

# Minutes

## The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Tuesday 28 July 2020

Present:-

### LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

### COUNCILLORS

Robert C Aldridge  
Scott Arthur  
Gavin Barrie  
Eleanor Bird  
Claire Bridgman  
Mark A Brown  
Graeme Bruce  
Steve Burgess  
Lezley Marion Cameron  
Jim Campbell  
Kate Campbell  
Mary Campbell  
Maureen M Child  
Nick Cook  
Gavin Corbett  
Cammy Day  
Alison Dickie  
Denis C Dixon  
Phil Duggart  
Karen Doran  
Scott Douglas  
Catherine Fullerton  
Neil Gardiner  
Gillian Gloyer  
George Gordon  
Joan Griffiths  
Ricky Henderson  
Graham J Hutchison

Andrew Johnston  
David Key  
Callum Laidlaw  
Kevin Lang  
Lesley Macinnes  
Melanie Main  
John McLellan  
Amy McNeese-Mechan  
Adam McVey  
Claire Miller  
Max Mitchell  
Joanna Mowat  
Rob Munn  
Gordon J Munro  
Hal Osler  
Ian Perry  
Susan Rae  
Cameron Rose  
Neil Ross  
Jason Rust  
Stephanie Smith  
Alex Staniforth  
Mandy Watt  
Susan Webber  
Iain Whyte  
Donald Wilson  
Norman J Work  
Louise Young

## 1 Minutes

---

### Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 30 June 2020 as a correct record.

## 2 Questions

---

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

## 3 Leader's Report

---

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

- Businesses re-opening
- Schools
- Community Centres and Libraries
- Transport
- Investments and Developments
- Progress of re-opening during recovery from Covid-19 – Guidance and adjustments to be made
- City Vision
- Planning strategies
- Tourism
- Economy

The following questions/comments were made:

- |                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| Councillor Whyte    | - | Edinburgh Trams – resolution of budget issues   |
| Councillor Main     | - | Home First Campaign – short-term lets in Edinburgh – action to inform owners that planning permission is required |
| Councillor Aldridge | - | Spaces for People Initiative – removing decision making from officers to politicians                              |
| Councillor Day      | - | Commending work of trade unions for positive engagement   |
| Councillor Dickie   | - | Children and Young People – mental health and well-being – full and safe return to school and support for this    |

- |                          |   |  |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Councillor Johnston      | - | Tram extension – future analysis of project and funding  |
| Councillor Staniforth    | - | No deal Brexit   |
| Councillor Lang          | - | Changes for safety of pedestrians – ban on pavement parking – commencement order   |
| Councillor Munro         | - | Covid impact on Council budgets – discussions for funding  |
| Councillor Gordon        | - | Good Food Nation Bill and Right to Access Food   |
| Councillor Rust          | - | Spaces for People Programme – Public Engagement – Accessing Bus Stops Across Cycle Lanes                                     |
| Councillor Barrie        | - | Safe use of bus services – promotion by Council members  |
| Councillor Rae           | - | Leithers Don't Litter Campaign – thanks to Zsuzsa and Gerry Farrell for their work in setting up and promoting this campaign |
| Councillor Doggart       | - | Spaces for People Programme – complaints received regarding temporary proposals on Comiston Road                             |
| Councillor Kate Campbell | - | Welcoming news of Edindex re-instatement   |

#### **4 Senior Councillor Remuneration July 2020 and Appointments to Committees and Outside Organisations etc**

---

The Council had agreed senior councillor remuneration to Councillor Main as co-leader of the Green Group with effect from 29 December 2019. Details were provided on a proposal that this be allocated to Councillor Staniforth to take effect from 28 July 2020.

A number of Councillors had also resigned from their positions on various Committees and organisations and the Council was required to appoint members in their place.

## **Motion**

- 1) To agree that Councillor Staniforth receive the Group Leader's Senior Councillor Remuneration with effect from 28 July 2020.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Day in place of Councillor Henderson on the Merchant Company Endowment Trust.
- 3) To appoint Councillor Day in place of Councillor Henderson on the Board of Life Care (Edinburgh) Ltd (on a division)
- 4) To appoint Councillor Miller in place of Councillor Mary Campbell as the Green Group representative on COSLA.

- moved by Councillor Doran, seconded by Councillor Fullerton

## **Amendment**

- 1) To agree that Councillor Staniforth receive the Group Leader's Senior Councillor Remuneration with effect from 28 July 2020.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Barrie in place of Councillor Henderson on the Merchant Company Endowment Trust.
- 3) To appoint Councillor Day in place of Councillor Henderson on the Board of Life Care (Edinburgh) Ltd (on a division)
- 4) To appoint Councillor Miller in place of Councillor Mary Campbell as the Green Group representative on COSLA.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Mowat

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	33 votes
For the amendment	-	25 votes

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

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

## Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Doran.

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

## 5 Supporting Local Businesses in Edinburgh – Report by the Executive Director of Place

---

In response to motions by Councillors Lezley Marion Cameron and Cook, an overview of the activities which the Council was currently or planned to progress to support local businesses in Edinburgh in response to Covid-19 and as part of the Adaptation and Renewal programme was presented.

### Motion

- 1) To note the ongoing work to support local businesses across the city.
- 2) To note that an application had been submitted to the Scotland's Town Partnership's 'Towns and Business Improvement Districts Resilience and Recovery Fund' to support the Shop Local campaign.
- 3) To note that a local Champions network would be established with individuals from local businesses, Traders Associations and/or Community Council to enable the Council to consult directly with local businesses on the additional action which they would like the Council to take to provide further support within the Spaces for People and other economic recovery programmes.
- 4) To ask that Officers engage immediately with trade bodies and work with the Local Champions network to quickly agree a policy proposal regarding licencing of outdoor spaces for eating, drinking and other similar activities; including exploring deferral of fees and discount for small businesses.
- 5) In the event that a policy was proposed which had a financial impact beyond the existing Spaces for People budget, that the proposed policy be brought to the next Policy and Sustainability Committee for consideration.
- 6) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cook, as approved at the Policy and Sustainability Committee of 11 June 2020.
- 7) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cameron, as approved at the City of Edinburgh Council of 30 June 2020.

- moved by Councillor Kate Campbell, seconded by Councillor Watt

## Amendment 1

- 1) To note the ongoing work to support local businesses across the city.
  - a) But expresses concern that feedback from businesses is that the Council is not moving quickly enough to support them or to meaningfully act on their concerns; recognises that the challenges faced by businesses in local high streets are different to those in the city centre and therefore require distinct solutions.
  - b) Many local high streets have seen encouraging footfall as lockdown has eased, thus far largely trading in an environment safe for staff and customers alike. Therefore, agrees it is essential that Spaces for People (SfP) measures recognise that traders know their client base better than the Council and that SfP measures assist rather than hinder their trading environment.
  - c) Notes statements by the Transport Convenor on the supposed value of customers travelling to businesses by bicycle rather than vehicle; Considers that this evidence fails to fully take account of Edinburgh's suburban demographics and unknown changes in consumer behaviour post-Covid.
  - d) Notes City Centre businesses are suffering from severely reduced footfall because of the absence of both tourists and office workers who amounted to 25 – 30,000 incoming visitors per day and there is currently a reduction of 85 – 90% in footfall; notes that this is unlikely to change until Scottish Government Covid-19 guidance changes but recognises that there is an urgent need to support these businesses in the immediate term, Therefore, requests that officers further review the speed and costs of licensing outdoor spaces in order to deliver animation to the City Centre to support it through this very difficult trading time.
- 2) To note that an application had been submitted to the Scotland's Town Partnership's 'Towns and Business Improvement Districts Resilience and Recovery Fund' to support the Shop Local campaign.
- 3) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cook, as approved at the Policy and Sustainability Committee of 11 June 2020.
- 4) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cameron, as approved at the City of Edinburgh Council of 30 June 2020.

- moved by Councillor Cook, seconded by Councillor McLellan

## **Amendment 2**

- 1) To note the ongoing work to support local businesses across the city.
- 2) To note that an application had been submitted to the Scotland's Town Partnership's 'Towns and Business Improvement Districts Resilience and Recovery Fund' to support the Shop Local campaign.
- 3) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cook, as approved at the Policy and Sustainability Committee of 11 June 2020.
- 4) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cameron, as approved at the City of Edinburgh Council of 30 June 2020.
- 5) To accept and endorse the Edinburgh Climate Commission recommendations on a 20-minute walking principle in place-making design and supporting neighbourhood economies; and recognise that applying such principles consistently would provide enormous benefit to local businesses.
- 6) To note that community support for local shops and businesses had an important part to play in adaption and renewal across the city, and therefore request that local residents be included in the Local Champions Network by including 2 representatives for each town centre drawn from Community Councils, residents associations, parent councils and other relevant local groups.

- moved by Councillor Main, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

## **Amendment 3**

- 1) To note the ongoing work to support local businesses across the city.
- 2) To note that an application had been submitted to the Scotland's Town Partnership's 'Towns and Business Improvement Districts Resilience and Recovery Fund' to support the Shop Local campaign.
- 3) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cook, as approved at the Policy and Sustainability Committee of 11 June 2020.
- 4) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cameron, as approved at the City of Edinburgh Council of 30 June 2020.
- 5) To agree that a six month update report on the Council's support for local businesses should be submitted to the first Policy and Sustainability Committee meeting of 2021.

- 6) To agree that officers responsible for the Edinburgh Economy Watch should consider how the quarterly briefing could be amended to include trends in small business numbers in the city.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Part (d) of Amendment 1 and all of Amendments 2 and 3 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	41 votes
For the Amendment 1	-	17 votes

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

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

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Kate Campbell:

- 1) To note the ongoing work to support local businesses across the city and that City Centre businesses were suffering from severely reduced footfall because of the absence of both tourists and office workers who amounted to 25 – 30,000 incoming visitors per day and there was currently a reduction of 85 – 90% in footfall; to note that this was unlikely to change until Scottish Government Covid-19 guidance changed but recognise that there was an urgent need to support these businesses in the immediate term, Therefore, request that officers further review the speed and costs of licensing outdoor spaces in order to deliver animation to the City Centre to support it through this very difficult trading time.
- 2) To note that an application had been submitted to the Scotland's Town Partnership's 'Towns and Business Improvement Districts Resilience and Recovery Fund' to support the Shop Local campaign.
- 3) To note that a local Champions network would be established with individuals from local businesses, Traders Associations and/or Community Council to enable the Council to consult directly with local businesses on the additional

action which they would like the Council to take to provide further support within the Spaces for People and other economic recovery programmes.

- 4) To ask that Officers engage immediately with trade bodies and work with the Local Champions network to quickly agree a policy proposal regarding licencing of outdoor spaces for eating, drinking and other similar activities; including exploring deferral of fees and discount for small businesses.
- 5) In the event that a policy was proposed which had a financial impact beyond the existing Spaces for People budget, that the proposed policy be brought to the next Policy and Sustainability Committee for consideration.
- 6) To accept and endorse the Edinburgh Climate Commission recommendations on a 20-minute walking principle in place-making design and supporting neighbourhood economies; and recognise that applying such principles consistently would provide enormous benefit to local businesses.
- 7) To note that community support for local shops and businesses had an important part to play in adaption and renewal across the city, and therefore request that local residents be included in the Local Champions Network by including 2 representatives for each town centre drawn from Community Councils, residents associations, parent councils and other relevant local groups.
- 8) To agree that a six month update report on the Council's support for local businesses should be submitted to the first Policy and Sustainability Committee meeting of 2021.
- 9) To agree that officers responsible for the Edinburgh Economy Watch should consider how the quarterly briefing could be amended to include trends in small business numbers in the city.
- 10) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cook, as approved at the Policy and Sustainability Committee of 11 June 2020.
- 11) To agree to discharge the motion by Councillor Cameron, as approved at the City of Edinburgh Council of 30 June 2020.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 11 June 2020 (item 22); Act of Council No 14 of 30 June 2020; report by the Executive Director of Place, submitted)

## **6 Rolling Actions Log - May 2015 to July 2020**

---

Details were provided on the outstanding actions arising from decisions taken by the Council from May 2015 to July 2020.

## Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following actions:

**Action 1** – Attracting and Retaining Carers - Motion by Councillor Miller

**Action 10** – Safe Re-opening of Businesses in Edinburgh– Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

- 2) To provide updates to members on the following actions:

**Action 4(b)** – Added Members and Voting Rights on the Education, Children and Families Committee – Legal Opinion

**Action 5** – Added Members and Voting Rights on the Education, Children and Families Committee

**Action 6** - Climate Change Impact and Management – motion by Councillor Macinnes.

- 3) To otherwise note the Rolling Actions Log.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, submitted.)

## 7 Revenue Budget 2020/21 Update – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

---

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report which provided an update on the estimated cost and income implications of the coronavirus pandemic on the Council and its Arm's-Length External Organisations' (ALEOs') activities to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of the use of up to £0.295m from the former Central Energy Efficiency Fund (CEEF) to enable investment in key energy efficiency initiatives.

### Motion

To approve the use of up to £0.295m from the former Central Energy Efficiency Fund (CEEF) to enable investment in key energy efficiency initiatives

- moved by Councillor Griffiths, seconded by Councillor McVey

### Amendment 1

- 1) To approve the use of up to £0.295m from the former Central Energy Efficiency Fund (CEEF) to enable investment in key energy efficiency initiatives.

- 2) To request a report in one cycle detailing:
  - a) The range of Council employees that had been furloughed and the time frame for which job retention scheme applications were made;
  - b) The date from which council employees were unable to work due to Covid-19;
  - c) Any engagement undertaken with Dundee Council, CoSLA or any other Scottish local authorities as to their job retention scheme applications;
  - d) What consideration had been given to applying for the job retention scheme bonus from February 2021 and the current status of this work;
  - e) Whether any Council employees had been 'flexibly' furloughed since 1st July 2020 and, if so, how many and in which department(s).

- moved by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Whyte

### **Amendment 2**

- 1) To approve the use of up to £0.295m from the former Central Energy Efficiency Fund (CEEF) to enable investment in key energy efficiency initiatives.
- 2) To note that, notwithstanding significant pressures on the core revenue budget, there remained opportunities to allocate funds which were earmarked for energy efficiency and spend to save initiatives which could be used to facilitate a Green Recovery and that a briefing note should be provided to all groups on the resources available and conditions of use within two cycles.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Rae

### **Amendment 3**

- 1) To note the further update of the estimated expenditure and income impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic on the Council and its ALEOs' activities and the potential sources of funding identified to address them.
- 2) To note the significant remaining projected in-year shortfall and associated risks linked to further service disruption and/or slower-than-assumed recovery.
- 3) To note that updates on expenditure and income impacts, and the confirmed and potential means to address them, would continue to be reported to elected members on an at-least monthly basis until greater certainty was obtained in these areas.

- 4) To note that further representations would be made through COSLA regarding the need for full pass-through of Barnett Consequentials resulting from the provision of relevant additional funding in England.
- 5) To note, nonetheless, that there remained a significant risk around receiving additional funding sufficient to address the remaining deficit, particularly in the event of any further lockdown, and thus further actions on service prioritisation were urgently required.
- 6) To approve, subject to onward ratification by Council on 28 July, the use of up to £0.295m from the former Central Energy Efficiency Fund (CEEF) to enable investment in key energy efficiency initiatives.
- 7) To request that the Council Leader write to the Cabinet Secretary for Finance to press the City of Edinburgh's case for urgent support and to call for the potential funding sources outlined in Paragraph's 4.8 to 4.11 of the report be passed on in full to Local Authorities as soon as available. The Council Leader's letter should also make the case for providing the additional financial flexibilities identified in Paragraph 4.23 of the report.
- 8) To agree to provide a briefing note with a breakdown of the £31m loss relating to Council ALEOs.

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

In accordance with Standing Order 19 (12), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to Amendment 3

## **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	33 votes
For Amendment 1	-	19 votes
For Amendment 3 (as adjusted)	-	6 votes

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

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

For Amendment 3 (as adjusted): Councillors Aldridge, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young)

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Griffiths:

- 1) To approve the use of up to £0.295m from the former Central Energy Efficiency Fund (CEEF) to enable investment in key energy efficiency initiatives.
- 2) To note that, notwithstanding significant pressures on the core revenue budget, there remained opportunities to allocate funds which were earmarked for energy efficiency and spend to save initiatives which could be used to facilitate a Green Recovery and that a briefing note should be provided to all groups on the resources available and conditions of use within two cycles.

(Reference – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 23 July 2020 (item 9); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted)

## **8 Edinburgh Climate Commission First Report – Motion by Councillor Burgess**

---

The following motion by Councillor Burgess was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council

- 1) Welcomes the report “Forward, Faster, Together” published by the Edinburgh Climate Commission on 9 July 2020;
- 2) Specifically welcomes;
  - Affirmation that progressing to the 2030 Net Zero carbon target could create at least 16,000 jobs;
  - Recognition that the City’s status as a global finance centre provides an opportunity for the finance sector, including pension investment, to support a sustainable future; and that this applies equally to Lothian Pension Fund;
  - The principle that public stimulus to business and partner organisations should be conditional on actively contributing to a greener, more inclusive city;
  - Endorsement of the 20-minute walking principle as core to placemaking;

- 3) Agrees that to achieve the full potential of a Green Recovery for Edinburgh the Scottish Government needs to review policy, funding and enabling powers to ensure that the City council can deliver on zero-carbon ambitions, and therefore that the Council Leader will ask the Scottish Government how they intend to engage on these issues.

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Miller

### **Amendment**

To adjust the motion by Councillor Burgess as follows:

- 1) To change “welcomes” in clauses 1 to 2 to “notes”
- 2) To add to clause 3, the following paragraph:

“Instructs the Executive Director of Place to produce a report to the next Policy and Sustainability Committee highlighting:

- a) the powers the Council has available to deliver on the Commission’s proposals;
- b) the areas where work could only be undertaken alongside partners;
- c) areas where there are gaps in the Council’s powers to act;
- d) the discussions that the Council has undertaken with the financial sector to help influence delivery of these ambitions and the results of this work to date;
- e) the changes that would be required to the Council’s objectives in order to implement the Commission’s proposals.”

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

### **Voting**

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	41 votes
For the amendment	-	17 votes

(For the motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgeman, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths,

Henderson, Key, Lang, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Young.

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

## **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

## **9 Commercial Short-Term Lets in Edinburgh - Motion by Councillor Staniforth**

---

The following motion by Councillor Staniforth was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council:

- 1) Notes the report on Commercial short term lets published by Andy Wightman MSP on 10 July 2020.
- 2) Notes that, of the 477 commercial short term lets identified in the report, only one had sought and obtained planning permission; and therefore agrees to ask the chief planning officer to prepare a response for the next meeting of Planning Committee.
- 3) Notes that three-quarters of the properties identified were not registered for Non-Domestic Rates; and agrees to request that the Lothian Valuation Joint Board investigate this further, along with the tax liability issues highlighted in the report.
- 4) Notes and welcomes the council’s aspirations to see more commercial short term lets returned to residential use, both for temporary accommodation and permanent residential purposes; but recognises that the extent to which some short term let owners have continued to trade during the restricted period; and the shortfalls in regulation and taxation frameworks highlighted means that a more proactive approach is required to achieve those aspirations.”

## **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Main

## **Amendment**

To add to the motion by Councillor Staniforth:

- 1) To recognise the ongoing work of officers within the cross service short term let team to tackle antisocial behaviour, using existing legislative powers across various council service areas including planning, licensing, environmental health, trading standards and housing and family support focusing on using planning enforcement and has successfully defended actions at appeal.
- 2) To note the decisions of the Policy and Sustainability Committee, based on the work of the Short Term Lets Working group, to make the case to the Scottish Government for a licensing regime that gives the council additional powers to control short term lets.
- 3) To welcome that the Scottish Government has restarted work on bringing forward the legislation required following a pause caused by Covid -19.
- 4) To agree that the STLWG and council officers will continue to work together to respond to the Scottish Government consultation, and help shape legislation that comes forward, so that it delivers the full powers that we need in Edinburgh to properly protect homes and communities.

- moved by Councillor Kate Campbell, seconded by Councillor Watt

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), the amendment was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Staniforth:

- 1) To note the report on Commercial short term lets published by Andy Wightman MSP on 10 July 2020.
- 2) To note that, of the 477 commercial short term lets identified in the report, only one had sought and obtained planning permission; and therefore to agree to ask the chief planning officer to prepare a response for the next meeting of the Planning Committee.
- 3) To note that three-quarters of the properties identified were not registered for Non-Domestic Rates; and to agree to request that the Lothian Valuation Joint Board investigate this further, along with the tax liability issues highlighted in the report.
- 4) To note and welcome the council's aspirations to see more commercial short term lets returned to residential use, both for temporary accommodation and permanent residential purposes; but recognise that the extent to which some short term let owners had continued to trade during the restricted period; and the shortfalls in regulation and taxation frameworks highlighted means that a more proactive approach was required to achieve those aspirations.

- 5) To recognise the ongoing work of officers within the cross service short term let team to tackle antisocial behaviour, using existing legislative powers across various council service areas including planning, licensing, environmental health, trading standards and housing and family support focusing on using planning enforcement and had successfully defended actions at appeal.
- 6) To note the decisions of the Policy and Sustainability Committee, based on the work of the Short Term Lets Working group, to make the case to the Scottish Government for a licensing regime that gave the council additional powers to control short term lets.
- 7) To welcome that the Scottish Government had restarted work on bringing forward the legislation required following a pause caused by Covid -19.
- 8) To agree that the STLWG and council officers would continue to work together to respond to the Scottish Government consultation, and help shape legislation that came forward, so that it delivered the full powers that were needed in Edinburgh to properly protect homes and communities.

## **10 50th Anniversary of the Edinburgh Archaeological Field Society – Motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan**

---

The following motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council notes that the Society:

- a) was originally established in March 1971 as the East of Scotland Archaeological Association. In 1975 the name was changed to the Edinburgh Archaeological Field Society to foster an interest in fieldwork archaeology;
- b) encourages people from the City and across the East of Scotland to learn practical archaeological skills and to discover more about current archaeology activity across the region and wider Scotland. Work includes surveys, lectures, and excavation and research;
- c) has most recently been undertaking excavations at Cammo Cottages;
- d) hopes to return to lectures and excavations following the current lockdown; and
- e) continues to work closely with the Council’s Museums Service on relevant archaeological projects.

In acknowledging the positive specialist fieldwork, heritage and educational impacts of the work of Edinburgh Archaeological Field Society, Council requests that the Lord Provost, marks the upcoming 50th Anniversary in an appropriate way.”

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

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan.

## **11 Fields in Trust - Mallyen Park – Motion by Councillor Gardiner**

---

The following motion by Councillor Gardiner was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council requests:

Officers bring forward a report for Elected Members to consider ‘Fields of Trust’ status for Mallyen Park in Balerno to the Policy and Sustainability Committee, in two cycles.

Implementing ‘Fields of Trust’ status for Mallyen Park has the support of both Balerno Community Council and Balerno Village Trust.”.

### **Motion**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Gardiner:

Council requests:

Officers bring forward a report for Elected Members to consider ‘Fields of Trust’ status for Marchbank Park in Balerno to the Policy and Sustainability Committee, in two cycles.

Implementing ‘Fields of Trust’ status for Marchbank Park has the support of both Balerno Community Council and Balerno Village Trust.

- moved by Councillor Gardiner, seconded by Councillor Henderson

### **Decision**

To approve the adjusted motion by Councillor Gardiner.

## 12 Edinburgh Leisure Wins Environmental Impact Award – Motion by Councillor Staniforth

---

The following motion by Councillor Staniforth was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council:

Notes that despite the immediacy of Covid-19, climate change remains the greatest challenge of the coming decade and that it is imperative ALEOs in partnership with the council, as well as City of Edinburgh Council itself, work hard to reduce carbon production.

Therefore congratulates Edinburgh Leisure on winning the Environmental Impact award at the Community Leisure UK Awards 2020 and commends Edinburgh Leisure on its commitment to carbon reduction.

Requests that the Lord Provost write to Edinburgh Leisure to formally convey the above congratulations.”

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Wilson

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth

### **Declaration of Interests**

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

## 13 Centenary of the North Merchiston Club – Motion by the Lord Provost

---

The following motion by the Lord Provost was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council notes that:

- a) The Club was founded in 1921 as the first and largest Boys Club in Scotland and was initially given a large hut from the YMCA to operate activities.
- b) Matching the ambition of the Club, the building gradually grew in scale as funds allowed and more people became involved.

- c) The Club was the hub of the local community for 50 years, until the 1970's when a number of factors, i.e.; lack of volunteers, changing tastes in activities, the rise of technology etc., led to a decline in presence and operations.
- d) In 2010, the Board decided to undertake one last effort to get the Club going again, and with support from the wider community, the Club now has a vibrant presence and popular programme of over 40 different activities.
- e) Currently, the Club has over 1000 people of all ages and cultures using their facilities every week and also provide a substantial venue for local celebrations, fundraisers, family parties etc. The Club endeavours to foster a sense of worth, self-confidence, citizenship, etc., and still hold true to these values today.
- f) The Board of the North Merchiston Club believe that the Club is unique and holds a special place in many people's hearts across the City.

Few community clubs reach a centenary of operation, and in acknowledging this substantial milestone, and the continuing local positive social and wellbeing impacts of the work of the Club, Council requests that the Lord Provost, marks this important upcoming Centenary Anniversary in an appropriate way.”

- moved by Councillor Key, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

### **Decision**

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

## **14 Commonwealth Games - Edinburgh 1970, 50th Anniversary – Motion by the Lord Provost – Commonwealth Games – Edinburgh 1970 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary**

---

The following motion by the Lord Provost was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council notes that:

- a) In 1970, Edinburgh was the first city in Scotland to host a Commonwealth Games. The Games were attended by 1,383 athletes representing 42 countries, featuring 9 sports, with competitions across 121 events.
- b) 2020 marks the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary for both the International Commonwealth Games movement and the City of Edinburgh's hosting of these Games.
- c) This 1970 event left an indelible legacy for Edinburgh and the country, with; (i) major new facilities built such as the Royal Commonwealth Pool and the

Meadowbank Sports Centre, and (ii) a generation of young people being inspired to participate in a range of sports.

- d) One world record and two Games records were broken at the competition.
- e) At the 1970 Games, Scotland won 25 medals including six gold, four of which were in athletics - a feat which has not been matched since.
- f) The 1970 Games also left their mark on the wider Commonwealth, being the first Games to use metric measurements (previously imperial units) and was the event that gave the Games its status as the 'Friendly Games', a moniker for which Edinburgh can be rightly proud and which continues today.
- g) Edinburgh has hosted events at three Commonwealth Games (1970, 1986 and as part of the 2014 Games) and a Commonwealth Youth Games in 2000. This is a record that no other city in the Commonwealth has achieved.

In acknowledging the continuing positive impact of the 1970 Games upon the City of Edinburgh, Council requests that the Lord Provost, marks the 50th Anniversary in an appropriate way.”

### **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by the Lord Provost:

Council notes that:

- a) In 1970, Edinburgh was the first city in Scotland to host a Commonwealth Games. The Games were attended by 1,383 athletes representing 42 countries, featuring 9 sports, with competitions across 121 events.
- b) 2020 marks the 50th Anniversary for both the International Commonwealth Games movement and the City of Edinburgh's hosting of these Games.
- c) This 1970 event left an indelible legacy for Edinburgh and the country, with; (i) major new facilities built such as the Royal Commonwealth Pool and the Meadowbank Sports Centre, and (ii) a generation of young people being inspired to participate in a range of sports.
- d) One world record and two Games records were broken at the competition.
- e) At the 1970 Games, Scotland won 25 medals including six gold, four of which were in athletics - a feat which has not been matched since.
- f) The 1970 Games also left their mark on the wider Commonwealth, being the first Games to use metric measurements (previously imperial units) and was the event that gave the Games its status as the 'Friendly Games', a moniker for which Edinburgh can be rightly proud and which continues today.

- g) Edinburgh has hosted events at three Commonwealth Games (1970, 1986 and as part of the 2014 Games) and a Commonwealth Youth Games in 2000. This is a record that no other city in the Commonwealth has achieved.

In acknowledging the continuing positive impact of the 1970 Games upon the City of Edinburgh, Council requests that the Lord Provost:

- i) marks the 50th Anniversary in an appropriate way.
- ii) fund an online exhibition of people's memories of the games including photographs from the former City Councillor Sir Peter Heatly.

Pays tribute to the work of the then organisers, volunteers and athletes, including our former Lord Provosts, Sir Herbert Brechin and Sir James Wilson Mackay, who all made these Games a resounding success, and wishes them all well on this anniversary.

Looks forward to Edinburgh once again welcoming visitors for sport or leisure.

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

## **15 IX Commonwealth Games – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell**

---

The following motion by Councillor Jim Campbell was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

Council:

Recognises the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the IX Commonwealth Games hosted in Edinburgh from the 16 to 21 July 1970 and the III Commonwealth Paraplegic Games held the following week.

Celebrates the success of these Games where Edinburgh played a welcome host to many visitors and gained new world class facilities such as previous Meadowbank Stadium and the Royal Commonwealth Pool, some of which still serve the sporting purposes of the City.

Notes the many “firsts” of these Games: first to be held in Scotland; first opening ceremony that was broadcast in colour across the Commonwealth; first Games attended by the Queen who presented a number of medals; first to use only metric measurements; and the first to use electronic photo-finish technology.

Further notes that Scotland achieved its equal highest ranking of 4<sup>th</sup> position in the Medals Table.

Pays tribute to the work of the then organisers, volunteers and athletes, including our former Lord Provost, Sir Herbert Brechin, who all made these Games a resounding success, and wishes them all well on this anniversary.

Looks forward to Edinburgh once again welcoming visitors for sport or leisure.”

### **Decision**

To note that Councillor Jim Campbell had withdrawn his motion.

## **16 Taxi Rank Spaces – Motion by Councillor Webber**

---

The following motion by Councillor Webber was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council:

- 1) Recognises that there has been a reduction in the number of taxi rank spaces across the city and these will be reduced further with the implementation of Spaces for People schemes.
- 2) Recognises the role taxis play in the city’s public transport network.
- 3) Notes that road regulations mean that only licensed taxi cabs can wait in these road spaces and tickets should be issued against a range of vehicles, including private hire cars as well as privately owned cars.
- 4) Recognises that it is vital that the existing taxi rank network is readily and easily identifiable to passengers and that the spaces are kept for eligible vehicles only.
- 5) Requests that signage and road markings for existing taxi ranks are refreshed to permit the enforcement of the road regulations and to ensure they are available for use by licensed taxi cabs and to make them more accessible for passengers.
- 6) Instructs the pending review of taxi rank spaces be expedited.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Rose

## **Amendment 1**

To insert “non-eligible” before vehicles in point 3 in the motion by Councillor Webber, and remove text in point 3 after “vehicles.

- moved by Councillor Fullerton, seconded by Councillor Doran

## **Amendment 2**

To add to the end of the motion by Councillor Webber:

- 7) Welcomes the reallocation of road space as part of Spaces for People, outlined in 1. above, while recognising that taxis form part of a strategy to help people move around the city without recourse to a private car; and that therefore there is a legitimate expectation of taxi-drivers to have access to earmarked space which is convenient for passengers to be picked up and dropped off; and further therefore, to agree that review of taxi rank spaces should *come to the appropriate Committee within one cycle* and include options for reallocating space currently provided for on-street parking of private cars to taxi ranks.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Main

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Amendment 1 was accepted as an amendment and Amendment 2 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

## **Decision**

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Webber:

- 1) To recognise that there had been a reduction in the number of taxi rank spaces across the city and these would be reduced further with the implementation of Spaces for People schemes.
- 2) To recognise the role taxis played in the city’s public transport network.
- 3) To note that road regulations meant that only licensed taxi cabs could wait in these road spaces and tickets should be issued against a range of non-eligible vehicles.
- 4) To recognise that it was vital that the existing taxi rank network was readily and easily identifiable to passengers and that the spaces were kept for eligible vehicles only.
- 5) To request that signage and road markings for existing taxi ranks were refreshed to permit the enforcement of the road regulations and to ensure they

were available for use by licensed taxi cabs and to make them more accessible for passengers.

- 6) To instruct the pending review of taxi rank spaces be expedited.
- 7) To welcome the reallocation of road space as part of Spaces for People, outlined in 1. above, while recognising that taxis formed part of a strategy to help people move around the city without recourse to a private car; and that therefore there was a legitimate expectation of taxi-drivers to have access to earmarked space which was convenient for passengers to be picked up and dropped off; and further therefore, to agree that a review of taxi rank spaces should come to the appropriate Committee within one cycle and include options for reallocating space currently provided for on-street parking of private cars to taxi ranks.

## **17 1140 Hours Provision of Early Learning and Childcare – Motion by Councillor Laidlaw**

---

The following motion by Councillor Laidlaw was submitted in terms of Standing Order 14:

“Council:

- 1) Notes that funded, local authority delivered early learning and childcare (ELC) is available to all three- and four-year olds and eligible two-year olds and that currently 600 free hours are provided to each child per year – and that the Scottish Government had committed to increasing this to 1140 hours from August 2020.
- 2) Notes the announcement by Early Years Minister, Maree Todd MSP that releases the statutory obligation of local authorities to meet the August deadline and the recent announcement by the First Minister that an ‘initial assessment of readiness’ will be conducted in December, suggesting that the requirement to provide the provision will not be this academic year.
- 3) Recognises that the previous commitment to provide high quality, flexible ELC, that is accessible and affordable for all families, was to enable improve children’s outcomes and help close the poverty-related attainment gap, increase family resilience through improved health and wellbeing of children and parents and support parents into work, study or training.
- 4) Notes the above objectives are particularly pertinent in the COVID-19 recovery phase and that much work has been done by City of Edinburgh to meet the earlier deadline including the provision of facilities and recruitment of staff.

- 5) Asks the Executive Director Communities and Families to report back within one cycle as to what provision can be made available to the families of Edinburgh and the costs and feasibility of providing the following options:
- Full 1140 hours provision as envisaged
  - A phased scale-up across the 2020-21 academic year rising from 870 hours to 1140 hours
  - Provision of 1140 hours to the children of key workers.”

### **Motion**

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Douglas

### **Amendment 1**

- 1) To insert a new paragraph 3 in the motion by Councillor Laidlaw and renumber all the paragraphs that follow.

“Acknowledges that prior to Covid-19 the council were on track to deliver its early years commitment by August 2020.

The announcement of the delay to statutory entitlement does not affect the commitment to expand the council’s early years provision but enables the council to manage the delay to the building programme and workforce recruitment caused by the pandemic.”

- 2) To add an additional bullet point in last paragraph of the motion as follows:
- the new timetable for the delivery of the new early year’s facilities planned for August 2020 but delayed by the pandemic.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dickie

### **Amendment 2**

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

“This report to include how the use of outdoor spaces particularly forest kindergartens can be maximised for early learning and childcare as part of the 1140 hours provision.”

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion

## Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Laidlaw:

- 1) To note that funded, local authority delivered early learning and childcare (ELC) was available to all three- and four-year olds and eligible two-year olds and that currently 600 free hours were provided to each child per year – and that the Scottish Government had committed to increasing this to 1140 hours from August 2020.
- 2) To note the announcement by Early Years Minister, Maree Todd MSP that released the statutory obligation of local authorities to meet the August deadline and the recent announcement by the First Minister that an ‘initial assessment of readiness’ would be conducted in December, suggesting that the requirement to provide the provision would not be this academic year.
- 3) To acknowledge that prior to Covid-19 the council were on track to deliver its early years commitment by August 2020.

The announcement of the delay to statutory entitlement did not affect the commitment to expand the council’s early years provision but enabled the council to manage the delay to the building programme and workforce recruitment caused by the pandemic

- 4) To recognise that the previous commitment to provide high quality, flexible ELC, that was accessible and affordable for all families, was to enable improved children’s outcomes and help close the poverty-related attainment gap, increase family resilience through improved health and wellbeing of children and parents and support parents into work, study or training.
- 5) To note the above objectives were particularly pertinent in the COVID-19 recovery phase and that much work had been done by City of Edinburgh to meet the earlier deadline including the provision of facilities and recruitment of staff.
- 6) To ask the Executive Director for Communities and Families to report back within one cycle as to what provision could be made available to the families of Edinburgh and the costs and feasibility of providing the following options:
  - Full 1140 hours provision as envisaged
  - A phased scale-up across the 2020-21 academic year rising from 870 hours to 1140 hours
  - Provision of 1140 hours to the children of key workers

- The new timetable for the delivery of the new early year's facilities planned for August 2020 but delayed by the pandemic

This report to include how the use of outdoor spaces particularly forest kindergartens could be maximised for early learning and childcare as part of the 1140 hours provision

## Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 2 of 28 July 2020)

### QUESTION NO 1

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question** (1) Can he publish a table detailing the current identified capital requirements for each of the Council's play parks?

**Answer** (1) Table 1 lists play parks which will require refurbishment within a future Play Capital Programme. Inclusion in the future programme is determined by play provision, the current age of equipment and a ROSPA assessment of safety. For the purpose of a cost estimate an average build sum of £100,000 has been assumed. Three play areas have also been assessed as requiring replacement equipment at an estimated £25,000 per item. Total value for all works is, therefore, estimated at £3,275,000. Over a five-year period third party funding which could contribute towards this sum is likely to be in the region of £500,000.

**Question** (2) If he will publish the current capital investment plan for Council owned play parks for the next two years?

**Answer** (2) Table 2 lists the capital investment programme for the next two years for play parks. Investment is funded by a combination of grants, developer contributions and an allocation from the Council's capital budget.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much Lord Provost and my thanks to the Convener for the answers that he provided. His figures did underline I think the gulf which exists between the capital requirements to bring our children's play parks up to scratch and the money which is currently available and given that indoor play areas like soft plays and activity centres are still

off-limits and could be for some time, does the Convener agree with me, the outdoor play areas like our play parks and now even more important and that there is a case for additional funding to be found?

**Comments by  
the Lord  
Provost**

Okay, just before we look to the Convener for an answer on that one, I'll remind members that supplementary questions are for clarification of points raised, not to raise new points, it is quite clear that this is talking about outdoor play areas and indoor play areas etc in the way that you've done Councillor Lang is a new point. Can I just ask members, any supplementary must be for clarification of points which have been submitted already in written form.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost, but I'm happy answer both those points. I think that first of all, yes, you are absolutely right Councillor Lang that it does highlight the costs of maintaining these play areas and does show the difference between what's available and what we would need, but I also do agree that at this time we should prioritise outdoor play areas and take that opportunity.

(Please see update at the end of the Supplementary Answer to Question 12)

**TABLE 1****Future Capital Requirements for Council Play Areas****Table 1**

<b>SITE</b>	<b>CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS</b>
Allison Public Park x 3 - Junior, Toddler & Teenager Areas	£ 300,000
Bingham Park	£ 100,000
Bloomiehall Public Park	£ 100,000
Broomhouse Grove	£ 100,000
Campbell Public Park	£ 100,000
Carlowrie Crescent	£ 100,000
Clovenstone Park (Block 40)	£ 100,000
Craigpark Crescent	£ 25,000
Dalry Community Park	£ 100,000
Dean Park Place/Square	£ 100,000
Drum Park/Avenue	£ 100,000
Dumbryden Gardens (No. 1-17)	£ 100,000
Dundas Avenue	£ 100,000
Forth Terrace	£ 100,000
Glendevon Park	£ 100,000
Granton Crescent	£ 100,000
Inch Public Park	£ 25,000
Inchcolm Terrace	£ 100,000
Keddie Gardens	£ 100,000
King George V Park (Farquhar Terrace)	£ 100,000
Kirkliston Sports Centre	£ 100,000
Magdalene Community Centre	£ 100,000
Meadows (Toddlers)	£ 100,000
Moat House	£ 100,000
Muir Wood Road	£ 100,000
Murieston Public Park	£ 100,000

Niddrie House Drive (Clock)	£ 100,000
Peffer Place	£ 100,000
Pentland View	£ 100,000
Sighthill Drive	£ 100,000
Sighthill Public Park, play, wheels	£ 25,000
St. Mark's Public Park	£ 100,000
Victoria Public Park Toddlers	£ 100,000
TOTAL	£ 3,275,000

**TABLE 2**

Table 2

<b>Site</b>	<b>Estimated Project Cost</b>	<b>Actual Project Cost</b>	<b>External Funding required</b>	<b>External Funding confirmed</b>	<b>Play Capital Budget</b>
Fauldburn Park	£61,936				£61,936
Glenvarloch Crescent	£72,259				£72,259
Morningside Public Park	£103,226		£40,000		£63,226
Wester Hailes Park Block 20	£33,032				£33,032
Inchcolm Terrace	£15,484				£15,484
Figgate Park	£23,872		£50,000		£73,872
Loganlea Avenue	£41,291			£20,000	£21,291
Spylaw Park	£51,613		£20,000		£31,613
Westfield Court	£46,452				£46,452
Oxgangs Brae	£106,323	£106,293		£59,623	£46,670
Clovenstone Gardens	£20,645				£20,645
Montgomery Street	£123,872				£123,872
Kirkbrae Recreation Ground (Double Hedges)	£154,806			£154,806	
	<b>£954,811</b>	<b>£106,293</b>	<b>£110,000</b>	<b>£234,429</b>	<b>£610,352</b>

**QUESTION NO 2**

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the  
Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 30 June 2020**

**Question** (1) How many street lights are still due to be converted as part of the LED streetlighting project and what this represents as a percentage of all the street lights within the following wards?

- a) Sighthill / Gorgie
- b) Fountainbridge / Craiglockhart
- c) Pentland Hills
- d) Almond
- e) Drum Brae / Gyle
- f) Corstorphine / Murrayfield
- g) Inverleith

**Answer** (1) The Energy Efficient Street Lighting Programme (EESLP) project has 27,908 street lights still to convert to energy efficient street lights across the city.

The street lights still to be converted within the following wards, as a percentage, are as follows:

- a) Ward 7: Sighthill / Gorgie – 2.03%
- b) Ward 9: Fountainbridge / Craiglockhart – 0.14%
- c) Ward 2: Pentland Hills – 1.78%
- d) Ward 1: Almond – 3.86%
- e) Ward 3: Drum Brae / Gyle – 3.45%
- f) Ward 6: Corstorphine / Murrayfield – 4.06%
- g) Ward 5: Inverleith – 24.18%

**Question** (2) When is the LED street lighting project now likely to be complete?

**Answer** (2) Current completion date: 1 October 2021

The reasons for the extension are:

1. COVID-19 suspension = 65 working days; and  
Additional works (e.g. replacement of corroded brackets, installation of new column sockets for Christmas Lights, installation of lighting in Colinton Tunnel and additional street light replacements) = 20 days.

**Question** (3) What impact has the longer implementation timetable for the LED street lighting project had on a) the total costs associated with the project and b) the ongoing energy costs associated with the city-wide street lighting network?

**Answer** (3) a) The total project costs for the longer implementation timetable can be split into two categories:

1. COVID-19 suspension costs = £219,308.72
2. Additional works:
  - a. replacement of corroded brackets = £1,629,000
  - b. replacement of time-expired wall boxes = £66,420
  - c. supply and installation of new column sockets for Christmas light decorations = £91,686.21
  - d. installation of lights in Colinton Tunnel = £29,761.08; and
  - e. additional street light replacements not included in the original Contract = £326,843.71

b) With the COVID-19 restrictions resulting in the suspension of on-street work for 13 weeks, the Council did not gain savings in energy consumption for the lanterns that could have been installed by the Contractor during this time. In monetary terms, this equates to a loss of saving of around £12k.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you and again thank you to the Convener for the answers provided. In the answers it does show that there are a number of legacy lampposts dating back from some of the early Wards that were supposed to be completed. Can I

check that the arrangement we have in place contractually means that these won't be left in the difficult to sort pile and these lampposts which were highlighted in the answers will at some point all be sorted.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Lang for the supplementary. Clearly the issue of dealing with non-standard lanterns is an operational issue for us and my understanding is that they will continue to be dealt with and I think it's something I'll need to refer back to the service in order to get you a more detailed answer on it.

**QUESTION NO 3**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

Under the FAQ (on the Council Website) with regards to pupils returning to school in August:

“Will there be support for Safe Routes to School, to allow children and young people to walk/cycle to school safely.

Response: We are encouraging Parent Councils to become involved in reducing the number of cars attempting to come near schools and to develop active travel plans for children.”

**Question**

Since 1st April 2020:

- a) What engagement has been had with Parent Councils to facilitate this?
- b) What actual support has been offered?

**Answer**

- a) The engagement with Parent Councils to date on this specific issue has been as part of the general engagement with Parent Councils. The advice is that wherever possible if parents can consider not using a car for school drop off then this will be very helpful given the overall situation. In the longer term, once schools have returned and settled in there will be an opportunity for parents at any school to engage more directly with officers about specific improvements which may be required.
- b) All schools already have an identified safe route. In response to COVID, the road safety team have considered some immediate improvements that might be required at specific schools, particularly in relation to bus drop off etc. However, as part of the longer term engagement highlighted discussions about further improvements will be taken forward where it is possible to do so with available funding.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you very much indeed and thank you very much indeed Councillor Dickie. Just to be clear then, I just wanted to check, since the emergence of Covid there has been no specific engagement with Parent Councils then about tackling cars because we all know this is a major major problem. I appreciate there's still a couple of weeks left to go and I would really ask, is it possible to actually engage with Parent Councils to try and see if we can help with this issue?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Yes, taking that on board. You'll see the answer says at the moment it's been general engagement with Parent Councils given there's such a variety of different issues but as details unfold and especially in the next week and we have a meeting with the CCWP for instance next week, so these are issues that we will very specifically come into and take on board as we move forward this August, so I'll take this on board, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 4**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question**

When should parents expect to hear from their (own) school about plans for the return of pupils in relation to:

- How pupils are to be dropped off at the school
- The arrangement for collection of pupils
- Lunch provision
- Gym provision
- Dress code

**Answer**

We will finalise the local guidance as soon as the national guidance is published. Provisional planning has taken place around all of these issues. We will provide a framework and will devolve finer details to schools to agree with their communities. Headteachers will be formally briefed on 3rd August but documentation will be sent to them by Friday 31st July.

**QUESTION NO 5**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by  
the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question** (1) How many officers are currently working on delivering the temporary Spaces for People measures?

**Answer** (1) Transport Design and Delivery – 3  
Road Safety – 5  
Active Travel – 10  
Events – 2  
South West – 3.5  
South East – 3  
North East – 2  
North West – 1

Total 29.5.

**Question** (2) How many of these Officers have been diverted from other transport related projects?

**Answer** (2) All the above staff have some involvement in the delivery of other Transport Projects.

**Question** (3) If so which projects?

**Answer** (3) It has not been possible to collate a full list of projects, but this would include a variety of projects relating to: Road Safety; Active Travel; Transport Capital schemes and Locality Neighbourhood Environment Programme (NEP) and Infrastructure projects.

**Question** (4) How are these projects going to be delivered without further delay to the current program?

**Answer** (4) In general, work on the majority of projects is still ongoing or has had to cease due to contractor operations being ceased during the COVID 19 lockdown restrictions. As contractor operations recommence, officers will be reallocated accordingly to ensure that projects are resourced appropriately.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you very much indeed and thank you very much indeed Convener for your answers. I note work on the majority of the projects is still ongoing and the officers will be re-allocated appropriately to resource them. Residents, parents and staff at Broughton High School will be relieved to hear this as the long-awaited pedestrian crossing on East Fettes Avenue after a seven year wait was due to be installed in spring of this year, so I look forward to hearing an update in the near future as to the new time plan for this, which I think is coming forward quite soon.

**Statement by  
the Lord  
Provost**

Whilst I don't disagree with the sentiment Councillor Osler, I'll just remind members that Supplementary Questions usually involve a question.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I will confirm after this meeting about the exact status of that pedestrian crossing, but I recognise the frustration that communities feel about some of the projects that have had to be put to one side, whether it's pedestrian crossings or other road related projects, but clearly we're beginning to get back under way and I hope that some of those frustrations across the city will begin to be met, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 6**

**By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

For delivery of the Spaces for People programme under delegated authority,

**Question** (1) What elected member reporting and approval are to take place prior to or at:

- Initiation
- Publication
- Consultation
- Review
- Implementation

**Answer** (1) The Composite Motion passed at the Policy & Sustainability Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2020 agrees to delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader and Depute Leader of the Council, to implement temporary schemes.

**Question** (2) Which elected members are involved in at each of the above stages?

**Answer** (2) Relevant ward members are included in the consultation stage for schemes which are in their ward.

**Question** (3) And (separately) what is their role?

**Answer** (3) To put forward views or concerns which they may have with such proposed schemes.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you very much indeed and thank you again Convener for the answers. Just to clarify, then, aside from ward councillors being involved at consultation stage, the only other elected member involvement are the Leader and Deputy Leader being consulted and then giving the final go-ahead for implementation, is that correct?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Broadly speaking yes, but clearly in our role as Transport Convener and Vice Convener, Councillor Doran and I have a heavy involvement in his project so as you might expect it was both a flow of information around that and our work directly with the service on progressing this particular project, but the answers as given give a correct indication. There's been a lot of discussion around consultation levels on this particular project and I want to make it absolutely clear that this particular authority has gone beyond what is required under the Spaces for People Initiative from the Scottish Government on consultation, that's both in terms of talking to local ward councillors and stakeholder groups including obviously notification out to Community Councils as well. It must be really clear that we have gone beyond what was requested by the Scottish Government and we've taken that route despite the pressing nature of timing attached to this particular project, so it's a difficult balancing act that we have around that notification, whether we're talking about ward councillors or the wider stakeholder group, but I hope it's one in most instances people will recognise has had a motivation behind it of taking communities with us around particular moves. I'm trying to get a degree of explanation out there as to why we're taking particular actions helping to shape them and recognising sometimes the need to tweak them after they've gone in and a lot of that will be based on feedback from communities and/or elected members.

## QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 28 July 2020**

As shown in the Council's 2019/20 unaudited accounts at Note 32.1, the Council's Otherring Catering services, serving seven Council buildings, has, for the third year running, not met the statutory obligation to break even, recording a deficit of £48k on turnover of £921k.

**Question** (1) Is the Convener committed to addressing this situation?

**Answer** (1) This service is the Council's one remaining Significant Trading Organisation (STO) which provides a service for Councillors and Council employees alike by providing on-site catering provision in a small number of our key properties, as well as supporting income generation through events and functions. The level of deficit associated with this STO has reduced significantly and successively over the last 3 years. The service would have delivered a small surplus in the 2019/20 financial year if trading had not been impacted by Covid-19 lockdown restrictions and a one-off, previously unbudgeted employer pension contribution.

**Question** (2) If so, can he please explain what specific proposals he will bring forward to ensure that this service will generate a surplus in future?

**Answer** (2) For the 2020/21 financial year there has been no income to date as the service is closed due to Covid-19 restrictions and the employees have been furloughed.

The challenges and future actions were reported to, and approved, by the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee on 20 March 2018. These actions have been implemented and have contributed to the ongoing reduction in any deficit and to move the unit into profitability. In addition, the opportunity to 'debadge' the unit as an STO is being considered this year, to reduce some of the associated bureaucracy that this creates.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answers. I note the progress that's being made towards achieving a break-even position at or better. I do have a supplementary, I appreciate that the Convener's not here this morning but it was simply to ask if someone can confirm or indicate perhaps a timescale for the de-badging process which is referred to in the answer?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I am unable to give you the time scale, but I will get the answer to you in written form after the meeting.

**Comments by  
the Lord  
Provost**

Thank you, just a reminder to officers that the answers to these supplementaries that we give in written form should go to all elected members not just the person who asks the question.

**QUESTION NO 8**

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer  
by the Convener of the Transport and  
Environment Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question**

I understand that the Council has powers available to it in terms of road traffic legislation, in particular section 59 of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, to require the removal of anything causing an obstruction on the road and that causing an obstruction (or failing to remove) is an offence. I also understand that a non-motorised vehicle does not require a parking permit. Where a trailer or caravan has been parked without permission in a parking bay on the public roadway, it is clearly occupying space that could be used by a parking permit holder.

How long can a trailer sit on the public roadway unmoved, but not abandoned, before the Council considers that it is causing an obstruction sufficient to justify requiring its removal?

**Answer**

The Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 does not specify a time period that must be exceeded in order for an object, which has been deposited on the road, to become an obstruction. The Council has also not set such a period.

An object, in this case a trailer, does not necessarily become an obstruction because it is not moved.

However, the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984 does not include a definition of obstruction. It is also uncertain if Section 59 applies to trailers. Therefore, it is not clear whether a trailer left at the edge of the carriageway (or in a parking place) and which is not preventing the passage of other road users is causing an obstruction under Section 59 of the Act.

The general view is that an obstruction is only caused when someone is physically obstructed from proceeding along the road. Typically referred to as "actual obstruction." So, a trailer may not be causing an obstruction if a road user can

go around it. It could also be difficult to suggest that a trailer is causing an obstruction where a car occupying the same parking space was not. Although there is no caselaw where the meaning of obstruction has been tested.

In specific cases of this nature, it is recommended that Councillors raise these issues with Parking Services in the first instance

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you and I would like to thank the Convener for her answer. Unfortunately the law in these cases isn't very helpful and as a supplementary, I know of two trailers occupying the public roadway in the Morningside ward, in each case for well over 12 months, would the Convener be willing to work with me to find a solution please?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Ross I think the answer around our legal powers as a council is quite clear in terms of the written answer and there are clearly limitations of what we can do there. I'm more than happy to discuss the issues that you're raising and to see whether or not we can find a way of finding owners and take it forward, but I will counsel, that it is quite a difficult thing for the council to take any official action on, given the fact that there seems to be no legal breach attached to that. I would welcome an approach from him to give me more detail, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 9**

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer  
by the Convener of the Culture and  
Communities Committee at a  
meeting of the Council on 28 July  
2020**

Libraries have been permitted to re-open from 15 July. As of today, 17 July, the city's libraries remain closed and there has been no announcement of a date when they expect to re-open.

**Question** (1) When will plans be made public for Edinburgh's libraries to re-open and what is the re-opening date likely to be?

**Answer** (1) It is expected that plans for the safe and sustainable opening of services in libraries will be included in a report by the Executive Director of Communities and Families to the Policy and Strategy Committee on 6 August.

**Question** (2) What precautions will be taken to ensure that all library users will feel safe to visit?

**Answer** (2) The services will operate fully in accordance with current and future Scottish Government and public health guidelines. Risk assessments will be completed for each establishment and there will be clear messages to make sure members of the public and all staff can have confidence in the new arrangements.

**QUESTION NO 10**

**By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

West Lothian Council approached Edinburgh Council regarding their plans to build a new denominational high school and whether CEC would like to realign St Margaret's in South Queensferry into the catchment. Although this offered a significant geographical advantage to parents reducing journey times by half, no approach was made to the parents to gauge level of interest.

**Question** (1) When did the council first become aware of the proposal by West Lothian?

**Answer** (1) Officers were made aware of the consultation by West Lothian Council when the statutory consultation was launched in November 2019. West Lothian Council did not engage with CEC officers in advance of the statutory consultation being published to ask whether a catchment review involving the secondary school catchment areas in Edinburgh would be something worthy of consideration.

**Question** (2) Was the Convener aware of the proposal and if so, what was his view?

**Answer** (2) As the statutory consultation had no direct impact on a School catchment area or capacity Officers did not raise this as a matter of concern with the Convenor. Had there been an informal approach made to Senior Management before the statutory consultation paper was published then this would have been raised with the Convenor. However, as above on this occasion no informal approach was made to Senior Management in CEC.

**Question** (3) Was St Margaret's mgmt. team approached to discuss, and if so, what was the outcome of that discussion?

**Answer** (3) For the same reason of no direct impact to a catchment area or school capacity in Edinburgh no approach was made to St Margaret's RC management or Parent a Council. Given the geographical considerations highlighted, in hindsight an approach to parents to make them aware of the consultation would have been reasonable. As the new RC High School in West Lothian is not open yet I have asked Officers to discuss this issue further with their counterparts in West Lothian. Parents/Carers will always be able to make an out of school placement request to the new school in Winchburgh even if they live in a different local authority area.

**Question** (4) Was the decision not to proceed/consult approved at Director or Head of level?

**Answer** (4) As this was a West Lothian Consultation, no decision was required by any City of Edinburgh Officer or Committee for it to proceed. Officially any one can respond to a consultation and it should be advertised in local newspapers. As above, on this occasion and following usual practice in such a situation, Officers did not engage with St Margaret's RC school community and the issue was not discussed with a Director or Head of Service. Again, in hindsight it is accepted that doing so would have been reasonable.

**Comments by Councillor Young** Thank you very much, please to be conveyed back to the Convener for his answer and I really appreciate the candour that the process could have been handled differently, I have now been contacted by Council officers in order to progress on that so there's no further questions on number 10.

**QUESTION NO 11**

**By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

With children due to return to school on 100% classroom exactly 2 weeks tomorrow, there is still uncertainty about what elements of the contingency plan may still be apply and whether all wraparound care (breakfast and afterschool clubs) can operate, including those who use community centres as their venue.

**Question** (1) On what date will parents receive confirmation that schools are returning at 100% (appreciating that this may alter in the future should a second wave arise)?

**Answer** (1) We expect to receive guidance from the DFM on 30th July. This will be national guidance but will apply to Edinburgh schools

**Question** (2) What elements of the contingency plan will still apply across all schools (so excluding decisions made at a delegated level by headteachers)?

**Answer** (2) At this time, all elements of the plan apply to all schools. Should the contingency plan become operational, each element will be considered. This is because we believe that on balance, the contingency plan is more likely to be operated for local school closures rather than city-wide closures. The contingency plan will be invoked if there is a requirement for social distancing. If a setting suffers an outbreak, the setting will follow HPS advice which could involve temporary or partial closure

**Question** (3) Will all council run wraparound care services fully resume [from 12<sup>th</sup> August](#)?

**Answer** (3) Following the Scottish Government advise that schools should return at 100% capacity, it is anticipated that **all** registered and regulated Breakfast and Out of School Care clubs will be able to operate from 12<sup>th</sup> August. All advice on health and safety will require to be in place by each provider.

Childcare and Youthwork in non-Council owned settings have been permitted to operate from 15<sup>th</sup> July. Work is underway to allow these services to operate in Council premises as soon as possible.

Current Scottish Government guidance states the only face-to-face youth work that is allowed is work that takes place outdoors and with safe practices in place. Further Scottish Government advice and guidance was published on 20<sup>th</sup> July on a gradual phasing of youth work indoors and this will inform the re-introduction of youth work in Council buildings.

**Question** (4) Will community/private run wraparound care services be allowed to continue using community centres (even if these remain closed to the wider public) to provide their service to parents in the same way as private nurseries are able to operate, considering that there is a proposal to open and use community centres if required in the contingency plans?

**Answer** (4) Should schools return with 100% capacity in August, plans are in place to identify those Community Centres which currently provide spaces for Out of School Clubs. It is anticipated that Community Centres will be able to provide care for children and families as usual.

**Question** (5) When will community centre maintenance employees be allowed access to prepare venues for use - even if that use is restricted (school/afterschool)?

**Answer** (5) Maintenance staff can access buildings at any time.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you I do have a supplementary of this one and again I really appreciate the detailed reply that we've been given and very much actually the confirmation at Question 5 about Community Centres being able to start making preparations. The one clarification please, it may require follow-up after the meeting, is the answer given to Question 2, my Question 2 was slightly misinterpreted, what I was trying to find out was what elements of the contingency plan will also apply in a 100% return to school, so purely for example purposes, I'm assuming that the cleaning regime for example will apply to both 100% and contingency, I just wanted to know what other elements would also apply if we do the return 100% and I'm happy to receive that as a written update, again to all councillors after the meeting if it's not quick answer.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Yes, I think it's actually quite a detailed answer, so can absolutely get that information to you Councillor Young, thank you.

## QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

Since the gradual lifting of lockdown restrictions, South Queensferry has seen a significant increase in 'car racing' and late/overnight congregation at the Hawes Pier. At the request of Police officers all ward councillors and the Roads team agreed to close the Hawes Car Park each night [until 31<sup>st</sup> July](#). However, speeding on surround roads continues and there is a lack of clarity over where roles and responsibilities lie.

- Question** (1) What is the longer term plan for the Hawes Car Park [after 31/07/2020](#)?
- Answer** (1) In general the Car Park would operate as a public adopted space, however, we can consider and respond to requests from the Police to manage access to the space as appropriate.
- Question** (2) How many complaints have been received by council officials on speeding or excessive vehicle noise, since 01/04/2020 in the area of Queensferry/Dalmeny/Kirkliston, and what was the nature of the complaints?
- Answer** (2) The Council's Road Safety team has received three complaints about traffic speeds in the Queensferry/Dalmeny/Kirkliston area since 01/04/2020. These relate to the A904 Builyeon Road and the B907 Kirkliston Road in Queensferry and Burnshot Road, east of Kirkliston.
- Question** (3) Have any meetings taken place between road safety and the Police regarding speeding and/or noise complaints in this area of the city – please provide details of dates and attendees since 01/04/2020.
- Answer** (3) No meetings have been requested or have taken place between the Police and the Council's Road Safety team since 01/04/2020 regarding traffic speeds in this area.

<b>Question</b>	<b>(4)</b> Have any other requests (apart from the Hawes closure currently in force) been made by the Police to address speeding cars or noise, which have not been acted upon, since 01/04/2020 – please provide details of request and reason for not progressing
<b>Answer</b>	<p><b>(4)</b> The Council’s Road Safety team has been contacted by the Police about issues relating to traffic speeds on the A904 Builyeon Road and the B907 Kirkliston Road in Queensferry since 01/04/2020. The team has liaised with the Police and taken the appropriate action on these issues.</p> <p>In the case of the A904 Builyeon Road, the request was to consider additional 30mph repeater speed limit signs and larger terminal signs at the start of the 30mph speed limit. The use of 30mph repeater speed limit signs is prohibited by national legislation and the terminal signs are the correct size, which is also specified in legislation.</p>
<b>Supplementary Question</b>	Thank you very much and again thank you very much to the Convener for a very helpful detailed response which helps understand the Council’s response to matters which are under the responsibility of the police. I would just like to ask her in relation to point 1 about the closure of the Hawes Car Park, is the Convener or officers considering an extension to the closure beyond 31 July 2020, have we either been asked to consider it or would we be open to that request if it came?
<b>Supplementary Answer</b>	As Convener it's not something that I've been particularly party to but I will follow up after this meeting and come back to both yourself and other Councillors on it.
<b>Update on Supplementary Answer to Question 2</b>	<p>I hope I'm not breaking any rules here Lord Provost but I wonder if I might go back to Question 2.</p> <p>Councillor Lang asked me specifically about heritage projects and in a great display of efficiency I almost immediately got the answer from the head of service, and in fact they will all be completed and taken forward by the end of the lighting project, so I hope that that give some degree of reassurance about that and that it’s being taken care of, thank you.</p>

**QUESTION NO 13**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

- Question** (1) Can the Convener detail the number and location (by street) of:
- a) Residents parking spaces
  - b) Pay & display parking spaces
  - c) Disabled parking spaces: removed in each residents parking zone, and the number of each type of space detailed above at or around 1<sup>st</sup> March 2020

- Answer** (1) The table below details the number of parking places available within each controlled parking zone around 1 March 2020.

Zone	P&D	Permit Holder	Shared Use	Disabled	M/cycle
1	490	783	21	2	22
1A	468	511	117	24	20
2	259	213	102	24	14
3	688	483	20	24	29
4	357	700	164	19	25
5	122	765	13	4	5
5A	169	770	23	3	5
6	542	1189	65	10	15
7	385	770	26	6	16
8	194	778	73	7	10
N1	86	1218	1121	21	0
N2	238	703	596	11	0
N3	647	803	574	10	0
N4	0	49	324	0	0
N5	199	208	1035	0	0
S1	53	1502	912	17	0
S2	195	1145	686	20	0
S3	65	1075	857	11	0
S4	90	812	489	10	0
K	0	29	0	0	0

However, it should be noted that parking places can be suspended or become unavailable for many reasons, such as; events, removals, filming or road works. A daily total of such interventions is not available.

The second table below details the number and location of parking places that have temporarily been withdrawn to provide additional space for physical distancing as part of the Council's Spaces for People programme, at 27 July 2020.

	Parking Places Unavailable				
	P&D	Permit Holder	Shared Use	Disabled	M/cycle
Victoria Street & West Bow	6	15	2	2	1
Grassmarket	0	0	25	0	3
Cockburn Street	20	12	0	2	1
George IV Bridge	0	0	0	0	0
South Bridge	0	0	0	0	0
Bruntsfield Place	35*	0	0	0	0
Morningside Road	52*	0	0	0	0
Total	113	27	27	4	5

\*Off-peak parking places only

**Question** (2) Could the Convener tell Council when and how the removal of parking spaces was communicated to residents of the affected streets?

**Answer** (2) The Scottish Government has identified Covid-19 as a danger to the public and as such, the Council may introduce Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTROs) to quickly introduce physical distancing measures to help prevent the further spread of the infection.

There is no right of objection to a TTRO, but the Council has taken steps to inform residents and members of the public of the temporary measures being put in place. This includes; writing to affected residents, publishing details on the Council's website and Tell Me Scotland (the national public information portal), social media promotion, press notices, making use of community noticeboards where possible and using on-street notices when necessary.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answer. Given that permits are being renewed electronically, are we e-mailing permit holders in affected streets of the changes, and if not why not?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

This is not part of the written original question so I don't have that information directly to hand. This is essentially an operational issue, however, I will try to confirm that detail and come back to you on that particular note along with all other councillors.

**QUESTION NO 14**

**By Councillor Johnston for answer  
by the Convener of the Finance and  
Resources Committee at a meeting  
of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question** (1) In the past 6 months how much has the Council loaned to other local authorities across the UK and under what terms?

**Answer** (1) The attached appendix sets out details.

**Question** (2) In the past 6 months how much has the Council borrowed from other local authorities and under what terms?

**Answer** (2) No sums borrowed.

**Supplementary Question** A brief supplementary. I wonder if the Depute Convener can confirm, as per the answer, that at the moment Edinburgh Council is owed in excess of £0.3 billion from other local authorities across the UK?

**Supplementary Answer (by Councillor Griffiths)** I'm sorry Councillor Johnson I'm not able to give you a response, I don't want give you misinformation so I will get a written response to you after the meeting.

**Statement by the Lord Provost** Can I just confirm that the written response will merely be an update of the table I think that's what Councillor Johnston's asking for?

**Councillor Griffiths** Yes.

## Deposits Outstanding at 23 Jan 2020

<u>COUNTERPARTY</u>	<u>START DATE</u>	<u>MATURITY DATE</u>	<u>OUTSTANDING</u>	<u>INTEREST RATE</u>
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council	29/09/17	/ /	20,000,000.00	0.80
Eastleigh Borough Council	28/11/19	/ /	10,000,000.00	0.75
Leeds City Council	19/11/19	/ /	25,000,000.00	0.80
Birmingham City Council	26/11/19	27/01/20	10,000,000.00	0.80
Bedford Borough Council	27/12/19	27/01/20	4,100,000.00	1.00
Birmingham City Council	28/11/19	28/01/20	10,000,000.00	0.77
Merthyr Tydfil Borough Council	29/10/19	29/01/20	2,000,000.00	0.80
Blackpool Borough Council	30/10/19	30/01/20	9,000,000.00	0.80
London Borough of Havering	30/12/19	30/01/20	5,000,000.00	1.00
Blackpool Borough Council	31/10/19	31/01/20	6,000,000.00	0.80
Slough Borough Council	19/08/19	19/02/20	5,000,000.00	0.82
Flintshire County Council	27/11/19	27/02/20	3,000,000.00	0.80
Flintshire County Council	28/11/19	28/02/20	4,000,000.00	0.80
Wokingham Borough Council	02/12/19	31/03/20	3,000,000.00	0.85
Cornwall Council	18/10/19	17/04/20	20,000,000.00	0.85
The Highland Council	23/10/19	23/04/20	5,000,000.00	0.85
Middlesborough Council	29/10/19	29/04/20	10,000,000.00	0.85
Plymouth City Council	31/10/19	30/04/20	10,000,000.00	0.85
North East Lincolnshire Council	30/10/19	30/04/20	4,000,000.00	0.85
Wrexham County Borough Council	20/12/19	22/06/20	10,000,000.00	0.93
West Dunbartonshire Council	18/10/19	16/10/20	10,000,000.00	1.02
Lancashire County Council	01/11/19	02/11/20	20,000,000.00	0.95
West Dunbartonshire Council	15/11/19	13/11/20	5,000,000.00	1.00
The Highland Council	19/11/19	17/11/20	5,000,000.00	1.00
East Dunbartonshire Council	10/12/19	08/12/20	5,000,000.00	1.00
Dundee City Council	18/12/19	16/12/20	5,000,000.00	1.00
Aberdeenshire Council	20/12/19	18/12/20	10,000,000.00	1.00
			<b><u>235,100,000.00</u></b>	

## New Deposits since 23 Jan 2020

Lancashire County Council	31/01/20	28/02/20	10,000,000.00	0.87
West Dunbartonshire Council	06/02/20	06/08/20	5,000,000.00	0.95
London Borough of Enfield	28/02/20	30/11/20	10,000,000.00	1.05
Flintshire County Council	24/02/20	26/05/20	7,000,000.00	1
Aberdeenshire Council	04/03/20	04/12/20	10,000,000.00	1.05
Nottingham City Council	09/03/20	11/05/20	10,000,000.00	1.1
Slough Borough Council	13/03/20	13/05/20	5,000,000.00	1.25
Cherwell District Council	16/03/20	30/03/20	10,000,000.00	1.3
Birmingham City Council	17/04/20	18/05/20	20,000,000.00	0.5
Suffolk County Council	27/04/20	27/05/20	5,000,000.00	0.5
Perth and Kinross Council	27/04/20	27/05/20	5,000,000.00	0.5
			<b><u>97,000,000.00</u></b>	

**QUESTION NO 15**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question**

At the Leadership Advisory Panel of 31 March 2020 it was agreed that the management of events would be reported on to the Culture and Communities Committee as part of the Public Spaces Protocol that was being prepared; as there was no date given for the completion of this work and we don't know when the next meeting of the Culture and Communities Committee will be held could the Convener advise when Councillors will see and discuss this report so that residents' concerns about how event and on street activity will be managed can be addressed?

**Answer**

As was presented to the Leadership Advisory Panel, there has clearly been a significant delay to the time that this work will take to complete. However, it remains a priority for the service and the Culture and Communities Committee.

A verbal update was provided by the Head of Place Management to the Festivals and Events All Party Oversight Group on the 21<sup>st</sup> July 2020 to state that a dedicated member/officer workshop is being arranged for late August 2020 to focus on the principles of the Public Spaces Management Plan prior to wider engagement taking place.

Following this workshop, officers will look to re-establish work fully on this plan, and will undertake engagement with key stakeholders, including Community Councils, Business Improvement Districts, Festivals Edinburgh, Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Small Businesses and other key interest groups.

It is expected that this engagement will take up to three months to complete. A draft Public Space Management Plan will then be collated and presented to Culture and Communities Committee within one month of this engagement exercise being completed.

**QUESTION NO 16**

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the  
Convener of the Housing,  
Homelessness and Fair Work  
Committee at a meeting of the  
Council on 28 July 2020**

On 12 March 2020, Council agreed the Edinburgh International Conference Centre Hotel and Hotel School Business Case, which had been referred by the Finance and Resources Committee, following its earlier agreement.

**Question**

Can the Convener update Council on progress officers have made in carrying out this decision?

**Answer**

Officers have continued to work towards the outcomes agreed by Council on 12 March 2020.

This involves the negotiation and drafting of an agreement to Lease and an Agreement to sub-lease the hotel along with the development of a Strategic Delivery Agreement between the Council and the EICC to reflect the overall relationship between the two organisations and ensure appropriate controls and governance is in place.

Due to the Covid-19 pandemic due diligence has had to be carried out with a review of some aspects of the business case.

Notwithstanding this, good progress is being made and it is envisaged that this work will be completed in the Autumn

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, thanks to the Convener for her answer. What aspects of the business case are being reviewed and will councillors be advised as to the outcome of that review?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thanks Councillor Rust for your question. I mean obviously there's commercial confidentiality that means there is a limit to what I can say, but it's no secret that for example things like construction costs will have to be reviewed in light of COVID-19. I think the key thing though is that officers are progressing, they're working hard to negotiate the best deal for the EICC and for the City and they're hoping to have that work completed by the autumn.

## QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

### Question

At Policy and Sustainability Committee on 14<sup>th</sup> May 2020 the following matrix was presented as an assessment tool and was subsequently approved as the criteria to be used to create temporary walking and cycling infrastructure schemes:

Projects with moderate to low risk mitigation will not be generally implemented if they are expected to have any significant negative impacts, particularly on public transport or emergency services.

Criteria	Assessment		
Covid-19 Risk mitigation	Very significant	Significant	Moderate to low
Benefit to pedestrians	high	medium	low
Benefit to people on bikes	high	medium	low
Impact on Public Transport	positive impact	neutral or minor negative impact	significant negative impact
Impact on emergency services routes	None or negligible	Minor	significant negative impact
Impact on people with Mobility difficulties or visual impairments	positive impact	neutral or minor negative impact	significant negative impact
Impact of diverting traffic	none to minor	moderate	significant
Impact on residential parking	none to minor	moderate	significant
Impact on public parking	none to minor	moderate	significant
Impact on business servicing	none to minor	moderate	significant
Cost	low	moderate	high
Ease of operation	easy	moderate operational burden	high operational burden

Can the Convener provide the results of this assessment for each of the measures implemented to date and those currently going through the accelerated consultation process?

### Answer

The above assessment criteria has been adopted to prioritise all schemes contained in the project programme. This information is available for all prioritised projects and will be made available to Elected Members. However, at this time, officers do not have the capacity to collate and prepare this response. This information will be provided as soon as is reasonably possible.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener for your answer. I do have a supplementary, it's relatively simple, we have now found out elsewhere on these questions that there were almost 30 people working on this across the Council and notwithstanding the original debate we had at Policy and Sustainability about the complexity of the matrix, can I assume that the approval of all the recent emergency measures have been given equal priority and that these have ranged from everything from hedge cutting to the restrictions planned for the main arterial routes such as Wester Hailes Road and Comiston Road and I know I'm not allowed to but there is a bit in here Lord Provost, if you'll just forgive me on this, in the interest of transparency and openness, with what has been a very controversial consultation process, can I make a plea that this information when it is available is made public to all the public and not just elected members please?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Webber for the supplementary. There's a number of issues that sit around this. There will be a detailed assessment of these criteria brought forward by officials on 11 August 2020, which is when it will be ready. I see no reason why given the fact that members briefings often are put out to the public why we cannot proceed to do that. I would however question the use of the pushing of this idea that somehow consultation and prioritisation needs to be reassessed. I'm not quite sure what you mean about equal prioritisation of issues because prioritisation by its very definition indicates that you put one measure above another in order to get all of them achieved over a period of time. There is an enormous effort being put into this project to ensure that we get the greatest benefit across the city from the money that we've been given by the Scottish Government to achieve this and it's important that we don't get caught up in the usual nonsense about too much consultation, not enough consultation, who have you consulted with, who have you not consulted with. I refer you back to my earlier answer, to one of the previous questions, which is that we've gone above and beyond the request that was attached to this funding in order to try to provide as

much consultation, as much feedback, and an explicit promise, that if something is not working in these series of temporary measures, that we will tweak that and that's a complete undertaking from the Administration that we will absorb feedback and use it to go forward and improve the measures as they're in place, thank you.

**QUESTION NO 18**

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for  
answer by the Leader of the Council  
at a meeting of the Council on 28  
July 2020**

- Question**           **(1)** What is the estimated value of lost income in 2020/21, that the City of Edinburgh Council would have planned to receive from sales, fees and charges had the Coronavirus Pandemic not occurred?
- Answer**             **(1)** The update reported to the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 23 July sets out, in Appendix 1, total expected COVID-related income losses for Council services of £44.349m. The report additionally notes an estimated reduction in income, or increase in required support, for the Council's ALEOs of £31m.
- Question**           **(2)** What discussions has the Council initiated with the Scottish Government or COSLA to promote a scheme to compensate Scottish Local Authorities specifically for lost income from sales, fees and charges?
- Answer**             **(2)** Lost income is included in the overall financial impact being submitted and monitored to the Scottish Government through submissions to COSLA. Given the particular relevance of losses of income to Council ALEOS, I have also written to the Cabinet Secretary for Finance on this issue.
- Question**           **(3)** What formula, or amount, has the Council been given to understand can be used to negate this lost income?
- Answer**             **(3)** Some individual decisions have been taken in relation to this, i.e. the payment to Edinburgh Tram. There are also a number of other similar specific discussions continuing on lost income and costs, as well as the overall discussions through COSLA on the sum total effect. As these are ongoing and the effects are not yet fully known as the situation remains fluid, there is not an agreed final position on this.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Leader for his very helpful answer. I'm sure the Leader's aware that English local authorities have received some compensation for lost income, has he found in his discussions that the Scottish Government and other Scottish Local Authorities have been sympathetic to compensating Scottish Local Authorities for lost income and lost fees.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Can I thank Councillor Campbell for the supplementary. Yes, the lost income component of financial pressure on councils was very much part on equal terms along with opportunity costs, of transformation programmes that have been disrupted and additional costs as a result of covid, so the additional financial burden placed on us by loss of income has been treated exactly the same in those discussions as other financial pressures in terms of work.

**QUESTION NO 19**

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

Notes a number of roundabouts that have recently been proposed for sponsorship signage across the city, and asks the Convener to update Council on the following:

**Question** (1) What roundabouts are being tendered for sponsorship?

**Answer** (1) Please refer to the attached list (CT2466 Roundabout Sponsorship - Site Information).

**Question** (2) Which roundabouts have agreements already in place?

**Answer** (2) None.

**Question** (3) What does the sponsor receive in return?

**Answer** (3) For sponsorship monies they receive signage which shows the company logo and that they are the sponsor of the roundabout or verge

**Question** (4) What say do they have in the maintenance and or design/upgrading of the roundabout?

**Answer** (4) The Council are responsible for design and upgrading of roundabouts.

**Question** (5) How are the sponsorship fees allocated?

**Answer** (5) These are allocated per sign, per site.

**Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for the answer. A supplementary just to clarify around answers 3 and 4. What I was seeking to ask here is, will sponsors see an upgrade or improved maintenance of the verges and roundabouts that they provide the money for and will that be through the money going into a central pot for parks and green space or roads or wherever that sits within the council, or will that be specific to and the roundabout they sponsor. Obviously we've seen in other local authorities, West Lothian and Perth for example, where the sponsor can increase the amount they spend and the substantive work is

done to those verges and roundabouts, the extra planting sculptures etc, to just get some clarity on what exactly this is about or is it just signs and then money going into a central pot, thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

So I had some slight difficulty in hearing all of your question there Councillor Laidlaw but if I've got it correct I would hesitate to give you a detailed response on that at this point because there are clearly implications to what you've asked about. My broad understanding is that it's sponsorship which will allow continued maintenance of those roundabouts, whether or not there's any degree of difference in terms of sponsorship deals etc. I'd have to go into in more detail with the service and I'll come back to you with a written answer and issue to all councillors at same time.

## CT2466 Roundabout Sponsorship - Site Information

Ref.	Location	Locality	Site Type	Area	Circumference (R'bout Only)	Type
GS1	Airport Interchange (North)	NW	Roundabout	2,675	194	Green
GS2	Airport Interchange (South)	NW	Roundabout	2,794	198	Green
GS3	Comley Bank	<b>NW</b>	Roundabout	278	84	Green
GS4	Crewe Toll	NW	Roundabout	333	65	Green
GS5	Drumbrae	NW	Roundabout	185	48	Amber
GS6	East Craigs	NW	Roundabout	1,065	116	Green
GS7	Eastfield Road (Airport)	<b>NW</b>	Roundabout	606	150	Green
GS8	Granton Square	NW	Roundabout	843	161	Amber
GS9	Groathill Road North	NW	Roundabout	453	75	Green
GS10	Lauriston Farm Road	NW	Roundabout	572.5	85	Green
GS11	Pennywell Gardens (Muirhouse View)	NW	Roundabout	533	82	Green
GS12	Pennywell Road (Muirhouse Parkway)	NW	Roundabout	1039	114	Green
GS13	Quality Street (Queensferry Road)	<b>NW</b>	Grass & Bedding	939	151	Amber
GS14	South Gyle Broadway (East)	NW	Roundabout	2,571	179	Green
GS15	South Gyle Broadway (Mid)	NW	Roundabout	2,917	191	Green
GS16	South Gyle Broadway (West)	NW	Roundabout	1,160	122	Green
GS17	Gogar	NW	Roundabout	11,830	433	Green
GS18	Balgreen Road	SW	Roundabout	175	46	Amber
GS19	Bankhead / Broomhouse Drive	SW	Greenspace	7,448	751	Amber
GS20	Biggar Road	SW	Roundabout	169.5	46	Amber
GS21	Broomhouse Drive	SW	Roundabout	574	84	Green
GS22	Calder Road (Bankhead)	SW	Roundabout	1,847	154	Amber
GS23	Calder Road (Saughton)	SW	Roundabout	2,308	174	Amber

GS24	Calder Road (Sighthill)	SW	Roundabout	2,540	182	Amber
GS25	Clovenstone	SW	Roundabout	2,617	181	Green
GS26	Dreghorn Link	SW	Roundabout	110	37	Green
GS27	Hermiston Village	SW	Roundabout	2,967	193	Green
GS28	Longstone Road	SW	Roundabout	648	105	Green
GS29	Redford Road	SW	Roundabout	112	37	Green
GS30	Riccarton Mains Road (North)	SW	Roundabout	387	72	Green
GS31	Riccarton Mains Road (South)	SW	Roundabout	3,893	225	Green
GS32	Stenhouse Cross	SW	Roundabout	1,015	112	Green
GS33	Western Approach Road (North side)	SW	Greenspace	1,529	508	Green
GS34	Whitson Crescent	SW	Greenspace	3138	394	Amber
GS35	Atholl Crescent Gardens	SE	Bedding	1,665	1,335	Green
GS36	Broughton Street	SE	Roundabout	251	57	Green
GS37	Coates Crescent Gardens	SE	Bedding	1,665	1,335	Green
GS38	Gilmerton Road	SE	Roundabout	215	51	Amber
GS39	Lady Road (Cameron Toll)	SE	Roundabout	39	22	Amber
GS40	Liberton Road / Kirkbrae	SE	Bedding	130	53	Green
GS41	Melville Drive	SE	Bedding	1255	152	Green
GS42	Old Dalkeith Road	SE	Roundabout	5,960	289	Green
GS43	Old Dalkeith Road (bottom)	SE	Grass			Green
GS44	Pleasance	SE	Bedding	25	29	Amber
GS45	Randolph Cliff (Dean Bridge)	SE	Bedding	98	69	Amber
GS46	St Patrick Square	SE	Park	436	126	Green
GS47	Straiton	SE	Roundabout	1,655	144	Amber
GS48	Easter Road	NE	Roundabout	61	28	Amber
GS49	Joppa & Portobello Seafront (East of Rockville Hotel)	NE	Greenspace	1,617	429	Amber
GS50	Lochend	NE	Roundabout	496	114	Green
GS51	Sir Harry Lauder Road (Traffic Lights)	NE	Greenspace	291	116	Green
GS52	Smokey Brae	NE	Roundabout	126	40	Green

GS53	Smokey Brae (top beside Barrell House Pub)	NE	Bedding	180	95	Amber
GS54	The Jewel	NE	Roundabout	2,390	173	Amber

**QUESTION NO 20**

**By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

Notes the COVID-19 pandemic has led to a reallocation of resources across the Council and that as a result that weed issue on our roads, pavements and paths is once again impacting on the appearance of our city and its fabric, increasing costs of repair.

Asks the Convener to update Council on:

- Question** (1) To what extent to which the COVID-19 pandemic resilience has impacted on scheduled weed-killing/removal?
- Answer** (1) No herbicide applications were carried out during phase 1 of the Covid-19 restrictions by Parks and Greenspace staff due to their classification as non-essential workers. Prior to 23<sup>rd</sup> March no herbicide applications were carried out because it was too early in the growing season.
- Street cleansing teams, as essential workers, carried out a limited programme of manual weed and detritus removal during phase 1.
- Parks and Greenspace teams began applying herbicide from the week beginning 8<sup>th</sup> June.
- Question** (2) What areas are being prioritised?
- Answer** (2) The service will work systematically across the city's streets using planned routes.
- Question** (3) When will regular weed-killing/removal return to pre-COVID-19 levels?
- Answer** (3) 2021. In previous years most wards have received two herbicide applications per year. Due to the late start and the need to focus resources on grass cutting to get sheltered housing, care homes, parks, green spaces and schools back to standard, only one application per location is likely to be made before the end of the 2020 growing season.

**Supplementary  
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost hopefully this is a little bit clearer, I thank the Convener for her answer. It was just a small supplementary. In answer 2 where it talks about the service will work systematically across the city's streets using planned routes, are those planned routes available to elected members thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I don't see why not Councillor Laidlaw, it's part of our standard operational procedures around weed control, the only difference this year that I understand to be the case is that there's a limited number of applications partially caused by weather and of course at the lack of ability to deliver during the more serious part of the lockdown and I see no reason why we can't provide it, I'll ask the service to do so.

**QUESTION NO 21**

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question**

Could the Convener explain why the cycle lanes going south from the Omni Centre to Leith Street have not been opened during the Covid-19 pandemic and what is preventing these being opened as a piece of cycle infrastructure in place, but currently unused; could she also detail why a TTRO for their use could not be put in place to create a safe route south for cyclists?

**Answer**

The Scottish Government are still to make their decision following the hearing (processed by written submissions) into the RSO for the Leith Street cycleway. Consideration had been given to using a TTRO to open the cycleway, however with the protracted legal process it was considered prudent to await the outcome of the hearing rather than potentially prejudice the decision.

Council Officers have been regularly pursuing Transport Scotland (TS) for the formal decision from the Scottish Government. The importance of this cycling infrastructure to Spaces for People initiative has been made. The most recent advice from TS is that that a positive response will be received by the Council by the end of July 2020.

Consequently, the plans are being put in place to open this cycle route in early August 2020, allowing time for its use to be fully publicised and barriers removed.

**Supplementary Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her answer. I note that in the answer it says that it was considered prudent, can I ask whether there was any legal impediment to using a TTRO given the extraordinary circumstances we find ourselves in for the last few months?

**Supplementary  
Answer**

I'm not aware of the precise details around the legal impediment and I would hesitate as a non-lawyer to provide you with an off-the-cuff answer but again will come back to you in more detail attach to that. I appreciate that locally it's been a source of some degree of frustration but there is also a requirement on the Council to do things correctly around the legal requirements, and as we all know I think the processes around the TROs and TTROs are incredibly complex and sometimes produce unsatisfactory results, but we'll come back to you with a bit more detail on the precise nature your supplementary question.

**QUESTION NO 22**

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 28 July 2020**

**Question**

Can the Convener please provide the following information relating to all temporary and permanent active travel projects/schemes across the city (not split by ward) that have been approved for completion since 2010:

- a) Location and route of scheme
- b) Is scheme temporary / permanent (ie related to Covid 19)
- c) Short summary of scheme including if cycle / walkway is segregated
- d) Date of committee approval of scheme
- e) Date of completion of approved scheme
- f) If not complete, then anticipated completion date
- g) Budget allocated to each scheme

**Answer**

In September 2010, the Council approved the first edition of its Active Travel Action Plan (ATAP).

In order to facilitate the delivery of the ATAP, the following decision was included within a [Budget Motion](#), approved by the Council at its meeting of 9 February 2012:

“Council agrees that the percentage of transport spend (net of specifically allocated external transport funding) allocated to cycling shall be a minimum of 5%, for both revenue and capital, in 2012/13 and that the percentage of spend on cycling will increase by 1% annually. Council therefore instructs the Director of Services for Communities to provide a report to a meeting of the Transport, Infrastructure and Environment Committee in September each year detailing,

the allocation of cycle funding, progress towards the Council's Charter of Brussels commitments, and progress on the cycle aspects of the ATAP”.

On 27 August 2013, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [5% Budget Commitment to Cycling - Summary of Expenditure](#). This report summarised the Council's capital and revenue expenditure on cycling in the 2012/13 financial year.

The same Committee also considered a further report titled [Active Travel Action Plan - 2 Yearly Review](#). This report provided a review of progress to date on the delivery of the ATAP and sought approval for a revised programme of actions and timescales.

On 3 June 2014, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [7% Budget Commitment to Cycling](#). This report sought approval for the proposed Council expenditure on cycling for 2014/15.

On 26 August 2014, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [6% Budget Commitment to Cycling - Summary of Expenditure](#). This report summarised the Council's capital and revenue expenditure on cycling in the 2013/14 financial year.

On 17 March 2015, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [8% Budget Commitment to Cycling](#). This report sought approval for the Council's proposed expenditure on cycling in 2015/16.

On 25 August 2015, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [7% Budget Commitment to Cycling – Summary of Expenditure](#). This report summarised the Council's capital and revenue expenditure on cycling in the 2014/15 financial year.

On 12 January 2016, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [Active Travel Action Plan Review 2016](#). This report summarised progress made in relation to targets and actions in the ATAP and sought approval for a [revised ATAP document](#).

On 15 March 2016, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [9% Budget Commitment to Cycling](#). This report sought approval for the Council's proposed expenditure on cycling in 2016/17.

On 1 November 2016, the Transport and Environment Committee considered a report titled [8% Budget Commitment to Cycling - Summary of Expenditure](#). This report summarised the Council's capital and revenue expenditure on cycling in the 2015/16 financial year.

On 9 August 2018, the Transport & Environment Committee considered a report titled [Budget Commitment to Cycling in 2016/17 and 2018/19 Cycling Programme](#). This report provided information on the expenditure on cycling in 2016/17 and sought approval for the planned programme for 2018/19.

On 20 June 2019, the Transport & Environment Committee considered a report titled [Investing in Active Travel and in People Friendly Streets](#). This report sought approval for the current Active Travel Investment Programme 2019-24 and provided details of the work done to deliver and develop active travel infrastructure in financial years 2017/18 and 2018/19.

The information requested is provided in the tables below for projects in the current Active Travel Investment Programme 2019-24 (permanent schemes) and the Spaces for People programme (temporary schemes related to Covid-19).

**Supplementary  
Question**

Yes thank you Lord Provost and thank you Convener for your answer and I would just like to welcome the list of 40 permanent measures that we have for active travel products across the city on the wide ranging aspect of these. The supplementary is that I'm not quite sure why my columns D and G have not been able to be populated, these are significant projects and I would hope that there would be a specific budget allocated to each of them which is only how I would expect any project management to take place, so I would be hoping that would be forthcoming, and secondly the date of committee approval, maybe that may have just

been the terminology I used, I was maybe looking at the date some of these went to committee and were discussed, debated and then approved, so I'm not quite certain as to why, it's just to try and give some idea of how long projects take to come to fruition, that was why I asked, and so I'm not getting the answer that I want because it's not showing that in the table, thank you.

**Supplementary  
Answer**

Clearly there was an enormous amount of information to go into your very detailed question in order to try and properly respond to and given the kind of timescales we've got around Committee work and processes, I suspect that the lack of response on those two specific issues partially relates that. However, there is some degree of explanation in the footnotes attached to where the funding comes from because clearly some of these active travel projects include external funding, some of which will have been secured, some not secured as yet, some related to developer contributions etc., so what is clearly a need for further information attached to that for you, I will try and provide a more detailed response to you on that but in the meantime I would commend officers for the level of detail that they have been able to provide in this particular answer, the answer provides a bit of a romp through the process that we've gone through across the last couple of Administrations to get us to reach the point where active travel is such an important part of our transport considerations and I think is a very useful display of all the efforts have gone into providing these 40 permanent schemes, it's quite an ambitious programme as you'll see from that, but will come back you as soon as I can.

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Tram Safety Improvements</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	Phased programme to improve tramline safety for cyclists.	Permanent		January 2021	
<b>City Centre West to East Link</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	Segregated cycle lanes, crossings and street improvements from Roseburn via Haymarket to George St and from George St to York Place.	Permanent		May 2022	
<b>Meadows to Union Canal</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	Segregated cycle lanes and toucan and Street Improvements.	Permanent		May 2023	
<b>Dropped Kerbs Programme</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	Upgrade of missing and damaged dropped kerbs across the city, prioritising access to	Permanent		November 2020	

---

<sup>1</sup>The current budget availability for the delivery of the Active Travel Investment Programme is £69.5m. This funding is made up of £21.3m of the Council's capital budget, an estimated contribution from the Scottish Government's Cycling, Walking and Safer Streets (CWSS) programme of £7.1m and a contribution from Sustrans under their Places for Everyone programme of £41.1m. This means that prioritisation of the schemes needs to be continuously evaluated in order to assess deliverability of each individual scheme within the available budget.

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
		high streets, hospitals and health centres.				
<b>City-wide Public Bike Parking</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	On street cycle rack installations, mostly on shopping streets.	Permanent		May 2020, new rollout under development	
<b>West Edinburgh Link</b>	Stage 3 Developed Design	Segregated cycle lanes, crossings, street and path improvements and a bridge over Fife Railway linking East Craigs and Wester Hailes to Edinburgh Park/Gyle.	Permanent		October 2023	
<b>Secure On-street Cycle Parking</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	Phase 1 (approx. 60 units) of on-street secure cycle parking hanger implementation, including TROs and initial installation across the city.	Permanent		November 2020	
<b>Main Roads</b>	Stage 1 Preparation	Feasibility study of potential on road cycle	Permanent /		End of Preparation and	

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>Study</b>	and Brief	lanes/segregation and enhancements to yellow line restrictions.  Further assessment required for potential delivery opportunities under Spaces for People.	Temporary		Brief by Summer 2020	
<b>Princes Street East End</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Under review	Permanent		Under review	
<b>Roseburn Path – Union Canal</b>	Stage 3 Developed Design	Connection from North Edinburgh Path Network at Roseburn to Union Canal via new off-road path, including bridges and Dalry Park improvements.	Permanent		June 2022	
<b>Meadows to George Street</b>	Stage 3 Developed Design	Street improvements and segregated cycle lanes.	Permanent		November 2023	

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>North Edinburgh Active Travel (NEAT) Connections</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	New segregated cycleways, crossings and street improvements.	Permanent		August 2023	
<b>Leith Connections / Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Improved walking and cycling connections from the Foot of Leith Walk to Ocean Terminal and development of other local proposals.	Permanent		Under review	
<b>Morrison Street</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Street improvements, including to footways, crossings and cycle provision.	Permanent		June 2023	
<b>Marchmont to Blackford</b>	Stage 3 Developed Design	New cycle lanes, junction and crossing improvements.	Permanent		July 2021	
<b>QuietRoute 8 – Balgreen to Edinburgh Park</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	Permanent		October 2022	

Scheme	Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)	a) Location and route c) Short summary	b) Temporary or permanent scheme	d) Date of committee approval	e) Date completed; or f) Anticipated completion	g) Budget allocation <sup>1</sup>
<b>Cameron Toll to BioQuarter</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	Segregated cycleways and shared footpaths.	Permanent		April 2022	
<b>Fountainbridge / Dundee Street</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Segregated link between Telfer Subway and Union Canal. Optioneering for remainder of street. Further assessment required for potential delivery opportunities under Spaces for People.	Permanent / Temporary		June 2023	
<b>Maybury Road</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Feasibility study of potential to improve cycle provision along Maybury Road, taking account of dependencies with proposals under the Local Development Plan Action Programme (LDPAP).	Permanent		Preparation and Brief complete early 2020.	

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>QuietRoute 6 – Grange Road Crossings</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	New crossings, including footway and path improvements.	Permanent		November 2020	
<b>St Leonards – Canongate / Holyrood Drive</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	On carriageway cycle provision, crossings and path improvements.	Permanent		June 2021	
<b>QuietRoute 9</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	Pedestrian and cycle improvements to paths and crossing and Quiet Streets.	Permanent		September 2021	
<b>QuietRoute 5 – Holyrood Park</b>	Stage 3 Developed Design	Improved cycle and foot paths and new crossings.	Permanent		July 2022	
<b>QuietRoute 61 - Niddry to Moredun via Bioquarter</b>	Stage 3 Developed Design	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	Permanent		December 2020	
<b>A8 Gyle – Newbridge</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Path widening between Middle Norton and Gogarstone and new road layout at	Permanent		September 2021	

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
		Gogarstone Road junction with A8.				
<b>Arboretum Place</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	Upgrade of the circular area outside the west gate of the Botanic Gardens to prioritise pedestrians, slow traffic and make the road easier to cross.	Permanent		November 2022	
<b>QuietRoute 30 – Holyrood Park to Ratcliffe Terrace</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	Permanent		Summer 2022	
<b>QuietRoute 6 – Meadows to Bread Street</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	Permanent		March 2022	
<b>One-way Street Exemptions</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	City-wide signs, markings and traffic management.	Permanent		November 2021	
<b>QuietRoute 60</b>	Stage 7 In	Footpath widening and	Permanent		Complete	

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
<b>– Davidson's Mains Park</b>	use	lighting from Queensferry Road to Barnton Avenue.			2019/20	
<b>Lower Granton Road</b>	Stage 7 In use		Permanent		Complete 2019/20	
<b>Marchmont Filtered Permeability</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief		Permanent		Under review	
<b>Deanhaugh Street and Leslie Place</b>	Stage 4 Technical Design	Pedestrian crossings upgrade at junction.	Permanent		March 2021	
<b>Minor Improvements</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	City-wide low cost and delivery risk package of interventions to support walking and cycling.	Permanent		Under review	
<b>QuietRoute 60 – Davidson's Mains Park (Phase 2)</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design	Improvements to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements.	Permanent		July 2021	
<b>Salvesen Steps</b>	Stage 1 Preparation		Permanent		Under review	

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)</b>	a) <b>Location and route</b> c) <b>Short summary</b>	b) <b>Temporary or permanent scheme</b>	d) <b>Date of committee approval</b>	e) <b>Date completed; or</b> f) <b>Anticipated completion</b>	g) <b>Budget allocation<sup>1</sup></b>
	and Brief					
<b>Powderhall Railway</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Repurposing disused railway into green active travel corridor for cycling and walking.	Permanent		March 2023	
<b>Cultins Road Cycleway</b>	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Improved cycle and walking link between the Canal and QuietRoute 8.	Permanent		Under review	
<b>The Causey Project</b>	Stage 2 Concept Design		Permanent		Under review	
<b>Minor Lighting Schemes</b>	Stage 3 Developed Design	Lighting upgrades at Innocent Path.	Permanent		October 2020	

## Spaces for People Schemes

Scheme – a) Location/Route	c) short description A description of what each scheme entails can be found on the <a href="#">Spaces for People pages</a> on the Council's website	a) Temporary or permanent scheme	b) Date of committee approval	c) Completion date or d) Anticipated completion date	e) Budget allocation
Old Dalkeith Road	Segregated Cycle Lanes	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	03/06/20	All schemes included in SfP Budget
Crewe Road South	Segregated Cycle Lanes	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	03/06/20	
Braid Road	Road closure – Space for exercise	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	30/04/20	
Silverknowes Road	Road closure – Space for exercise	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	30/04/20	
Links Gardens	Road closure – Space for exercise	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval	30/04/20	
Cammo Walk	Road closure – Space for exercise	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	01/05/20	
Warriston Road	Road closure – Space for exercise	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT	29/05/20	

			Approval instead		
Stanley Street / Hope Street	Road closure – Space for exercise	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	29/05/20	
East Princes Street – Bus gate	Bus Gate	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	18/06/20	
Waverley Bridge Closure	Road Closure	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	18/06/20	
George IV Bridge	New widened footway and shared Cycleway	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	WC 27/7/20	
Bank St / Mound	Segregated Cycleway	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	08/07/20	
Forest Road	Segregated Cycleway	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	08/07/20	
Victoria St - Closure	Soft Road Closure	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	10/07/20	
Cockburn Street – Closure	Road Closure	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead	10/07/20	
Maybury Road - Controlled crossing	Temporary Controlled Pedestrian Crossing	Temporary	Not approved by Committee, CIMT Approval instead on 26 <sup>th</sup> June	30/06/20	

