Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 24 October 2019

Present:-

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

COUNCILLORS

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

Graham J Hutchison
Andrew Johnston
David Key
Callum Laidlaw
Lesley Macinnes
Melanie Main
John McLellan
Amy McNeese-Mechan
Adam McVey
Claire Miller
Max Mitchell
Joanna Mowat
Rob Munn
Gordon J Munro
Hal Osler
Ian Perry
Susan Rae
Alasdair Rankin
Lewis Ritchie
Cameron Rose
Neil Ross
Jason Rust
Stephanie Smith
Alex Staniforth
Mandy Watt
Susan Webber
Iain Whyte
Donald Wilson
Norman J Work
Louise Young
1 Capping Private Hire Car Licences - Motion by Councillor Rae

a) Deputation- Unite the Union

The deputation supported the request for a report on the overprovision of Private Hire cars within the city and requested that a cap be put on the number of Private Hire car licences. They raised concerns that there was not enough work for the number of vehicles that already existed and that this may encourage drivers to pick up customers from the street.

The deputation felt that more enforcement action was required for all vehicles for hire within the city and that this would only be achieved by limiting the number of licences available.

b) Motion by Councillor Rae

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

“Council:

Notes that there is presently no cap on the number of private hire licenses in the city as there is with Taxis.

Notes that Unite’s Edinburgh Cab Section has called for an over provisioning survey to cap Private Hire Licenses in Edinburgh;

Notes that City of Glasgow Council has introduced a cap on PHCs;

Therefore calls for a report to Regulatory Committee on capping Private Hire Car licenses in the City.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rae.

- moved by Councillor Rae, seconded by Councillor Burgess

Amendment

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

Council notes:

That the Convener of the Regulatory Committee has previously written to the Cabinet Secretary for Justice requesting that Scottish Government officials urgently
issue the guidance to local authorities on calculating PHC overprovision which they undertook to provide when the Act was passed; and

The Convener of the Regulatory Committee and other senior elected members of the Administration have met separately with the representatives of the Taxi Trade and Unite the Union’s Cab section to discuss this important issue.

Council calls for a report to the Regulatory Committee within 2 cycles to identify whether there is overprovision of private hire cars within Edinburgh so that it can consider whether a policy on overprovision should be introduced.

The report should also include:

Information regarding current means of inspection and enforcement undertaken by CEC and Police Scotland including any examples of best practice elsewhere; and

Data in relation to public safety; and information from Police Scotland on reported crime for both the taxi and private hire trade for each of the last five years (inclusive).

- moved by Councillor Cameron, seconded by Councillor Fullerton

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), the amendment was adjusted at Paragraph 3 and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rae:

Council:

Notes that there was presently no cap on the number of private hire licenses in the city as there was with Taxis.

Notes that Unite’s Edinburgh Cab Section had called for an over provisioning survey to cap Private Hire Licenses in Edinburgh;

Notes that City of Glasgow Council had introduced a cap on PHCs;

Notes that the Convener of the Regulatory Committee had previously written to the Cabinet Secretary for Justice requesting that Scottish Government officials urgently issue the guidance to local authorities on calculating PHC overprovision which they undertook to provide when the Act was passed;

The Convener of the Regulatory Committee and other senior elected members of the Administration had met separately with the representatives of the Taxi Trade and Unite the Union’s Cab section to discuss this important issue.
Therefore calls for a report to Regulatory Committee on capping Private Hire Car licenses in the City. The report to the Regulatory Committee within 2 cycles should identify whether there was overprovision of private hire cars within Edinburgh so that it could consider whether a policy on overprovision should be introduced.

The report should also include:

Information regarding current means of inspection and enforcement undertaken by CEC and Police Scotland including any examples of best practice elsewhere; and

Data in relation to public safety; and information from Police Scotland on reported crime for both the taxi and private hire trade for each of the last five years (inclusive)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Work declared a financial interest as the driver of a black cab and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

2 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 19 September 2019 as a correct record.

3 Questions

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

4 Leader’s Report

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

• Thanked Councillors Bird, Macinnes and Day for providing cover during adoption leave
• Edinburgh Tram extension
• City Deal
• Waste Complaints
• Net Zero – carbon emissions
The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Whyte - Welcome leader back from adoption leave  
- Forthcoming Council budget – long-term financial strategy

Councillor Staniforth - EU Citizens employed by the City of Edinburgh Council – Second status applications

Councillor Aldridge - Welcome back to Council Leader  
- Tackling poverty - budget proposals

Councillor Day - Climate emergency - Councillor McLellan

Councillor Gordon - Health and Social Care Sector - staffing

Councillor Laidlaw - Dog friendly days in libraries and community centres

Councillor Main - Mental health services – waiting lists

Councillor Gloyer - Low level waste collection complaints – brown bin stickers issue delays

Councillor Munro - Welcome back to Council Leader  
- Budget setting exercise – letter of 18 September 2019 from the Depute Leader asking for a meeting with the Scottish Government Finance Minister - response

Councillor Rankin - Masonry and falling roof materials – powers to make owners take responsibility for the maintenance of their properties

Councillor Webber - Welcome back to Council Leader  
- Reputational risk - Council taxi account – misuse – justifications for persistant use

Councillor Jim Campbell - Welcome back to Council Leader  
- Fair funding for this city – response to request by Depute Leader

Councillor Johnston - Coalition commitment 49 – Limiting Council Tax increase
Councillor Macinnes - Thanks for verbal report re improved waste services – introduction of on the go re-cycling in the city centre locations

Councillor Doggart - Welcome back to Council Leader
- 27 June 2019 – Sick Children’s Hospital – timescales – health and social care funding

Councillor Booth - Fuel poverty

Councillor Kate Campbell - Impact of the Brexit process on the construction industry and in particular on affordable housing

Councillor Rae - Welcome back to Council Leader
- Invitation to celebrate the 96th anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic of Turkey taking place in the City Chambers

Councillor McNeese-Mechan - Concern that basic crops are at risk of disappearing due to lack of labour supply

Councillor Bridgman - Castle Towers car park – financial impact

5 Appointments to Committees etc

The Council were invited to nominate a member to SEStran’s Performance and Audit Committee.

Decision

1) To appoint Councillor Rose to SEStran in place of Councillor Cook.

2) To nominate Councillor Rose to SEStran’s Performance and Audit Committee.

3) To appoint Councillor Griffiths as Vice Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee in place of Councillor Cameron.

4) To appoint Councillor Griffiths to the Finance and Resource Committee in place of Councillor Cameron.
5) To appoint Councillor Cameron to the Personnel Appeals Committee in place of Councillor Griffiths.

(References: Act of Council No 8 of 29 June 2017; report by the Chief Executive, submitted)

6  Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal Annual Report, Annual Conversation and Regional Growth Framework Update

A summary was provided on the key findings of the City Region Deal Annual Report and the annual conversation between UK Government, Scottish Government and City Region Deal partners.

Motion

1) To note the summary findings of the first annual report and annual conversation for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal.

2) To note the decision of the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal Joint Committee on 3 September 2019 to approve a project brief for officers to commence the production of a Regional Growth Framework. There would be regular consultation with members through briefings, consultation and workshops. The process would be overseen by an Elected Member Oversight Committee. The development of a Regional Growth Framework was expected to take until June 2020 and would be reported to each constituent authority for their consideration.

3) To note that Elected Member briefing sessions took place on 21 and 22 October 2019.

4) To agree to the recruitment of a Programme Director to oversee the development of the Regional Growth Framework and that the recruitment be overseen by the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal Joint Committee. Discussions were taking place with the Scottish and UK Governments about the resourcing requirements of the Programme Director role.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day
Amendment 1

Council:

**Add to Recommendation 1.2** after ‘. . .Elected Member Oversight Committee’, ‘made up of one member from the Administration and one from the opposition parties’

**Add after Recommendation 1.4**

1.5 To thank the Council’s officers and elected members for their hard work and successful and harmonious progress in taking forward the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal.

1.6 To note the challenges summarised in paragraph 4.12, requiring more focus and attention particularly with respect to one of the top priorities of this Council, namely the delivery of housing and supporting transport infrastructure.

1.7 To agree that the earliest possible delivery of these goals is a key requirement for maximising the benefits of the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal for the people who live and work in Edinburgh.

- moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Mowat

**Amendment 2**

To add recommendation 1.5 to the motion as follows:

1.5.1 Recognises that since City Region Deal was signed, the city council has declared a climate emergency as have three of our partner councils and the Scottish Government and UK Parliament;

1.5.2 Recognises that the scale and urgency of climate breakdown requires all major plans and programmes to be re-aligned;

1.5.3 Therefore agrees that the leader of the council as chair of the joint committee should seek agreement from partners and Scottish and UK Governments on developing a clear statement of targets by no later than June 2020 on how the City Region Deal will integrate delivery on net zero carbon aims

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Staniforth
Amendment 3

To amend recommendation 1.4 to read:

To agree in principle to the recruitment of a Programme Director to oversee the development of the Regional Growth Framework and that the recruitment is overseen by the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal Joint Committee, but to take no action until resourcing for the post has been secured.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion and Amendments 2 and 3 were accepted as an addendum and amendment respectively to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey

1) To note the summary findings of the first annual report and annual conversation for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal.

2) To note the decision of the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal Joint Committee on 3 September 2019 to approve a project brief for officers to commence the production of a Regional Growth Framework. There would be regular consultation with members through briefings, consultation and workshops. The process would be overseen by an Elected Member Oversight Committee. The development of a Regional Growth Framework was expected to take until June 2020 and would be reported to each constituent authority for their consideration.

3) To note that Elected Member briefing sessions took place on 21 and 22 October 2019.

4) To agree in principle to the recruitment of a Programme Director to oversee the development of the Regional Growth Framework and that the recruitment be overseen by the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal Joint Committee, but to take no action until resourcing for the post had been secured.

5) To thank the Council’s officers and elected members for their hard work and successful and harmonious progress in taking forward the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal.

6) To note the challenges summarised in paragraph 4.12 of the report by the Chief Executive, requiring more focus and attention particularly with respect to
one of the top priorities of this Council, namely the delivery of housing and supporting transport infrastructure.

7) To agree that the earliest possible delivery of these goals was a key requirement for maximising the benefits of the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal for the people who lived and worked in Edinburgh.

8) To recognise that since the City Region Deal was signed, the city council had declared a climate emergency as had three of the partner councils and the Scottish Government and UK Parliament;

9) To recognise that the scale and urgency of climate breakdown required all major plans and programmes to be re-aligned;

10) To therefore agree that the leader of the council as chair of the joint committee should seek agreement from partners and Scottish and UK Governments on developing a clear statement of targets by no later than June 2020 on how the City Region Deal would integrate delivery on net zero carbon aims.

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

7 International Travel and Conferences

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had agreed that a report be submitted on suitable monetary and carbon threshold for future elected member and officer international site visits.

Details were provided on the approval process and financial and carbon thresholds for international travel travel by elected members and officers. The approval process for conference attendance by elected members was also clarified.

Decision

To continue consideration of the matter to the next meeting.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee, 6 August 2019 (item 8); report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)


The Pensions Committee had referred a report which set out the Audited Annual Report 2019 of the Lothian Pension Fund and Scottish Homes Pension Fund including the report by the External Auditor to the Council for information.
Decision

To note the report by the Pension Committee.

(References – Pensions Committee 25 September 2019 (item 4); referral from the Pensions Committee, submitted.)

9 City of Edinburgh Council – 2018/19 Annual Audit Report to the Council and the Controller of Audit – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the principal findings arising from the Council’s 2018/19 external audit to the Council for information.

Motion

To note the report by the Finance and Resources Committee.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Amendment

Council:

1) Recognises that significant improvement is required in a number of areas including: tracking and progressing audit findings, openness and transparency and long-term strategic planning.

2) Notes that a report will be presented to GRBV in January detailing progress in addressing deficiencies highlighted in the audit findings.

3) Requests a report from the Chief Executive and Executive Directors in two cycles to Full Council, setting out the Council’s long-term strategic plan in order to better inform the 2020/21 budget process.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Cook

In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), the amendment was adjusted and accepted as an amendment to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

1) To note the report by the Finance and Resources Committee.
2) To recognise that significant improvement was required in a number of areas including: tracking and progressing audit findings, openness and transparency and long-term strategic planning.

3) To note that a report would be presented to GRBV in January detailing progress in addressing deficiencies highlighted in the audit findings.

4) To request a report from the Chief Executive to be shared with members at the point of submission to the January 2020 Finance and Resources Committee Agenda Planning meeting and that following the Finance and Resources Committee it be referred to Full Council, setting out the Council’s long-term strategic plan in order to better inform the 2020/21 budget process.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee, 26 September 2019 (item 6); referral from the Finance and Resource Committee, submitted.)

10 **Bustracker – Contract Award – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee**

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the prudential borrowing of up to £2.35m for the installation of a new Content Management System, bus station information system and installation of a new Real Time Passenger Information system to the Council for approval.

**Decision**

To approve the prudential borrowing of up to £2.35m, with the resulting repayments of £0.299m able to be met in full through reductions in on-going maintenance costs.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee, 10 October 2109 (item 16); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

11 **Edinburgh World Heritage – Motion by Councillor Gardiner**

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

“Council notes that:

a) Edinburgh World Heritage (EWH) is currently celebrating its 20th year anniversary, since being established on 31 March 1999. EWH inherited the tradition of work undertaken by two previous bodies:

i) Edinburgh New Town Conservation Committee: established in 1970 to tackle the economic and physical problems that threatened the Georgian New Town at that time; and
ii) Edinburgh Old Town Committee for Conservation and Renewal (which changed its name to Edinburgh Old Town Renewal Trust): established in 1985 with an emphasis on renovation and re-development of the Old Town appropriate to its then near-derelict and depopulated state.

b) The City’s leading heritage charity continues to be involved in a number of local and international projects:

i) Continuing work from the 1970s, over 1,500 local projects across Edinburgh have been undertaken covering; conservation, learning and planning.

ii) Seven initiatives taking place around the globe.

c) EWH are keen to use the milestone of their 20th year and reach 1,500 projects as a platform to;

i) raise awareness about their work,

ii) fundraise for future projects.

d) Reflecting the City’s enduring connection with EWH, Council requests that the Lord Provost, mark in an appropriate way."

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Child

**Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Gardiner.

**12 Hutchison Vale Football Club – 80th Anniversary - Motion by Councillor Fullerton**

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

"Hutchison Vale Football Club will be celebrating its 80th Anniversary in 2020.

Based in a wee hut in Fords Road, this Club has had success after success with the players who have been part of it since youngsters. To name a few - Leigh Griffiths, Allan McGregor, Marc McNulty, Darren Fletcher, John Collins, Peter Cormack, Michael Stewart and the list goes on.

Hutchie Vale have also had a very successful women’s team since 1991 and can count Lizzie Arnot and Claire Emslie among their successes who played for Scotland."
The Club is led by Tam Smith who has been Club Leader since 1989 but been involved for 33 years, which is a remarkable contribution for a volunteer.

Whether players have gone on to join Hearts, Hibs or Manchester United or gone on to other careers, they never forget their roots and allegiance to one of the best clubs in the city and still visit the Club frequently.

Given this is a significant anniversary, Council requests the Lord Provost to mark this occasion in the appropriate manner.”

- moved by Councillor Fullerton, seconded by Councillor Wilson

**Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Fullerton.

### 13 Respectful Political Debate - Motion by Councillor Bird

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

“Council condemns the pejorative and inflammatory language that has been heard in the House of Commons over the past weeks.

Regrets that dangerous rhetoric of this kind threatens to widen division in our society and encourage hate speech, verbal abuse and the threat of physical violence, including that faced by politicians at both a local and national level.

Notes the President of COSLA’s recent letter to the Speaker of the House of Commons raising these concerns, and Cllr Watt’s motion on Threatening Behaviour Towards Councillors from May’s meeting of full council.

Welcomes the robust debate and close cross party working that is central to our role as elected members.

Agrees however, that it is also our responsibility to set a respectful tone both in and out of the chamber.

Requests an update to Policy and Sustainability committee on the work done to date on the protocol referred to in Cllr Watt’s motion.”

- moved by Councillor Bird, seconded by Councillor Watt

**Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Bird.
14  Transgender Day of Remembrance - Motions by Councillors Mary Campbell and Mitchell

The following motions were submitted in terms of Standing Order 16:

a) By Councillor Mary Campbell:

“Council notes:

That Transgender Day of Remembrance falls on November 20th every year since 1999, when it was founded by Gwendolyn Ann Smith, a trans woman, to memorialize the murder of Rita Hester in Massachusetts. A day observed as a memorial for the trans people who have been murdered as a result of transphobia, which is unfortunately a continuing reality for trans people. It is also a day to draw attention to the violence that trans people experience in their lives.

The trans community in Edinburgh, including our trans colleagues working across the CEC, are currently facing a difficult time connected to the Scottish Government’s ongoing commitment to reform the Gender Recognition Act 2004. This is primarily due to dis-information and the mis-reporting of stories on social media and in the mainstream media, leading to trans and non-binary people experiencing abuse, hatred and ridicule daily, simply because of who they are.

In this context, it is more important than ever that Edinburgh Council shows support for the trans community, not just for days of celebration, but for days that mark a sad reality - that transphobia kills people.

Council agrees to mark this day by flying the trans pride flag at the City Chambers on 20 November 2019 as a symbol of our remembrance for the lives lost to transphobia.

Council also agrees to recognise its ongoing support for Transgender Day of Remembrance in future years by flying the trans pride flag on 20 November hereafter.”

- moved by Councillor Mary Campbell, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

b) By Councillor Mitchell:

Council:

Notes that Wednesday 20 November is Transgender Day of Remembrance, a day first recognised in 1999 by the transgender community and their allies in
recognition of those who had their lives taken from them for being transgender.

Therefore, agrees to support this day by flying the transgender and pride flags above the City Chambers on Wednesday 20 November 2019, and thereafter on 20 November, as a symbol of support and remembrance for the transgender community of Edinburgh."

- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Mowat

**Decision**

To approve the following composite motion:

To note that:

1) **Wednesday 20 November** was Transgender Day of Remembrance for the transgender community and their allies. A day first recognised in 1999, when it was founded by Gwendolyn Ann Smith, a trans woman, to memorialise the murder of Rita Hester in Massachusetts and remember those who have had their lives taken from them for being transgender.

2) It was also a day to draw attention to the violence, abuse, and difficulties that trans people still experience in their lives today.

Therefore, to agree to support this day by flying the transgender flag above the City Chambers on **Wednesday 20 November 2019**, and thereafter **on 20 November**, as a symbol of support and remembrance for the transgender community of Edinburgh.

**15 Proposed Amendments to Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions - Motion by Councillor Barrie**

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

“Council recognises that committee membership is designated based on proportionality. Council further recognises that the current COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DELEGATED FUNCTIONS fails to recognise councillors who are independent of political party affiliation when calculating proportionality.

Council therefore seeks that the Chief Executive produces a report within one cycle with recommendations to amend COMMITTEE TERMS OF REFERENCE AND DELEGATED FUNCTIONS as described below. This report shall also include recommendations for any consequential changes as required.”
3. Committee Membership

3.1 Committee membership will be proportionate according to the elected representation of political parties unless expressly agreed otherwise at a meeting of the full Council.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Committee Membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>3. Committee Membership</strong> Adam all elected members are members of political parties committee membership will be proportionate according to the elected representation of political parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Committee membership will be proportionate according to the elected representation of political parties unless expressly agreed otherwise at a meeting of the full Council.</td>
<td>Where there are elected members, who are independent of political party membership these members will be aggregated and treated as a single group for proportional purposes when deciding committee membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where there are elected members, who are independent of political party membership these members will be aggregated and treated as a single group for proportional purposes when deciding committee membership.</td>
<td>Where all independent members decline to take a place on any committee there shall be a recalculation of committee membership using only the numbers of those members who are members of political parties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Substitutes 5.1. Where permitted by law and where specified in these Committee Terms of Reference, a member may, subject to paragraph 5.2 below appoint a substitute member from his or her political group to attend a meeting of the committee in his or her place, by email to the Clerk in advance of the meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Substitutes</strong> 5.1. Where permitted by law and where specified in these Committee Terms of Reference, a member may, subject to paragraph 5.2 below appoint a substitute member from his or her political group, or in the case of independent members, another independent member, to attend a meeting of the committee in his or her place, by email to the Clerk in advance of the meeting.</td>
<td><strong>5. Substitutes</strong> 5.1. Where permitted by law and where specified in these Committee Terms of Reference, a member may, subject to paragraph 5.2 below appoint a substitute member from his or her political group, or in the case of independent members, another independent member, to attend a meeting of the committee in his or her place, by email to the Clerk in advance of the meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision

To note that Councillor Barrie had withdrawn his motion.
16  Civic Reception for Edinburgh Film Guild - Motion by Councillor Gloyer

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

“Council congratulates the Edinburgh Film Guild as it begins its 90th consecutive season. The oldest continuously-running film society in the world, the Edinburgh Film Guild organised and curated the first Edinburgh Film Festival. In recognition of its contribution to the cultural life of the city, Council requests the Lord Provost to mark this 90th anniversary with a civic reception.”

- moved by Councillor Gloyer, seconded by Councillor

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Gloyer.

17  Film Charter and Principles - Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council:

Council notes the recent filming of Fast and Furious and Eurovision in the City and the Council’s commitment to filming as detailed in the Film Charter; that this filming is happening after a busy summer which saw a number of streets closed and that this filming then required further street closures.

Calls for a report in two cycles detailing the impacts including:

1) costs of this filming on the City including roads closed, businesses who had to close, impacts on public transport and bus routes;

2) any benefits accrued from filming.”

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Rose

Amendment

To delete the second paragraph of Councillor Mowat’s and replaces with:

Calls for a report in two cycles to Policy and Sustainability Committee detailing the known impacts and benefits. However, notes that many of these will be intangible.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day
In accordance with Standing Order 21(11), the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

**Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mowat:

**Council:**

Council notes the recent filming of Fast and Furious and Eurovision in the City and the Council’s commitment to filming as detailed in the Film Charter; that this filming is happening after a busy summer which saw a number of streets closed and that this filming then required further street closures.

Calls for a report in two cycles to Policy and Sustainability Committee detailing the known impacts and benefits. However, notes that many of these will be intangible.

**Declaration of Interests**

Councillor Gloyer declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a Trustee of the Edinburgh Film Guild.

18  **Claim for an Award of Expenses in the Appeal PPA-230-2207 - Motion by Councillor Mowat**

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

“Council:

Notes with concern the decision against the Council in the Claim for an Award of Expenses in the Appeal PPA-230-2207 which found that: -

- "the council has acted in an unreasonable manner resulting in liability for expenses,

- although the committee report is correct it does not fairly or accurately reflect the terms of the application,

- it was unreasonable for the council not to advise members of the purpose for which the greenbelt land was included and in short this was a case that should have never come to appeal”

Considers this an extremely serious finding against the Council and calls for a report detailing planning appeals for major sites which have been allowed; and for an independent review of these decisions to determine whether the Council’s approach to determining these sites aligns with national and local policy.”
- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Rose

**Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat
Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 3 of 24 October 2019)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 October 2019

Question (1) Please list by month the number of requests received (via any channel) since September 2018 to clear leaves from footpaths and cycle paths.

Answer (1) Please find below a summary of the number of requests received for leaf clearing each month from September 2018. Although the system allows reports to be provided for cycleways, they are usually associated with the nearest street and therefore the specific location (e.g. cycleway) is recorded as free text. It is not possible to provide the breakdown of reports of cycleways recorded in free text without analysing each individual record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Not Cycleway</th>
<th>Cycleway</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018 09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 10</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 01</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 02</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 04</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 07</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 08</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 09</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>213</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question (2) Please provide the dates when footpaths and cycle paths have been swept or cleared since September 2018

Answer (2) Sweeping of footpaths and cycle paths is carried out as part of the normal street cleansing duties, although this happens more frequently from October through to January. A record of these day to day duties is not kept.

Question (3) Has the council’s new web site been updated to explicitly allow residents to report concerns re leaf sweeping?

Answer (3) There is no specific web form for recording leaf clearances. These can be logged on the Council’s website at the following location: https://webforms.edinburgh.gov.uk/site/portal/request/litter

Or by calling 0131 608 1100

Question (4) Has an equalities assessment identified which groups are more impacted by the condition of footpaths and cycle paths?

Answer (4) An equalities impact assessment has not been carried out for this. However, the service prioritises sweeping of areas where health and safety issues have been identified.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and thanks to the Convener for her answer. I just wondered if I could clarify by asking the Convener therefore if there should be an Equalities approach, because Part 4 of the question asks about an impact assessment and that appears not to have been done. My understanding was that we did take an equalities approach to all Council’s policies and I wondered whether that was something which she would consider implementing in the future?

Supplementary Answer Thank you Councillor Miller, I would certainly like to see that done. As you'll be aware from the rest of the answer, leaf sweeping and clearing of paths is conglomerated into other services and it might make it slightly more difficult but I think yes it is important. I think that we are all becoming increasingly clear that some of the transport policy issues that surround for example the way in which it affects different genders for example, or different disabilities, is of
increasing importance and should be reflected in our policy. It's something I'll be pursuing with the team, thank you.
## QUESTION NO 2

**Question**
How many cars have been either fined or towed for parking in front of a communal bin. Break down by Ward?

**Answer**
The parking contravention in this situation is not specifically related to the bin bay but to the yellow line restriction using the associated contravention codes. It is therefore not possible to identify tickets which have been issued specifically of instances of parking in front of a communal bin.

**Supplementary Question**
Thank you. Just a quick follow up to ask, in this instance, as parking in front of bins is a particular problem, especially in very congested areas, would it be a good time to start looking at what our restrictions are around bins so that it can be enforced over a longer period, thank you.

**Supplementary Answer**
I would like to thank Councillor Osler for her bravery in providing us with a supplementary question so thank you. Yes, it is time we should look at it. Something the Chamber may not be familiar with is we have been running a campaign targeting those drivers who park directly in front of bins, it's an informational campaign, a reminder of people's social responsibilities to not block the access, both in terms of general road access and for waste collection as well. It is an interesting area to look at, of course it's bound in with what we do around other traffic regulations so it's not as simple as it might look on paper, but yes, it is an area that I'm pursuing with the team. Thank you.
QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Osler for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 October 2019

Question
After road resurfacing what checks are done of the gullies to make sure that they are not blocked by loose chippings?

Answer
All gullies are visually inspected after all resurfacing works and cleaned out by the contractors as required.

However, the approach is slightly different when surface dressing is carried out. In this case, gullies are cleaned out immediately after the surfacing works. However, as loose chippings will occur for a period after the surfacing, the contractor has an obligation to monitor and brush up any loose chippings. They inspect and clean gullies if necessary at these times.

Comment by the Lord Provost
Feel free if you want someone else to ask your supplementary given the circumstances.

Supplementary Question
That's very kind, I will persevere. Thanks for your answer as well. Just a quick question, it's about timing, I know in my ward we have had quite a lot of road resurfacing and I have to say that a lot of the gullies are very choked through the chippings so I would like to have a better understanding of when these gullies are expected, because for example East Fettes Avenue is full of road chippings and all the gullies and has caused a horrific problem with flooding.

Supplementary Answer
Thank you again for the supplementary, I appreciate what you're talking about, as outlined in the written answer, there is a time gap in certain types of road resurfacing process to allow the loose chippings to gather and then be subsequently cleared by the contractor. I am not absolutely certain about the amount of time that is allowed for that process, but I'll go back and check and will come back to you specifically with that answer. Thank you
QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Convener of the Planning Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 October 2019

Question

On 14 October the Centre for Ecology and Hydrology published a study which showed that, on average, Edinburgh is losing 11.3 hectares of green space annually as gardens are paved over or built on. In light of climate breakdown forecasts of increased and more intense rainfall, what steps does the convenor propose as regards policy and guidance to ensure that the rate of loss is reversed?

Answer

The city continues to grow and acknowledges that there is demand/pressure on green space. The role of planning is to balance the need for change whilst protecting high quality amenity spaces. It appears that people are adapting their homes to reflect an overheated property market and people are adjusting to different lifestyles such as growing families and an ageing population.

The study notes two causes of the loss of green land to ‘urban creep’:

- urbanisation through development of new homes, employment sites and other building and infrastructure (average 4.81 hectares per year);
- and the loss of garden ground of homes to extensions, hardstanding and other domestic development (average 6.44 hectares per year).

The emphasis of the report is on the impacts of urban creep on potential flooding rather than the loss of green space in itself and it makes clear that some instances of new or re-development have increased available greenspace e.g. Quartermile.

It is also important to recognise that new developments can reduce flooding and flood risk as they are required to incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems under Local Development Plan policy as well as national planning policy.
and Scottish Environment Protection Agency requirements. New development can also remediate brownfield sites and produce significant areas of high quality open space to complement development, as is the case of the new landscaped park at Western Harbour which will serve the new community and also at Granton. The Local Development Plan has policies to encourage this, to protect existing open spaces and the Council is currently developing policy on Green Networks to complement place-making and active travel policies.

For smaller scale garden ground development, a significant amount is carried out under permitted development rights granted by government legislation; and the Council has no control over these developments outside of conservation areas. It should be noted that where these rights are to form hardstanding to the front of a house, there is a requirement that the surface be porous or otherwise drained so as not to affect the street or roadway. Householder or other small scale developments that do need a grant of planning permission need to comply with Local Development Plan.

The Council is currently doing everything in its power to ensure that loss of green space is minimised, that new green spaces are created and that in all developments it has control over the issues of flood risk and flooding are addressed, whilst providing for homes and jobs. Features such as green roofs can contribute both to rainwater attenuation and biodiversity.

City Plan 2030 provides an opportunity to get involved in the debate on this issue. Other CEC programmes such as City Centre Transformation also offer the opportunity to reimagine road space (and parking areas) to introduce trees and greenspace. Edinburgh Design Guidance is also reviewed on a regular basis by the Planning Committee.
Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost. I feel almost like a sense of solidarity with Councillor Osler, I shouldn't ask a supplementary but I will. For clarification, one aspect of the report is about what's called the problem of urban creep and that's, for people who haven't read the report yet, it's the loss of green space within existing gardens or grounds and we know the total loss of green space over the last 25 years in Edinburgh totals more than a mile square, the size of Holyrood Park in other words, most of that is urban creep.

Now what the answer says is that much of urban creep, as it's called, is permitted development within the terms of planning legislation but still requires mitigating measures to deal with excess surface water. So given that it's permitted development and therefore not under the same level of scrutiny, is the Convener satisfied that those mitigating measures are indeed being put in place?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Corbett for the question and I think it was in your leading up to the supplementary, it's important to emphasise a lot of this is in back land development, it's not Holyrood Park, it's not football pitches, so it's important to differentiate and in that sense it's intensifying that the urban area and that the alternative to that would be greenfield development which would potentially be even worse. In answer specifically to the question, as we don't control the permitted development, it's difficult to check actually what is built but it would not be in compliance with the permitted development rights if they weren't putting the right kind of drainage in as that's a requirement of that, but we don't actually check that, but I'm happy for this to be considered more through Planning Committee if that's appropriate in due course. So for now I hope that answers your question.
QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 October 2019

Question

What independent evidence did you have when you warned of “a steady and unstoppable decline for the city’s global reputation if it started to turn away promoters and organisers” and why imposing “a cap or upper limit” on what the gardens could be used for would send out the wrong message?

Answer

The article on Saturday misleadingly links my comment specifically to Princes Street Gardens, which is to take what I actually said, out of context.

It is my personal view that limiting or cutting back on events and festivals in the city as a whole runs the risk of sending out the wrong message internationally.

However, at no point in the interview did I state that either I or the Council were in favour of removing, or even altering, the cap on events in Princes Street Gardens.

Supplementary Question

Thank you, thank you Lord Provost and I'd like to thank the Convener for the answer and the clarification of your remarks. Are we to take this to mean that Edinburgh is open to any offer from any promoter and that it is your opinion that all and every event that is proposed should be supported and if this is not the case, how do you propose to consult with local members, the community, and Committee, about what and how many events is appropriate or does anything go?
Thank you very much for the question, thank you Lord Provost. I'm very grateful for the opportunity to reiterate this, I haven't just put in the answer, but I've also sent an opinion piece to the Evening News, it's quite unusual to have a question that is directly directed at an article rather than any kind of policy, but I do appreciate the opportunity to, if you like, set record straight here on the webcam and indeed in writing on the website and hopefully in the opinion piece tomorrow. First of all let me be very clear, the answer to the first question is no, I asked myself that question so that I can reiterate that am I in favour of capping - of removing the cap on major events in Princes Street Gardens the answer is no, so any indication that that is not the case is misleading and I did make that quite clear at the time and I'm making it clear again now I absolutely accept that the protection of the gardens has to come absolutely first and that should be our first priority. My reference to global reputation was directed in general about how we go forward, but as Councillor Mowat knows that I have been quite central to making sure that citizens voices are heard both in our tourism strategy, through the Tourism and Communities Working Group and for that reason, to answer the second part of the question is that one of the main things that have come out of that is a full consultation on what we want by way of our winter festivals, both Christmas and Hogmanay, that will be a full consultation. So it's coming to the end of the existing contract, so the time is absolutely right now to look at exactly what citizens want so that we can deliver that in the city. The phrase is quite often used that this is a balance between visitors, businesses and citizens, for me there is no balance to be struck, we have to put the citizens first when we're looking at what is on offer in the city. That has to be put first and foremost and the time is right now to look at exactly what citizens want and that's what we're doing through Culture and Communities.
QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 October 2019

Question
Can the Convener advise of the total numbers, per school and as a percentage of school roll, how many school children across Edinburgh were granted authorised absence by Parents / Guardians to attend the Climate Change event on 20th September 2019?

Answer
According to attendance statistics 2005 pupils in Primary, Secondary and Special Schools were granted authorised absence to attend the Climate Change event on 20th September 2019.

This represents:

3.4% of Primary School Pupils
4.4% of Secondary School Pupils
9.7% of Special School Pupils
## Attendance - Friday 20 September 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Number of Pupils</th>
<th>% of School Roll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Abbeyhill Primary School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Balgreen Primary School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Blackhall Primary School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Bonaly Primary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Broomhouse Primary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Broughton Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Brunstane Primary School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Bruntsfield Primary School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Buckstone Primary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Bun-sgoil Taobh na PÀ irce (Parkside Primary)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Canal View Primary School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Carrick Knowe Primary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Castleview Primary School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Clermiston Primary School</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Clovenstone Primary School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Colinton Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Corstorphine Primary School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Craigentinny Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Craiglockhart Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Craigour Park Primary School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Craigmoyton Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Cramond Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Currie Primary School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Dalmeny Primary School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Dalry Primary School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Davidson’s Mains Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Dean Park Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Duddingston Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>East Craigs Primary School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Echline Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Ferryhill Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Flora Stevenson Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Forthview Primary School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Fox Covert ND Primary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Gilmerton Primary School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Gracemount Primary School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Granton Primary School</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Gylemuir Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Hermitage Park Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Hillwood Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Holy Cross Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gillespie's Primary School</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniper Green Primary School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirkliston Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leith Walk Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberton Primary School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longstone Primary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorne Primary School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murrayburn Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nether Currie Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newcairn Primary School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niddrie Mill Primary School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxgangs Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parsons Green Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentland Primary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pirniehall Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Street Primary School</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestonfield Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensferry Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratho Primary School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburn Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Mile Primary School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciennes Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sighthill Primary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Morningside Primary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Andrew's Fox Covert RC Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Catherine's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Cuthbert's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St David's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Francis' Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John Vianney Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St John's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Joseph's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Margaret's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mark's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School (Edin.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary's Roman Catholic Primary School (Leith)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ninian's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Peter's Roman Catholic Primary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stenhouse Primary School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockbridge Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Royal High Primary School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tollcross Primary School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towerbank Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Primary School</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Victoria Primary School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Wardie Primary School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1064</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Balerno Community High School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Boroughmuir High School</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Broughton High School</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Castlebrae Community High School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Craigmount High School</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Craigroyston Community High School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Currie Community High School</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Drummond Community High School</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Firrhill High School</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Forrester High School</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Gracemount High School</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Holy Rood Roman Catholic High School</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>James Gillespie's High School</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Leith Academy</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Liberton High School</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Portobello High School</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Queensferry Community High School</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>St Augustine's Roman Catholic High School</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>St Thomas of Aquin's Roman Catholic High School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>The Royal High School</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Trinity Academy</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Tynecastle High School</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>Wester Hailes Education Centre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>877</strong></td>
<td><strong>4.4%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Braidburn</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Gorgie Mills School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Howdenhall and St Katharine's</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Kaimes School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Oaklands School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Pilrig Park School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Prospect Bank School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Redhall School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Rowanfield School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>St Crispin's School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td>Woodlands School</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>2005</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTION NO 7

Question (1) What business case has the City of Edinburgh Council put forward to secure additional funding from the £99m made available by the UK Government to the Scottish Government for distribution to Local Authorities to help prepare for the UK leaving the European Union?

Answer (1) The Council has contributed to various submissions being collated by CoSLA / SOLACE Scotland, the most recent showing estimated costs for Edinburgh of £1.2m.

Question (2) How much additional funding has been secured for City of Edinburgh Council to be best prepared for leaving the European Union? And have these funds been received?

Answer (2) To date all Scottish local authorities have been awarded £50,000 of funding.

Additionally, a £7m Rapid Poverty Mitigation Fund has been announced by the Scottish Government in the event of a No Deal EU Exit. It is anticipated that the basis of distribution of this funding will be agreed at October’s CoSLA Leaders’ Meeting.

The Council will continue to work with CoSLA to identify the costs incurred in respect of exiting the European Union and will support CoSLA actions to have these fully funded for Local Government.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Council leader for his answer and I can only assume that he shares my confidence that the Prime Minister’s Brexit deal will pass the House of Commons because it does seem surprising to me that given the estimate in the answer for the cost of leaving the European Union to Edinburgh is £1.2m, that he seems to feel that the £50,000 allocated by the Scottish Government is sufficient and that we can well afford the
£25,000 referred to in his leader’s report, from the Council Priorities Fund. So could the Convener perhaps explain why he hasn’t written to the Scottish Government to ask for some of the unallocated £97.4m in local authority funding that has been provided by UK government and does he agree that it’s acceptable for the Scottish Government to expect local authorities to write begging letters while the equivalent local authorities in the rest of the UK had that money allocated directly to them, thank you?

Supplementary Answer

Can I thank Councillor Laidlaw for giving me the chance to elaborate on my answer and for picking up some of the points that he raises, the question that he asked although I’m sure this wasn’t his intention, was a process question. We are whether the Conservatives like it or not and I appreciate they put in their budget that we would come out of COSLA, that’s their position, it’s not the position of the Administration, it’s not the position of this Council, so right now we are members of COSLA working with our Local Government colleagues from across the country and our job right now is to make sure that COSLA are armed with the facts and information of costs that we’re incurring so that they can feed into that process from the Scottish Government on our behalf with the strength of 32 local authorities behind them, not simply one Council engaging with the Scottish Government. I think that is the best way of maximising the amount of financial support that we get. I am astounded that Councillor Laidlaw has mentioned the £25,000 which has supported settlement applications, and they are applications of one and a half thousand EU nationals, twelve hundred of our own Edinburgh residents. I am astounded that he points to what is one of the most fundamental problems in the Conservatives judgment in this subject, they are citing £25,000 we are spending towards supporting people through that process as some sort of bad thing. I’m proud that this Council took the decision to spend that money in supporting those one and a half thousand people, twelve hundred of our own residents, and the Chamber will remember that I did write to the UK Government because what Councillor Laidlaw missed out of that is that this is a Home Office scheme that we were being
asked to sign up to and I wrote to the UK Government saying that we were spending £25,000 and asking them for that money back. They rejected that application, they rejected that request. I am even more astounded that Councillor Laidlaw brings up any element of financial cost in Brexit right now, just this week analysis showed Brexit is costing the Scottish economy £3 billion with significant contributions to the amount of revenue that we will get in the Scottish Government and the consequences for us as a Council, fundamentally flawed logic from the Tories as usual, fundamentally flawed political nouse from having the gall to raise it right now. In terms of the Scottish Government I will say this, as well as working with our colleagues in COSLA to get direct financial support to the Council for the costs we’re incurring, the Scottish Government is putting together other funds and already has committed money to other funds to deal with some of the consequences of Boris Johnson’s fumbling tumbling Brexit as he fumbles his way through it. The £1.5m that the government has already put into ensuring food security during expected price rises from the Conservatives’ gullus wandering forward, is just one example where the Scottish Government and Council are putting enormous amount of effort and resource into making sure that whatever the chaos and disaster that the Conservative subject this country to, that we are best prepared to protect the most vulnerable in our society. I am amazed that the Conservatives thought they were on solid ground by raising this today, but I thank them for the opportunity to respond.
QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 24 October 2019

Question
Can the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee confirm the lead times in place for Council related lampposts wraps to be removed following the date of the event advertised?

Answer
The guidance states that lamppost wraps may be installed for a maximum period of 28 days. Typically, the duration is less and timescales are generally dictated by the end date of the campaign or need for public messages. Where a supplier is used, they are instructed with installation and removal dates.

Lamppost wraps for the Edinburgh Fringe festival are managed as part of a contract with by Out of Hand Ltd. These are in place for the duration of the festival and can be in place up to 20 September.

Supplementary Question
Thank you Lord Provost, not quite sure I can follow that kind of rambling rant. I’d like to thank the Convener for her answer. Now this whole question came from a constituent complaint around the Bughtlin Market area in my ward following the West Edinburgh cycle-link drop-in events which were very well received. This was held on Thursday 5th of September, however just as recent as this morning these lamppost wraps remain in situ. Can the Convener confirm what level of inventory is in place for Council related lamppost wraps and what pressure can the Convener place on Departments to have any post-event wraps such as those in my ward, removed in a timely fashion, thank you.
Supplementary Answer

I don't have such information as to the inventory of lamppost wraps at my fingertips as you can probably imagine. I will attempt to get that for you if I can. Clearly there’s been an oversight in this one and it’s incumbent upon the Council to get out there and clear it, but I don't think it indicates anything about policy, it indicates about an error in this particular instance and it will be cleared as rapidly as possible by the Department. Thank you for bringing it to my attention, an e-mail would also have worked, thank you.