reported to Committee, an annual update will be provided in the Transport and Environment Committee Business Bulletin for the interim year of the CMP review cycle.

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Beal for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question

Please indicate the numbers of over-hanging foliage cases reported to the Council that:-

- Are solved without further intervention from the Council
- Required minimal intervention from the Council to be cut back
- Required lengthy intervention from the Council to reach resolution
- Required a cut back by the Council and charged to the dwelling
- Are still outstanding

Please could this be broken down by Ward and month over the last 2 years?

Please also provide an average length of cases in each category above.

Answer

It has not been possible to provide all of the information requested within the timeframe for preparing this response. However, please find below a table, by ward and by month of the total number of trees and foliage enquiries received since August 2021.

In addition, a further table summarises the number of enquiries by ward and the number outstanding.

You may also want to refer Question 5 from the June 2023 full Council.

Ward	Enquiry Closed	Enquiry Outstanding	Total
1	435	53	488
2	290	41	331
3	218	34	252
4	354	44	398
5	293	44	337
6	331	24	355
7	349	48	397
8	346	45	391
9	224	22	246
10	202	45	247
11	163	20	183
12	188	37	225
13	133	15	148
14	386	43	429
15	215	43	258
16	375	170	545
17	283	74	357
			5,587

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Thornley for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

A new pedestrian crossing has been installed at the foot of Clermiston Road North. The reduced size of the pedestrian island, and placement of pedestrian crossing lights, means access by wheelchair and for prams is nearly impossible.

Therefore, to ask the Convener;

Question (1) What assessment has been made of the accessibility of the new pedestrian crossing island at the foot of Clermiston Road North?.

Answer (1) The alteration to the junction was required to accommodate the introduction of a Toucan crossing on Queensferry Road. Council officers agreed the final layout taking account of the different and, sometimes conflicting, requirements. The island itself has not been reduced in size but the layout has been altered to reflect current guidelines on where traffic signal apparatus has to be located.

Question (2) Is work planned to resolve this issue and if so, when is it expected to be completed?

Answer (2) Officers are currently looking at the feasibility of re-locating the signal pole within the current guidelines. If feasible, the pole will be moved as soon as possible (depending on contractor availability).

Question (3) If not, why not?

Answer (3) See above.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Thornley for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Original plans for the West Craigs development talked of a bus gate on Turnhouse Road, beyond the existing West Craigs housing. This would mean all traffic having to go via the Craigs Road/Maybury Road junction.

In answer to my question in February this year, the Convener stated that “a bus gate may be necessary” and was being investigated.

Therefore, to ask the Convener;

Question (1) Have investigations into the possibility of a bus gate concluded? If not, when does he expect they will conclude?

Answer (1) No decision has been made on the bus gate.

Initial feasibility indicated the potential for the introduction of a bus gate on Turnhouse Road. Further evaluation is now being taken forward as part of the wider review of the Maybury Junction. Consultants have recently been appointed to do this and Transport and Environment Committee will be updated when the project has been developed.

The implementation of any bus gate would require a traffic regulation order and a formal consultation process which would provide opportunities for the public to provide comment on any proposal.

Question (2) If so, will a bus gate be installed on Turnhouse Road?

Answer (2) See answer 1.

Question (3) If so, when is the bus gate expected to be installed?

Answer (3) See answer 1.

QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Campbell for answer
by the Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 31 August
2023**

Question

- (1) There are still a number of concerns that councillors have raised about the lifelong learning review which have not been fully resolved.

Councillors were initially told that no saving would be delivered through the Lifelong Learning Review yet a saving was made.

Can the convener please confirm:

- On what date was the decision made to delete vacant posts resulting in a £170k saving?
- Which officers (Job title, not individuals) were involved in signing off this decision?
- Which objectives in the business plan were considered when this decision was made?
- Was an equalities impact assessment undertaken?
- Was the convener consulted on this decision?
- Were any other councillors informed or consulted on the budget cut to lifelong learning?
- What was the formal governance process around this decision and was there advice sought at any point on whether, due to political sensitivity, this should be decided by committee or council?

Answer

(1) In response to the questions above:

- On what date was the decision made to delete vacant posts resulting in a £170k saving?

On 12 December 2022, the final structure following the Lifelong Learning Review was communicated to officers in scope of the review.

On 13 December 2022, Culture and Communities Committee received an update on the review which confirmed that a saving was anticipated from the review.

- Which officers (Job title, not individuals) were involved in signing off this decision?

The Senior Responsible Officers for the review were the Executive Directors of Place and (now) Children, Education and Justice Services.

- Which objectives in the business plan were considered when this decision was made?

The vision for the review included focusing service delivery on activities which support the three core business plan priorities.

- Was an equalities impact assessment undertaken?

An integrated impact assessment was prepared in advance of the organisational review commencing and was updated through engagement with Trade Union colleagues during the review process.

- Was the convener consulted on this decision?

I was not consulted on the outcome of the review, but I was kept updated on the progress of the review.

- Were any other councillors informed or consulted on the budget cut to lifelong learning?

As noted above, a report to Culture and Communities Committee in December 2022 highlighted that a saving was anticipated.

- What was the formal governance process around this decision and was there advice sought at any point on whether, due to political sensitivity, this should be decided by committee or council?

The Lifelong Learning Review followed the Council's Managing Change policy. As noted in response to Councillor Campbell's question in September 2022, organisational reviews are always taken forward by officers.

Question

(2) Concerns have also been raised about the HR processes and the conflicting information provided to councillors. Can the convener please confirm:

- Why were three posts deleted after the review because there was no member of staff matched, yet staff were moved onto redeployment following the review?
- Councillors have been told that the cut to the lifelong learning budget was made because it did not impact on staff, does she agree with this assessment?
- Were all processes followed correctly in terms of the information that staff were given about applying for posts while on redeployment?
- Were any posts advertised externally?
- What is the HR process for when posts are advertised externally following a review, and was the correct process followed in this case?

Answer

(2) In response to the questions above:

- Why were three posts deleted after the review because there was no member of staff matched, yet staff were moved onto redeployment following the review?

There have been no posts deleted from the structure following the review. As noted in a briefing note for Councillors in June 2023, following matching and assignment there were four individuals within the scope of the review who were unsuccessful in being matched into positions within the new service areas.

- Councillors have been told that the cut to the lifelong learning budget was made because it did not impact on staff, does she agree with this assessment?

There was 69.67 FTE (excluding vacancies) in scope of the review and the final structure has positions equivalent to a total FTE of 74.5. The saving achieved through the review is as a result of there being unfilled vacancies in the original lifelong learning structure.

- Were all processes followed correctly in terms of the information that staff were given about applying for posts while on redeployment?

Yes, the processes were followed. However, I asked officers to consider if the approach to redeployment was appropriate in the circumstances and, as a result, the individuals affected were invited to note interest in the unfilled roles.

- Were any posts advertised externally?

Yes, the unfilled posts were advertised concurrently to redeployment, internally and externally due to the number of positions available. Any redeployees who noted interest in these positions were seen prior to any other candidates.

- What is the HR process for when posts are advertised externally following a review, and was the correct process followed in this case?

There is no specific process for advertising vacancies externally following an organisational review. The process followed is outlined above.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Nicolson for answer by
the Council Leader at a meeting of
the Council on 31 August 2023**

Question

Following the SNP motion at Full Council which agreed unanimously that a Stolperstein will be installed at St Stephen's Church, Stockbridge, to recognise the heroic work of Jane Haining, please can you update us on progress towards the Stolperstein installation and a ceremony in January 2024 to commemorate International Holocaust Remembrance Day?

Answer

To date, approximately 95,000 Stolperstein have been installed across Europe.

Council officers have investigated the criteria on Stolperstein, which is a project initiated by German artist Gunter Demnig. The artist himself must install all of the Stolperstein, with production costs of 132 euros for each stone (which measure 10cm x 10cm). The cost of travel and accommodation for the artist will also need to be met.

The Stolperstein should be placed outside 'their last address of choice' therefore evidence would need to be provided that this was Jane Haining's address of choice. In addition, there is a requirement to contact any living relatives to ensure the correct placement and to organise permissions and media ahead of any unveiling.

Officers understand that there is a long waiting list for Stolperstein, with production of around 440 per month. They will continue to progress this and to identify any potential funding partners but unfortunately it is unlikely that an installation ceremony will be possible in January 2024.

**Supplementary
Question**

Have council officers spoken with Mr Demnig or his colleagues?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Council officers have not been in touch with Mr Demnig or his colleagues.

QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor McKenzie for answer
by the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 31 August
2023**

Under section 1(1C) of the Education (Scotland) Act 1980, education authorities are empowered to provide discretionary early learning and childcare, over and above the statutory entitlement. This can be used to widen local eligibility criteria.

Question (1) When was the Convener informed of changes to eligibility criteria for discretionary early learning and childcare?

Answer (1) There has been no change to the criteria for discretionary early learning and childcare. Discretionary for 2 year olds are allocated using the following criteria.

- Children in temporary accommodation or homeless.
- Children who have been supported through the Family Nurse Partnership.

Referrals for children under 2 years old are still made using the Getting it Right for Every Child SHANARRI wellbeing indicators and consideration is given to children who require additional support to enable them to reach their full potential (Education (Additional Support for Learning) (Scotland) Act 2004), or who meet the eligibility criteria as identified in the Children and Young People (Scotland) Act 2014.

Examples are

- Safe - Children on the child protection register
- Healthy - Multi-agency child planning (GIRFEC pathways 3 & 4 planning)

Question (2) Can the Convener share details of the changes that have been made to the eligibility criteria?

Answer (2) As stated, no changes have been made to the eligibility criteria. Members of the Children's Partnership (NHS, Education and Social Work) agreed to review the process for allocation to ensure children who have the greatest level of need are able to access a place as soon as possible.

Question (3) Can the Convener explain how the decision to change the eligibility criteria was reached, including details of any discussions with stakeholders and elected members?

Answer (3) The criteria has not changed.

Question (4) Has an Integrated Impact Assessment been completed in relation to changes to the eligibility criteria?

Answer (4) N/A

Question (5) How many referrals for discretionary early learning and childcare have been accepted as of 22nd August 2023 in comparison with 22nd August 2022 from each of the following sources:

- a) Self-referrals
- b) Health Visitor referrals
- c) Social Work referrals
- d) Third Sector referrals

Answer (5) Local authority early years settings have 124 registered places for children under the age of 2 years old.

August 2022 – 51 children under the age of 2 had a discretionary place. We do not hold accurate data for the process prior to August 2023 because the process in place at the time was inconsistent with early years settings taking different approaches to recording whether children had been referred or were actually eligible for funded ELC.

August 2023 - 77 children under the age of 2 have a discretionary place. 41 places have been allocated through the referral process.

- a) Self-referrals = 0
- b) Health Visitor referrals = 30
- c) Social Work referrals = 3
- d) Third Sector referrals = 0
- e) Family Nurse Partnership = 7
- f) Community Nursery Nurse = 1

Question (6) Can the Convener share the advice that is being given in response to unsuccessful referrals?

Answer (6) The advice will vary depending on the information provided in the referral.

Supplementary Question The answer to Question 1 states “ There has been no change to the criteria”, but the answer to Question 2 states “Members of the Children’s Partnership agreed to review the process for allocation”. Can the Convener share or signpost to any available information on the outcome of the review and its impacts?

Supplementary Answer The Children’s Partnership has an action to improve the information sharing protocol. Under the previous process, referrals were often made directly to a small number of early years settings through telephone calls with no written record of the reason for the referral or decisions to allocate discretionary places or not. It was also noted that many parents/carers of children allocated a discretionary place had to travel out with their community due to the referrals be made directly to a small number of early years settings. 34 early years settings provide places for children under 3 years of age, only 11 settings received referrals for discretionary places.

Our new centrally managed process agreed by CEC and NHS senior officers ensures referrals for discretionary

places are made through the GIRFEC process and information is appropriately shared and stored between services. It also takes account of all our early years settings with places for children under 3 years of age.

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Biagi for answer by the
Convener of the Education, Children
and Families Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 31 August 2023**

Question

In how many schools were fewer than one place per class kept aside this academic year for P1 pupils who moved into catchment after the December cut-off date for enrolment, and which schools are they?

Answer

Bonaly – two late catchment – 1 granted on appeal so now 1.

Broughton – 2 late catchment – 1 being offered.

Brunstane – 3 late catchment – 1 allocated – 3 appeals were granted so this has reduced the possibility of allocating to late catchment.

Corstorphine – 2 late catchment – 1 non-catchment granted on appeal, so this has reduced the possibility of allocating to late catchment.

Cramond – 1 late catchment now allocated.

Forthview – 4 late catchment – all now allocated.

Leith – 1 late catchment – now allocated.

Lorne – 1 late catchment – now allocated.

Newcraighall – 2 late catchment – now allocated.

Sciennes – 2 late catchment – 1 allocated

The class organisations in our primary schools are reviewed annually in January taking into account expected pupil numbers for the coming school session. Our priority is to accommodate catchment pupils, with out of catchment places offered where available. Edinburgh is experiencing a falling pupil roll across our primary schools with many schools experiencing a drop in pupil intake limits and classes.

The Council aims to provide places for P1 and S1 pupils at one of their catchment schools, if they apply and provide satisfactory proof of residence in the catchment area by 24 December in the year before they begin primary or secondary school and are still living at the same address at the start of session.

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 31 August 2023**

Question (1) How many fines have been issued to tourist coaches parking overnight on areas covered by signs saying “No Parking at Any Time”?

Answer (1) Over the past year, nine parking tickets have been issued to coaches parking on yellow lines out with the operating times of the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), with the latest issue time being 20:31.

Question (2) Who issues these fines?

Answer (2) Parking tickets in Edinburgh are issued by parking attendants who are employed by NSL on behalf of the Council.

QUESTION NO 16

**By Councillor Whyte for answer by
the Convener of the Regulatory
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 31 August 2023**

The cost of a Short Term Let License is intended to recover the costs to the Council of the work involved.

The cost of a license for a four person/two bed property in East Lothian for a three-year period is £390. In Edinburgh, the equivalent cost is £1440.

Question (1) Can the Convener explain why the costs vary so much?

Answer (1) The fees chargeable in Edinburgh were approved by the Regulatory Committee and reflect the work expected in terms of inspecting properties, dealing with complaints and ensuring that Licensed Short Term Let (STL) operators behave responsibly. I understand the fee for East Lothian is a flat fee irrespective of size or type of STL.

Question (2) How can this be justifiable when the work involved in administering the scheme will be the same? Indeed, it could be argued that there are economies of scale in administering the scheme for larger local authorities in Edinburgh

Answer (2) The fee is not simply for administration. A comparison could only be made if the approach to enforcement and monitoring the STL sector during the lifetime of the 3 year licence is identical. The Council has agreed a proactive monitoring approach and the costs have been set based on previous experience (of the real cost of monitoring and enforcement of other licence types). The Council will publish a full breakdown of the income and expenditure associated with STL to allow scrutiny by the Regulatory Committee on an ongoing basis.

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

At the most recent Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee a deputation suggested that there was proportionally a much higher number of void and long-term void Council homes in Lochend/Craigentenny/Restalrig than in other areas of the city.

Can the Convener please provide the following information in a tabular format to clarify the situation, City wide and for the areas of Lochend, Craigentenny and Restalrig

Question (1) The total number of Council HRA homes

Answer (1) The table below shows the total number of Council homes across the city, with a breakdown of the three areas listed.

As of 21 Aug 23	City wide	Craigentenny	Lochend	Restalrig	Total	Area % of city
CEC Homes	20,224	417	706	387	1,510	7.47%
Total voids*	1,435	8	66	59	133	9.27%
Voids over 18 months	478	1	36	31	68	14.23%

*includes 260 voids unable to be let due to decants, disposal, demolition, new build, management transfer etc

Question (2) The total number of voids, and the proportion of properties void in percentage terms.

Answer (2) See response to Q1 above

Question (3) The number of long-term voids, and the proportion of properties long-term void in percentage terms.

Answer (3) See response to Q1 above

Question (4) A breakdown of the main reasons that properties are long-term void

Answer (4) The table below provides a breakdown of the main reasons for the long term void properties in the three areas noted above:

As of 21 August 23	
Undergoing repairs	45
Repairs complete and returned to be let	20
Void Properties unable to be let*	3
Total	68

* Voids unable to be let due to being used as decants (2) or being transferred to temporary accommodation (1).

Question (5) The average turnover rate

Answer (5) The average length of time to re-let properties in 2022/23 was 108 days.

Question (6) The average length of tenancy

Answer (6) The average length of tenancy as of 22 August 2023 was 4,171 days.

QUESTION NO 18

**By Councillor Bruce for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 31 August 2023**

Question (1) What meetings have taken place with the landowners to deliver the fully signalised Dalmahoy Junction and what were the outcomes?

Answer (1) Initial contact was made with the landowners around September 2018. A meeting with the landowners took place in December 2019 and thereafter Council officers have been engaging with the landowners by correspondence.

Question (2) When is this part of the project expected to be concluded?

Answer (2) Terms are currently being discussed with each of the three landowners. Once terms are agreed with the landowners, the legal paperwork can be finalised and issued for agreement. It is not yet possible to provide a date for when these terms will be concluded.

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question

You mentioned back in the May Full Council that a direct and frequent bus service from Ratho to the city centre was not affordable within the current supported bus services budget. Will you write to the Transport Convener at the Scottish Government before the end of September 2023 to ask for extra emergency funding to make sure Ratho has a direct city centre bus service it so desperately needs?

Answer

Whilst much of the CEC area is provided with an excellent service via Lothian Buses, the Council supporting services elsewhere is an incredibly expensive undertaking within the context of the Scottish Government's squeeze on local government spending. This was only exacerbated when the proposal in the 2023/24 CEC budget process to provide additional funding to supported bus services was blocked.

I'm due to meet Fiona Hyslop MSP, the Scottish Government's Minister for Transport, in the coming weeks to discuss transport in Edinburgh and I will be sure to mention the challenges in rural west Edinburgh.

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

In December 2017 I asked the then Convener of Transport and Environment - what number of pedestrian crossings within the City of Edinburgh have been fitted with a pedestrian signalling box with working rotating cones underneath, which enable partially sighted individuals to know when it is safe to cross? Answer - There are currently **596 traffic signal** installations in the city. **409 have rotating tactile cones** for use by partially sighted pedestrians. Five and half years on:

Question (1) What number of pedestrian crossings within the City of Edinburgh have been fitted with a pedestrian signalling box with working rotating cones underneath, which enable partially sighted individuals to know when it is safe to cross?

Answer (1) There are currently 642 sets of traffic signals in Edinburgh. Out of the 642 sets of signals there are two different types of facilities for visually impaired users, tactile rotating cones & audio beeper units. These are broken down to, 319 with both rotating tactile cones and audio units, 209 with tactile rotating cones only and 72 with audio units only.

Question (2) What number of signalised crossing have no pedestrian signalling box?

Answer (2) Where there are junctions that have missing push buttons, the data isn't available for those crossings that still have a signalised red and green man. All standalone crossings have no missing push buttons, out of our 277 junctions there are 66 signal-controlled junctions that have partial pedestrian facilities. This is where 1 or more arms of the junction has a missing controlled crossing.

Question (3) In the cases where a pedestrian signalling box has been installed how many do not have working rotating cones?

Answer

- (3) There are a total of 29 traffic signals that have no facilities for visually impaired users where there are push buttons installed.

QUESTION NO 21

**By Councillor Osler for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 31 August 2023**

Question (1) According to a report that went to the Transport and Environment Committee in May of this year *the present contractor has agreed to undertake an on going sweeping program of all sites laid with micro-asphalt from the 2022/23 program.*

How is this being monitored?

Answer (1) The contractor agreed to undertake a regular sweep of sites between February 2023 and July 2023 (this time period corresponds with the date the material was identified as defective by the contractor, to the date the remedial works were completed).

After a sweep in late February 2023, it was agreed between the Council and the contractor that further sweeps would be undertaken as and when necessary, based on site inspections and resident feedback.

Council officers have carried-out ad-hoc inspections. However, due to the wholesale stone loss soon after laying (October 2022), the majority of the loose material had already been cleared (as a result of previous sweeping operations) therefore further sweeps have not been necessary as there was negligible loose material during the period from early March 2023 to July 2023.

Question (2) Given the unsatisfactory implementation and the lack of action to address the issues last year.

What improvements have been made this year?

Answer

- (2) The issues experienced during the 2022/23 programme can be attributed to defective material associated with the micro-asphalt programme (the surface dressing program was largely unaffected). Unfortunately, the issue with the material was only identified at the end of the programme, and was therefore too late to prevent wholesale failures at some sites. An extensive investigation was undertaken by the contractor and their findings were presented to the Council in February 2023.

As a result of the issues last year and further discussions with the contractor, their procedures were amended for the 2023/24 programme. The most notable change was the instigation of additional testing by the aggregate supplier on each batch prior to use by the contractor on-street. It was also decided to bring forward the 2023/24 programme by 2 – 3 months (starting in May and completing in July/early August), thus ensuring better climatic conditions for this type of operation.

The 2023/24 micro asphalt and surface dressing laying programme has now completed and material failures have not been identified.

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Flannery for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

The Council website states: *Edinburgh's city centre LEZ is here. Are you ready?* It points to boundary, standards, penalty charges, support funding and exemptions of impending LEZ, but there is no support or approved list of outlets for residents wanting to convert their vehicles to be LEZ-ready. Does the Convener agree that -

Question (1) To encourage this transition information should be readily available on Council Websites?

Answer (1) The Clean Vehicle Retrofit Accreditation Scheme (CVRAS) is only applicable to buses, coaches, heavy goods vehicles, mini-buses, taxis and certain vans (subject to conditions and feasibility being met).

More information on the [Clean Vehicle Retrofit Accreditation Scheme \(CVRAS\)](#) and [approved suppliers for eligible businesses and vehicle types](#) are available on the Energy Savings Trust website. The Council's [LEZ business support webpage](#) has been updated to reflect this information.

If you are a low-income household living within 20 kilometres (12 miles) of the LEZ, you may be eligible to apply for a grant of up to £3,000. Support includes:

- £2,000 for disposing of vehicles which do not comply with the low emissions standards; and
- £500 Travel Better vouchers per adult, up to £1,000 per household to buy bikes, e-bikes, cargo bikes and public transport tickets.

Other support is also available including for:

- e-bikes
- family cargo bikes
- adapted cycles; and
- electric vehicles and chargers

Further information on funding support for individuals and households is detailed on the [LEZ Individuals and Households support webpage](#).

Question (2) That officers who have had to check with Transport Scotland to find out approved CVRAS outlets, should be provided with this information, also?

Answer (2) See response to Question 1.

Question (3) Given this, is he aware that -

Some garages seem equally unclear as to what conversion entails, which garages will carry this out, and by when.

Answer (3) See response to Question 1.

Question (4) Given that the 1 June 2024 is the introduction date for the City Centre LEZ, would he agree that as a council we need to have this information available as a matter of priority for residents.

Answer (4) See response to Question 1.

Supplementary Question Questions 1 – 4 refer to support or approved list of outlets for residents wanting to convert their vehicles to be LEZ-ready by June next year, not public or business vehicles.

**Supplementary
Answer**

The response to Question 1 includes a link to the Council's webpage detailing support funding available to eligible business/commercial vehicles.

The Scottish Government's Bus Emissions Abatement Retrofit (BEAR) programme (which has been running since 2018) aims to fit buses/coaches with Clean Vehicle Retrofit Accreditation Scheme (CVRAS) accredited retrofit technology measures. Information will be published on both the Transport Scotland and Council websites once the status of this funding for 2023/24 has been confirmed

QUESTION NO 23

By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

On the 2nd of May, 2023, a number of trees were fell on Pilrig Street and multiple cherry blossom trees on Cambridge Gardens were cut back by contractors working on behalf of the City of Edinburgh Council. These trees are within the Pilrig Conservation Area, which has a 2013 character appraisal stating "*the significance of mature trees*" as part of the essential character.

Question (1) Why did these proposed works not go through the Planning system given the trees' status were known about for at least a month, as well as the consideration of the above significance of the conservation area, which private local residents rightly get permission when felling a tree, and allow residents to be aware of works?

Answer (1) Following an inspection of the trees within the Pilrig Conservation area, an urgent decision was taken to take action on a small number of trees due to their condition. Two trees were felled, and the remainder had minor pruning works carried out to improve sightlines and to address conflicts with low hanging branches along the public highway.

Emergency works are exempt from planning approval, and Council officers in Neighbourhood Environmental Services and Planning work closely to ensure that any emergency works are clearly documented so that they could be investigated at a later date if required.

Question (2) What liaison was done with residents of the properties these trees were on before and after the works, and what steps are being taken to replace the tree loss?

Answer (2) During the inspection, local residents engaged with the inspector on site in respect of the action being taken. As the trees are located on HRA land, the works were approved by Council officers in Neighbourhood Environmental Services and Housing.

There are plans to replace the two trees which were felled as part of a future planting programme. The date for this planting is yet to be confirmed.

Question (3) Why was the emergency tree number not staffed at 11am in the morning in question when residents suspected illegal tree felling?

Answer (3) The Council Emergency Contact Number is used for reporting all issues with trees. This is a 24-hour service, 365 days per year. However, it may be that residents contacted officers directly but were unable to reach them as the office is not always staffed. A dedicated mailbox is also in place and is monitored throughout office hours. Emails received are prioritised and responded to in order of priority.

Question (4) How are trees that have to be removed for safety on Council land recorded with the Planning service to ensure the Council are replacing our stock in order to meet the “one million tree city” target.

Answer (4) Where protected trees are removed, the Planning service will usually specify that replacements are planted (unless there is a good reason not to). A long-standing commitment to replace trees where they are lost is written into the ‘Trees in the City’ policy. Culture and Communities Committee are kept updated on this on an annual basis. This is achieved through the Council’s annual tree planting programme and the Edinburgh Million Tree Project (via external partners).

QUESTION NO 24

By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question (1) What is the Council's position on street furniture actively being installed in 2023 to 2015 Edinburgh Street Design Guidance specifications, rather than 2022 Guidance?

Answer (1) When street schemes are designed, they accord with guidance current at that time. This means that where guidance is updated prior to construction, situations can arise where the installed scheme does not meet the parameters of current guidance. Each must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis as updating design parameters to current guidance would, in normal circumstances, be a contract change which would need to be managed through each project's change management process.

Question (2) What is the Council's policy in responding to serious accessibility and safety concerns raised by residents on infrastructure such as benches (*C1-5-a in 2015 into F2 in 2022*), pavement width (*C1-1-a and C1-1-b in 2015 into P2 in 2022*) or cycle racks (*C2-4 in 2015 into C7 in 2022*) that don't meet 2022 Guidance?

Answer (2) The Council does not immediately review all existing infrastructure when guidance is updated and therefore there is no immediate action to replace anything that no longer complies to the most up to date guidance. When designing new infrastructure, the designs developed aim to comply with current guidance at the point of design.

Officers will also investigate issues of accessibility and safety if these are raised with residents and consider if there is any action which can be taken to address this.

Question (3) What steps generally across Edinburgh are the Administration taking to ensure infrastructure that doesn't meet the 2022 Guidance (but meets 2015) is replaced with infrastructure that does?

Answer (3) As above.

Question (4) What steps, specifically on the Trams to Newhaven Project and handover, are the Administration taking to ensure infrastructure that doesn't meet the 2022 Guidance (but meets 2015) is replaced with infrastructure that does?

Answer (4) Any steps would be taken in line with the parameters above and funding would have to be made available.

QUESTION NO 25

**By Councillor Davidson for answer
by the Vice-Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 31 August 2023**

Question (1) What assessment has been made as to the uptake of the online order service of sexual health testing kits provided by the EHSCP?

Answer (1) It is clear that uptake, in terms of demand, greatly exceeds capacity. Lothian Sexual & Reproductive Health Services (LSRHS) piloted the new software that supports online ordering of testing kits as part of a national pilot. We are still working with the developers and our data team to get further reporting capabilities set up. We are in the process of gathering data to write a report on the roll-out of the pilot in Lothian.

Question (2) Has an assessment to the accessibility of the current system taken place?

Answer (2) Accessibility testing was done as part of the project's software design phase by the team that created the pathway and is part of the national pilot project specification. Further accessibility testing has not taken place within Lothian Sexual and Reproductive Health Services.

Question (3) Is there an estimate as to the number of patients who have been unable to access kits due to limited accessibility to the online kits?

Answer

- (3) Initial reports from the electronic patient record developers who host the online ordering platform (Excelicare) identified that 11-13% of requests were being met. This is likely in part to reflect the same citizens making multiple attempts to order the kits, but we know that only a minority of requests are met. The service has advertised the time we make kits available on our FAQs on our website.

Based on the low percentage of people able to access testing kits online and the need to offer alternative routes to testing, we have re-introduced our face-to-face express

testing service for those without symptoms. We have not yet quantified the impact this has had on success at getting an online order as the service need to go via the developer for this information at present.

For context, it is important to note that this project was initiated in Lothian as a local solution during COVID restrictions, within the existing funding envelope. As other services have resumed and expanded, it constitutes an additional resource pressure. It has progressed as part of a national pilot which finishes in August 2023. Discussions are underway between the Project Board, Scottish Government and Public Health Scotland regarding the national roll out of the pilot, including nationally co-ordinated laboratory solutions and resource implications. We continue to work closely with the online ordering developers and programme board with the aim of supporting a national solution to make it more accessible and easier to access a testing kit for more people. In the meantime, we continue to work on solutions to improve capacity locally within existing resources.

QUESTION NO 26

By Councillor Dobbin for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question (1) Given the dependence of many residents on the Garden Aid Service and the failure of the Contractor to meet their responsibilities, how many residents have complained about missed appointments

Answer (1) In the period April to August 2023, there were 173 complaints about missed service from across the city from a total customer base of 2,592 (6.67%). It is important to note that the Garden Aid service is a basic grass and hedge-cutting service and does not operate on an appointment basis.

Question (2) When were officers aware of the issues and why were Councillors not briefed?

Answer (2) Much of the issues caused have been related to resourcing on the part of the contractor. It was anticipated these issues would have been resolved by now.

Officers recognise that when it became apparent that the issues were going to persist Members should have been notified. A Members Brief will be circulated as soon as possible.

Question (3) Will residents who have had failure of service receive compensation?

Answer (3) If paying customers have not received a hedge-cut this season they will be offered the chance to cancel the service and receive compensation and if they have only received one hedge cut, then they will be offered proportionate compensation.

QUESTION NO 27

By Councillor Dobbin for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question (1) Given many residents have now been waiting over a year to have windows replaced, and with the winter rapidly approaching, can the Convener explain in detail why the tendering process has taken so long to appoint a new contractor.

Answer (1) There are two live contracts in place to deliver the window replacement programme across the city. A procurement process is in progress now to address the backlog which has resulted from the difficulties experienced in procurement for this work. Officers anticipate that it will take 12 months from now to clear the backlog.

An update on the procurement process was provided in response to a previous question by Councillor Dobbin. There have been delays in awarding the live contracts as a result of a challenge to the decision of the procurement process which prevented the award of contracts until the dispute had been resolved.

Question (2) Given the failure of the process, why have Councillors not been briefed on the inordinate delays affecting constituents.

Answer (2) Ward members are regularly briefed on investment priorities and plans for each financial year and officers respond to individual questions from Elected Members and tenants on specific cases. This has been the case with regards to contract delays and window replacement, with a number of updates provided to councillors over a period of months.

QUESTION NO 28

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Despite the increased budget of £2.74 million for Street Cleansing, concerns have been raised that the standard has not been improved at all. With regards our Statutory Duties under the Code of Practice can the Convener please provide a response to the following questions -

Question (1) Does he accept that the department has a legal obligation to cleanse streets to the standard set out in the Code?

Answer (1) Streets should, as far as possible, be cleansed to a Grade A standard and where they fall below this should be recovered to this standard within the timescales in the Code.

Question (2) Does he accept that the only way to cleanse streets to those standards is by a brush and barrow operative as litter picking does not achieve the standard when there are parked cars, and neither will the new equipment?

Answer (2) This is dependent on the cleanliness of the street when a crew or barrow person attends. A street may only be required to be brought up to standard by some litter removal.

Question (3) The department has always stated they have a yearly blitz on street cleansing, as this is now August when is this due to start?

Answer (3) The service was funded in 2022/23 for a city-wide deep clean and also funded for a City Centre deep clean. The latter programme is in the final stages. Blitzes are routinely carried out by crews, and these are undertaken on a street-by-street basis.

Question (4) When is the weeding due to start?

Answer (4) Weed treatment has already started but, as with every other year, is dependant on weather and resources. Based on the budget available it is not possible to maintain weed free streets city wide.

Question (5) Why are abandoned items like traffic cones, signage, sandbags etc not removed in line with the NRSW Act which states they must be removed "promptly"?

Answer (5) The NRSW Act states that the company which has erected the traffic management should remove them, not the Council.

However, where abandoned items related to road works have been noted or reported to the Council, officers will take steps to identify the company responsible to arrange their removal. Where this is not possible, they will be removed as having been dumped or abandoned.

Question (6) Does the Convener accept that by failing to adhere to either the Code of Practice and the NRSW Act the council are leaving themselves open to court action?

Answer (6) The Council would only not be adhering to the NRSW Act where the traffic management relates to a Council road works or construction scheme. Any abandoned traffic management equipment left by statutory undertakers or private companies is not the duty of the Council.

QUESTION NO 29

**By Councillor Jones for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 31 August
2023**

Please can you provide information on the following:

- Question** (1) the standardised attainment results for 2022/2023 for all primary schools and secondary school in Edinburgh - P1, P4, P7 and S3
- Answer** (1) In Scotland National Standardised Assessments (NSA) data is used for diagnostic purposes only and is not used as a key performance indicator of pupil progress in learning, teacher, school or Local Authority performance. There is no correlation between ACEL scores and NSA scores, as these are all taken at different times, at the direction of class teachers, based on pupil readiness. They are considered as part of a range of assessment tools at teachers' disposal to be used diagnostically. This is the approach taken by Scottish Government: to use anonymised national level data to identify trends, National Policy and areas for improvement and support.
- Question** (2) the standardised attainment results for S 3 for all secondary schools for

2019/2020,
2020/2021 and
2021/22
- Answer** (2) As above

QUESTION NO 30

**By Councillor Jones for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 31 August
2023**

Question

Please could you provide the following information:

A breakdown school by school of the total percentage of children in SIMD 1 and SIMD 2.

Answer

This was last produced in December 2022. The next time this will be produced will be after the Pupil Census for the current session has concluded and this will be towards the end of November/early December of this year.

Please see overleaf the breakdowns:

SIMD 2020 Profile - Primary Schools

% of Pupils attending school on Census day (14/09/22) by SIMD Decile

School	SIMD Decile										Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Abbeyhill Primary School	1%	4%	5%	24%	19%	20%	11%	2%	15%	1%	100%
Balgreen Primary School	1%	5%	32%	15%	8%	17%	3%	9%	9%	3%	100%
Blackhall Primary School	0%	0%	2%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%	11%	81%	100%
Bonaly Primary School	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	2%	16%	79%	100%
Broomhouse Primary School	6%	38%	18%	12%	1%	19%	5%	0%	1%	1%	100%
Broughton Primary School	2%	5%	3%	24%	3%	1%	5%	12%	21%	23%	100%
Brunstane Primary School	40%	22%	9%	2%	6%	1%	11%	5%	3%	0%	100%
Bruntsfield Primary School	0%	0%	1%	0%	3%	2%	11%	6%	12%	64%	100%
Buckstone Primary School	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	5%	1%	11%	80%	100%
Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pàirce (Parkside Primary)	2%	7%	7%	10%	8%	7%	19%	8%	12%	19%	100%
Canaan Lane Primary School	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	10%	8%	20%	63%	100%
Canal View Primary School	70%	10%	3%	1%	11%	1%	0%	0%	4%	0%	100%
Carrick Knowe Primary School	0%	7%	1%	5%	2%	25%	27%	1%	13%	19%	100%
Castleview Primary School	40%	49%	0%	1%	1%	4%	4%	0%	1%	0%	100%
Clermiston Primary School	0%	9%	6%	26%	18%	0%	16%	12%	10%	2%	100%
Clovenstone Primary School	40%	30%	20%	0%	7%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Colinton Primary School	2%	2%	3%	0%	6%	21%	4%	38%	12%	11%	100%
Corstorphine Primary School	0%	1%	0%	2%	7%	1%	13%	2%	8%	65%	100%
Craigentiny Primary School	20%	20%	25%	6%	10%	2%	1%	9%	0%	8%	100%
Craiglockhart Primary School	0%	1%	1%	2%	5%	6%	3%	5%	4%	74%	100%
Craigour Park Primary School	10%	32%	26%	9%	10%	9%	4%	0%	0%	0%	100%

Craigroyston Primary School	37%	38%	9%	6%	8%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Cramond Primary School	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	3%	5%	31%	58%	100%
Currie Primary School	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	12%	14%	8%	10%	54%	100%
Dalmeny Primary School	0%	1%	0%	0%	3%	1%	5%	63%	24%	3%	100%
Dalry Primary School	2%	7%	7%	13%	23%	4%	28%	2%	9%	5%	100%
Davidson's Mains Primary School	3%	4%	3%	3%	6%	0%	1%	0%	26%	54%	100%
Dean Park Primary School	0%	0%	0%	0%	16%	0%	1%	17%	14%	51%	100%
Duddingston Primary School	3%	3%	12%	1%	2%	3%	21%	1%	6%	47%	100%
East Craigs Primary School	0%	0%	0%	18%	13%	10%	3%	6%	17%	34%	100%
Echline Primary School	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	28%	57%	100%
Ferryhill Primary School	5%	26%	22%	43%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	100%
Flora Stevenson Primary School	1%	3%	7%	4%	0%	0%	4%	11%	3%	66%	100%
Forthview Primary School	5%	47%	34%	9%	3%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Fox Covert ND Primary School	0%	3%	5%	3%	1%	1%	2%	22%	47%	17%	100%
Frogston Primary School	0%	29%	2%	0%	7%	0%	46%	9%	7%	0%	100%
Gilmerton Primary School	11%	19%	9%	9%	10%	0%	36%	1%	4%	0%	100%
Gracemount Primary School	2%	46%	18%	6%	5%	0%	8%	6%	7%	1%	100%
Granton Primary School	32%	23%	19%	5%	4%	1%	10%	5%	0%	1%	100%
Gylemuir Primary School	0%	2%	1%	1%	10%	2%	35%	16%	11%	22%	100%
Hermitage Park Primary School	26%	9%	4%	8%	1%	18%	12%	11%	1%	11%	100%
Hillwood Primary School	0%	1%	6%	0%	3%	82%	1%	3%	3%	0%	100%
Holy Cross Roman Catholic Primary School	4%	12%	13%	4%	3%	7%	19%	9%	13%	17%	100%
James Gillespie's Primary School	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	5%	2%	8%	80%	100%
Juniper Green Primary School	3%	4%	1%	1%	2%	2%	1%	9%	17%	61%	100%
Kirkliston Primary School	0%	0%	16%	0%	9%	5%	0%	70%	0%	0%	100%
Leith Primary School	11%	11%	15%	21%	18%	6%	5%	8%	4%	0%	100%
Leith Walk Primary School	3%	4%	3%	25%	6%	14%	14%	11%	6%	15%	100%
Liberton Primary School	0%	3%	29%	28%	4%	0%	10%	8%	9%	8%	100%
Longstone Primary School	7%	2%	16%	9%	1%	26%	2%	0%	35%	1%	100%
Lorne Primary School	3%	6%	8%	34%	12%	3%	30%	1%	2%	2%	100%

Murrayburn Primary School	14%	9%	2%	8%	12%	41%	12%	1%	1%	1%	100%
Nether Currie Primary School	1%	3%	0%	0%	4%	2%	2%	15%	55%	17%	100%
Newcraighall Primary School	8%	3%	0%	2%	52%	9%	4%	1%	22%	0%	100%
Niddrie Mill Primary School	52%	33%	2%	1%	1%	7%	3%	1%	0%	0%	100%
Oxgangs Primary School	2%	8%	10%	1%	19%	3%	10%	8%	2%	38%	100%
Parson's Green Primary School	2%	4%	2%	20%	5%	2%	2%	11%	9%	43%	100%
Pentland Primary School	7%	5%	12%	5%	1%	7%	1%	1%	2%	60%	100%
Pirniehall Primary School	19%	35%	19%	16%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Preston Street Primary School	2%	3%	3%	5%	1%	10%	5%	10%	41%	21%	100%
Prestonfield Primary School	18%	30%	4%	20%	1%	3%	3%	1%	8%	13%	100%
Queensferry Primary School	0%	0%	5%	0%	1%	0%	12%	66%	13%	3%	100%
Ratho Primary School	0%	0%	2%	0%	24%	48%	6%	0%	0%	20%	100%
Roseburn Primary School	0%	1%	1%	2%	5%	4%	3%	12%	22%	49%	100%
Royal Mile Primary School	4%	11%	27%	27%	8%	10%	4%	3%	4%	3%	100%
Sciennes Primary School	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	9%	7%	22%	56%	100%
Sighthill Primary School	32%	58%	1%	1%	5%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	100%
South Morningside Primary School	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	8%	7%	75%	100%
St Andrews Fox Covert Roman Catholic Primary School	3%	19%	14%	12%	4%	1%	8%	12%	13%	15%	100%
St Catherine's Roman Catholic Primary School	0%	54%	10%	1%	9%	0%	11%	9%	4%	0%	100%
St Cuthbert's Roman Catholic Primary School	3%	2%	6%	11%	19%	39%	1%	1%	14%	5%	100%
St David's Roman Catholic Primary School	20%	37%	24%	7%	11%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
St Francis' Roman Catholic Primary School	44%	42%	1%	4%	1%	4%	4%	0%	0%	0%	100%
St John Vianney Roman Catholic Primary School	4%	22%	26%	23%	6%	3%	12%	1%	3%	0%	100%
St John's Roman Catholic Primary School	15%	12%	6%	2%	6%	8%	21%	3%	12%	15%	100%
St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School	19%	36%	10%	8%	7%	9%	7%	1%	2%	0%	100%
St Margaret's Roman Catholic Primary School	1%	0%	6%	2%	2%	1%	4%	70%	9%	5%	100%
St Mark's Roman Catholic Primary School	12%	13%	19%	6%	7%	19%	6%	8%	3%	8%	100%
St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School (Edin.)	1%	3%	2%	10%	4%	6%	4%	17%	16%	38%	100%
St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School (Leith)	5%	11%	12%	30%	11%	6%	15%	7%	4%	0%	100%
St Ninian's Roman Catholic Primary school	22%	27%	10%	5%	8%	12%	3%	9%	2%	3%	100%

St Peter's Roman Catholic Primary School	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	11%	4%	16%	61%	100%
Stenhouse Primary School	3%	23%	21%	38%	7%	3%	2%	1%	2%	0%	100%
Stockbridge Primary School	0%	2%	0%	1%	2%	0%	9%	13%	19%	54%	100%
The Royal High Primary School	2%	3%	8%	1%	22%	4%	11%	8%	15%	26%	100%
Tollcross Primary School	2%	2%	5%	5%	13%	31%	20%	10%	5%	5%	100%
Towerbank Primary School	1%	1%	1%	14%	9%	19%	12%	10%	24%	10%	100%
Trinity Primary School	0%	9%	19%	10%	3%	11%	5%	2%	21%	21%	100%
Victoria Primary School	2%	5%	10%	16%	1%	21%	13%	9%	15%	7%	100%
Wardie Primary School	2%	5%	2%	3%	1%	0%	22%	2%	22%	42%	100%
Total	7%	11%	8%	7%	6%	6%	9%	8%	11%	26%	100%

Source:

ScotXed Pupil Census 2022

Scottish Government - SIMD 2020

SIMD 2020 Profile - Secondary Schools

% of Pupils attending school on Census day (14/09/22) by SIMD Decile

School	SIMD Decile										Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Balerno Community High School	2%	2%	2%	1%	14%	12%	11%	14%	14%	29%	100%
Boroughmuir High School	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	7%	7%	11%	71%	100%
Broughton High School	10%	10%	13%	15%	3%	1%	8%	9%	4%	26%	100%
Castlebrae Community High School	38%	32%	1%	4%	5%	6%	8%	3%	3%	0%	100%
Craigmount High School	1%	1%	1%	7%	6%	6%	6%	10%	17%	43%	100%
Craigroyston Community High School	17%	43%	19%	9%	6%	0%	2%	1%	0%	3%	100%
Currie Community High School	3%	6%	2%	1%	3%	6%	8%	10%	19%	43%	100%
Drummond Community High School	4%	6%	8%	20%	10%	8%	8%	8%	12%	15%	100%
Firrhill High School	4%	4%	8%	4%	5%	8%	6%	6%	11%	45%	100%
Forrester High School	7%	14%	4%	7%	8%	22%	15%	4%	7%	11%	100%
Gracemount High School	7%	37%	17%	7%	10%	1%	10%	5%	5%	1%	100%
Holy Rood Roman Catholic High School	21%	27%	11%	7%	6%	6%	10%	3%	4%	4%	100%
James Gillespie's High School	1%	2%	2%	5%	4%	5%	8%	8%	15%	50%	100%
Leith Academy	11%	11%	11%	19%	10%	7%	12%	8%	2%	8%	100%
Liberton High School	8%	18%	22%	16%	7%	2%	14%	5%	6%	3%	100%
Portobello High School	8%	6%	5%	6%	7%	6%	13%	8%	17%	25%	100%
Queensferry Community High School	0%	0%	8%	1%	4%	3%	5%	51%	13%	15%	100%
St Augustine's Roman Catholic High School	19%	26%	12%	9%	10%	8%	5%	4%	4%	3%	100%
St Thomas of Aquin's Roman Catholic High School	4%	8%	7%	8%	6%	8%	8%	8%	12%	31%	100%
The Royal High School	1%	5%	3%	8%	6%	0%	5%	5%	19%	48%	100%

Trinity Academy	2%	9%	7%	7%	3%	10%	11%	3%	22%	25%	100%
Tynecastle High School	6%	10%	14%	15%	11%	9%	6%	3%	7%	20%	100%
Wester Hailes High School	49%	33%	4%	1%	9%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Total	8%	11%	7%	8%	6%	6%	8%	8%	11%	27%	100%

Source:

ScotXed Pupil Census 2022

Scottish Government - SIMD 2020

SIMD 2020 Profile - Special Schools

% of Pupils attending school on Census day (14/09/22) by SIMD Decile

School	SIMD Decile										Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Braidburn	16%	14%	7%	6%	11%	4%	12%	9%	4%	16%	100%
Gorgie Mills	8%	37%	10%	14%	10%	2%	8%	4%	0%	6%	100%
Howdenhall and St Katharine's											
Kaimes School	16%	16%	6%	13%	11%	9%	2%	8%	11%	9%	100%
Oaklands School	8%	12%	12%	6%	4%	6%	10%	13%	10%	21%	100%
Pilrig Park School	14%	18%	7%	18%	11%	5%	7%	7%	1%	14%	100%
Prospect Bank School	22%	26%	2%	16%	4%	6%	10%	6%	2%	6%	100%
Redhall	10%	17%	13%	12%	4%	9%	9%	4%	9%	13%	100%
Rowanfield School	26%	19%	5%	17%	10%	0%	2%	10%	5%	7%	100%
St Crispin's School	13%	22%	2%	9%	11%	2%	11%	9%	13%	9%	100%
Woodlands	10%	11%	8%	10%	3%	11%	4%	6%	6%	30%	100%
Total	14%	18%	7%	12%	8%	6%	8%	8%	6%	14%	100%

Source:

ScotXed Pupil Census 2022

Scottish Government - SIMD 2020

QUESTION NO 31

By Councillor Jones for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question

Please could you provide the following information:

A breakdown, school by school, of the total number of children entitled to free school meals for primary and secondary schools received 2019/2020, 2020/2021, 2021/2022 and 2022/2023?

Answer

All of the data being requested is available at <https://www.gov.scot/publications/school-level-summary-statistics/>

The Free School Meal data (for each Scottish school) is in column AC for the 2019 and 2020 spreadsheets and in columns AI to AK for the 21 and 22 spreadsheets. The relevant columns are highlighted in yellow. The school level summary statistics spreadsheet for 2023 has not been published yet.

Free school meal information is collected annually by the Scottish Government via the Healthy Living Survey. Data is collected in February and published around August/September. More information about the healthy living survey is available at

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/healthy-living-survey-schools-meals-and-pe-supplementary-data/>

QUESTION NO 32

By Councillor Mumford for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 31 August 2023

Question (1) How many official communications were sent to the Management Committees of Community Centres regarding the lifelong learning review and potential changes in staffing support which may arise from this?

Answer (1) There has been one official communication to Community Centre Management Committees. In addition, individual meetings have been or are being arranged with Community Centre Management Committees to meet with the Community Engagement and Empowerment Team and to discuss future working arrangements with them. [An update on this was provided to Culture and Communities Committee in August and a briefing for Elected Members was held on 15 August 2023.]

Question (2) Specifically, what communications were sent to the Management Committees of Community Centres regarding the timescales of the review particularly relating to the pause and continuation relating to Covid?

Answer (2) There were no communications with Community Centre Management Committees on the pause of the organisational review as community centres across the city were closed during the Covid lockdown.

QUESTION NO 33

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 31 August
2023**

Question

Please will the Convener give the number of schools offering Gaelic Learners Education (GLE) and the number of students learning GLE across the council's educational estate in each of the last ten academic years?

Answer

Where GLE has been part of school curricula, it is as an L3 language, under the 1+2 Approach to Languages Teaching and we hold limited data on this. The information below comes from data held by BnaG which is drawn from the national census and no longer has L3 specific data.

Primary:

Session	Schools	Pupils
13/14	8	no data
14/15	8	no data
15/16	8	no data
16/17	4	no data
17/18	1	152
18/19	2	no data
19/20	no data	no data
20/21	no data	no data
21/22	no data	no data
22/23	0	0

Secondary:

Session	Schools	Pupils
13/14	1	5
14/15	1	5
15/16	0	0
16/17	1	42
17/18	1	70
18/19	0	0
19/20	0	0
20/21	1	<5
21/22	0	0

QUESTION NO 34

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 31 August
2023**

Question

Further to the answer to my question at full council on 22 June 2023, please will the convener provide an accurate list of the size (in acres / hectares) of each of the CEC's secondary schools, and in each case list whether the size complies with school premises regulations?

Answer

Please see the table below.

High School	Capacity	Main Site/Grounds (HA)	Additional Site (HA)	Additional Site ID	Total Site (HA)	Complies With School Premises Regulations 1967
Balerno Community HS	850	2.33			2.33	Does Not Comply
Boroughmuir HS	1560	0.92			0.92	Does Not Comply
Broughton HS	1200	6.89			6.89	Complies
Castlebrae Community Campus	700	3.48	0.95	Pitch to north	4.43	Does Not Comply
Craigmount HS	1400	6.06			6.06	Does Not Comply
Craigroyston Community HS	600	3.82			3.82	Does Not Comply
Currie Community HS	900	7.31			7.31	Complies
Drummond Community HS	600	1.99			1.99	Does Not Comply
Firrhill HS	1150	2.32	2.57	Pitches, sports hub and Braidburn	4.89	Does Not Comply
Forrester HS	900	8.14			8.14	Complies
Gracemount HS	650	5.59			5.59	Does Not Comply
Holy Rood RC HS	1200	5.18	14.44	Cavalry Park to south	19.62	Complies
James Gillespie's HS	1950	2.74	0.45	Darroch Campus	3.19	Does Not Comply
Leith Academy	950	7.24			7.24	Complies
Liberton HS	1000	7.86			7.86	Complies
Portobello HS	1400	6.21			6.21	Does Not Comply
Queensferry Community HS	1200	5.49	1	Pitch to SW	6.49	Does Not Comply
St Augustine's RC HS	900	8.25			8.25	Complies
St Thomas of Aquin's RC HS	750	0.69			0.69	Does Not Comply
The Royal HS	1350	9.56			9.56	Complies
Trinity Academy	950	1.37	3.31	Bangholm Facility	4.68	Does Not Comply
Tynecastle HS	900	2.26			2.26	Does Not Comply
Wester Hailes HS	750	5.83			5.83	Complies

