

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Tuesday 25 August 2020

Present:-

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

COUNCILLORS

Robert C Aldridge
Scott Arthur
Gavin Barrie
Eleanor Bird
Chas Booth
Claire Bridgman
Mark A Brown
Graeme Bruce
Steve Burgess
Lezley Marion Cameron
Jim Campbell
Kate Campbell
Mary Campbell
Maureen M Child
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
Ashley Graczyk
Joan Griffiths
Ricky Henderson
Derek Howie

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

1 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 28 July 2020 as a correct record subject to noting in Item 4 on Senior Councillor Remuneration July 2020 and Appointments to Committees and Outside Organisations etc, the amendment by Councillor Aldridge was to appoint Councillor Day to Merchant Company Endowment Trust (Para 2) and Councillor Barrie to the Board of Life Care (Edinburgh) Ltd (Para 3)

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:

- Granton Primary School
- James Gillespies High School – wearing of face masks
- Forever Edinburgh Campaign
- New Waverley Station proposals
- Winter Festival

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Whyte	- Forever Edinburgh Campaign/Spaces for People programme
Councillor Staniforth	- Low traffic proposals - East Craigs area - campaign
Councillor Aldridge	- Spaces for People – equalities – Blue Badge holder spaces
Councillor Day	- Funding for IJB Uplift in Living Wage
Councillor Bird	- Employment challenges for young people – welcome £60m investment from Scottish Government in the youth guarantee
Councillor Johnston	- Budget savings – used of reserves to fund budget gap

Councillor Main	- Pay increase for care workers
Councillor Lang	- Voucher scheme for businesses in Leith Walk
Councillor Munro	- Progress on requests for additional funding for the Council
Councillor Dickie	- Overall success of helping pupils back into school
Councillor Doggart	- Red internal audit opinion
Councillor Burgess	- Face coverings for secondary school pupils
Councillor Webber	- Digital learning plan for the future
Councillor Cook	- Spaces for People – reduction in profits for local traders
Councillor Wilson	- Congratulations to Edinburgh Festival for its Digital Festival
Councillor Neil Ross	- Council van parked in loading bay in Morningside Road – parking enforcement

4 Review of Appointments to Committees, Boards and Outside Bodies 2020/2021

On 28 May 2020, the Policy and Sustainability Committee, under interim political management arrangements, appointed members to executive committees, other committees, joint boards and outside bodies, etc for 2020/21.

Due to the resignation of Councillor Howie from the Scottish National Party (SNP), a number of committees were not compliant with the decision made on 28 May 2020. Details were provided of the affected committees and the action required.

Motion

- 1) To agree the political membership of the committees, boards and outside bodies set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To replace Councillor Howie with Councillor Key on the Culture and Communities Committee.
- 3) To replace Councillor Howie with a Conservative Councillor on the Regulatory Committee and Licensing Sub-Committee.

- 4) To note that Councillor Rankin was taking a leave of absence on health grounds, in line with the changes to senior Councillor rules as recommended by COSLA and approved by the Scottish Government, effective immediately.
- 5) To appoint Councillor Munn as the acting Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at an SRA of 62.5% of Leader's.
- 6) To also agree to replace Councillor Rankin with Councillor Munn on an interim basis on all respective working groups, bodies and committees.
- 7) To appoint Councillor Munn as Chair of the Pensions Committee.
- 8) To replace Councillor Munn with Councillor Dixon on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.
- 9) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to end these interim arrangements once the Leader of the Council informs him of a date that Councillor Rankin will return to carry out his responsibilities as Convener.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

To agree to appoint Council Committees in line with the proportional make-up of the Council as outlined in Appendix 1 "New Political Breakdown" of the report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee of 28 May 2020 adjusted to take account of Councillor Howie resigning from the SNP Group.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Amendment 2

- 1) To agree the political membership of the committees, boards and outside bodies set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To replace Councillor Miller with Councillor Staniforth on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.

- moved by Councillor Main, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	34 votes
For Amendment 1	-	26 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To agree the political membership of the committees, boards and outside bodies set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To replace Councillor Howie with Councillor Key on the Culture and Communities Committee.
- 3) To replace Councillor Howie with a Conservative Councillor on the Regulatory Committee and Licensing Sub-Committee.
- 4) To note that Councillor Rankin was taking a leave of absence on health grounds, in line with the changes to senior Councillor rules as recommended by COSLA and approved by the Scottish Government, effective immediately.
- 5) To appoint Councillor Munn as the acting Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at an SRA of 62.5% of Leader's.
- 6) To also agree to replace Councillor Rankin with Councillor Munn on an interim basis on all respective working groups, bodies and committees.
- 7) To appoint Councillor Munn as Chair of the Pensions Committee.
- 8) To replace Councillor Munn with Councillor Dixon on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.

- 9) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to end these interim arrangements once the Leader of the Council informs him of a date that Councillor Rankin will return to carry out his responsibilities as Convener.
- 10) To replace Councillor Miller with Councillor Staniforth on the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 28 May 2020 (item 16); report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

5 Interim Procedural Standing Orders and Revised Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions

The Council's Leadership Advisory Panel had agreed interim Procedural Standing Orders to allow Council business to be carried out during the Covid-19 pandemic and that the political management arrangements should be reviewed by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in August 2020.

Details were provided on the proposed Interim Procedural Standing Orders and revised Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Function to allow Council business to continue to be carried out for the period 1 September 2020 to 31 December 2020.

Motion

- 1) To suspend Procedural Standing Orders until 31 December 2020 and to agree the Interim Standing Orders set out in appendix one to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To approve the revised Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions set out in appendix two to the report.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

- 1) To suspend Procedural Standing Orders until 31 December 2020 and to agree the Interim Standing Orders set out in appendix one to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To approve the revised Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions set out in appendix two to the report.

3) In Standing Order 5.1 - Quorum, to add:

“If the absence of a quorum for a meeting is due to technical failure relating to IT the Lord Provost shall have discretion to extend the period to allow for the technical problem to be resolved.”

4) In Standing order 12 – Deputations, to add:

“until it is practicable for such deputations to be heard in person.”

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Lang

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	35 votes
For the amendment	-	24 votes

(For the motion): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, 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, Doggart, Douglas, Gloyer, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, Lang, Mitchell, Mowat, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Webber, Whyte and Young.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(References – Leadership Advisory Panel of 23 April 2020 (item 4); Policy and Sustainability Committee of 6 August 2020 (item 5); report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

6 Support of Civic Life in the Capital City

The Council had agreed to a report on how to continue to support of civic life in the city while COVID -19 Regulations applied and proposed methods of civic engagement by the Lord Provost, Depute Convener and Bailies to ensure as complete a civic presence as possible.

Details were provided on the significant work being undertaken to plan future civic events in the city and lift spirits of the community together with proposals for a clearer

set of duties for the Bailies and a better-defined role for the Depute Convener, particularly in relation to the Council's Civic Hospitality Policy.

Motion

- 1) To note the range of civic activity undertaken by the Office of Lord Provost during Phases 1 and 2 of Lockdown, and the wide use of alternative and virtual means of communication, as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To recognise the restrictions placed on the civic diary in the next phase of operation arising from the decision not to re-open the City Chambers for events until at least the middle of October 2020.
- 3) To note that outdoor events and engagements at other venues would go ahead during Phase 3 subject to satisfactory risk assessments by event organisers.
- 4) To endorse the early planning that was underway for future civic events including a Lord Provost Community Garden Party in 2021, as set out in paragraphs 4.9 to 4.12 of the report.
- 5) To acknowledge the key role of the Depute Convener and Bailies and support the proposal for fuller participation at key civic events throughout the year, as described in paragraphs 4.18 to 4.20 of the report.
- 6) To note the more clearly defined role for the Depute Convener and proposed adjustment to the Council's Civic Hospitality Policy, as set out in paragraphs 4.21 to 4.24 of the report.
- 7) To agree that the amendments to the Civic hospitality Policy, outlining the changing roles and responsibilities, be delegated to the Chief Executive to implement in consultation with the Lord Provost and Depute Convener.

Amendment

- 1) To note the range of civic activity undertaken by the Office of Lord Provost during Phases 1 and 2 of Lockdown, and the wide use of alternative and virtual means of communication, as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To recognise the restrictions placed on the civic diary in the next phase of operation arising from the decision not to re-open the City Chambers for events until at least the middle of October 2020.

- 3) To note that outdoor events and engagements at other venues would go ahead during Phase 3 subject to satisfactory risk assessments by event organisers.
- 4) To endorse the early planning that was underway for future civic events including a Lord Provost Community Garden Party in 2021, as set out in paragraphs 4.9 to 4.12 of the report.
- 5) To acknowledge the key role of the Depute Convener and Bailies and support the proposal for fuller participation at key civic events throughout the year, as described in paragraphs 4.18 to 4.20 of the report.
- 6) To note the more clearly defined role for the Depute Convener and proposed adjustment to the Council's Civic Hospitality Policy, as set out in paragraphs 4.21 to 4.24 of the report.
- 7) To agree that a "read only" on-line digital archive shall be maintained which record shall be freely accessible for public viewing on edinburghlordprovost.com webpages and which shall:
 - a) record the date and venue of all civic hospitality by the Office of the Lord Provost and where appropriate link to the decision of Full Council, and
 - b) list any decisions of Full Council asking the Lord Provost take action by way of letter, visit or other manner and the date when said action is completed.

- moved by Councillor Rust, seconded by Councillor Mowat

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 McVey:

- 1) To note the range of civic activity undertaken by the Office of Lord Provost during Phases 1 and 2 of Lockdown, and the wide use of alternative and virtual means of communication, as set out in paragraph 4.2 of the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To recognise the restrictions placed on the civic diary in the next phase of operation arising from the decision not to re-open the City Chambers for events until at least the middle of October 2020.

- 3) To note that outdoor events and engagements at other venues would go ahead during Phase 3 subject to satisfactory risk assessments by event organisers.
- 4) To endorse the early planning that was underway for future civic events including a Lord Provost Community Garden Party in 2021, as set out in paragraphs 4.9 to 4.12 of the report.
- 5) To acknowledge the key role of the Depute Convener and Bailies and support the proposal for fuller participation at key civic events throughout the year, as described in paragraphs 4.18 to 4.20 of the report.
- 6) To note the more clearly defined role for the Depute Convener and proposed adjustment to the Council's Civic Hospitality Policy, as set out in paragraphs 4.21 to 4.24 of the report.
- 7) To agree that the amendments to the Civic hospitality Policy, outlining the changing roles and responsibilities, be delegated to the Chief Executive to implement in consultation with the Lord Provost and Depute Convener.
- 8) To agree that a "read only" on-line digital archive should be maintained which record should be freely accessible for public viewing on edinburghlordprovost.com webpages and which should:
 - a) record the date and venue of all civic hospitality by the Office of the Lord Provost and where appropriate link to the decision of Full Council, and
 - b) list any decisions of Full Council asking the Lord Provost take action by way of letter, visit or other manner and the date when said action is completed.

(References – Act of Council No 8 of 30 June 2020; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

7 Annual Performance Report 2019/20 - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report provided a detailed overview of the council performance in 2019/20 against the Change Strategy themes, drawing on corporate performance indicators and benchmarking data including the Local Government Benchmarking Framework 2018/19 data to the City of Edinburgh Council for consideration.

Motion

- 1) To note the annual performance report for the 2019/20 financial year.
- 2) To note that the development of a revised performance framework was underway as part of the Adaptation and Renewal programme and the development of a revised Council Business Plan.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the annual performance report for the 2019/20 financial year.
- 2) To regret that once again, the narrative style of reporting presented gives an unbalanced view of service performance, masks comparisons of performance over time with yet another change to the way the status of KPIs are presented as compared to 2018/19.
- 3) To further regret that the report ignores benchmarking and that views from the Edinburgh People Survey are not available due to a decision by the SNP/Labour Administration not to undertake the survey this year.
- 4) To regret that over 40% of targets have not been met and that targets relating to trends are only being measured compared to 2018/19 when a longer term review of data would show that a number of these ranked as "Green" have actually not shown an improving trend and that for key issues like delayed discharge performance is still worse than that inherited by this Administration in 2017.
- 5) To agree that in future any alterations to KPIs and Performance Reporting are considered and approved by Corporate Policy and Sustainability Committee in advance of any future reporting year and instructs the Chief Executive to ensure all KPIs meet established SMART criteria.
- 6) To further note that the development of a revised performance framework is underway as part of the Adaptation and Renewal programme alongside the development of a revised Council Business Plan and agrees that this should be reviewed and subject to approval by the Council before implementation.
- 7) To note that the Council had been assessed for its regular Best Value Report this year and is awaiting the final Report in the Autumn and instructs the Chief Executive to ensure that these were incorporated into the development of the revised performance framework and that a Best Value Improvement Plan is produced that seeks to address the areas of Council service where performance improvement is required.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Amendment 2

- 1) To endorse the decision of Policy and Strategy Committee on 20 August as detailed in this report including to:

'note with serious concern that 27 of the Council's performance indicators show that performance has declined in the last year and that significant performance challenges remain across the Council'

and

'that there are 18 council performance areas for which performance is greater than 5% behind the required target or trend and are flagged as having 'Red' status and also 15 areas for which performance is behind target or trend and are flagged as having 'Amber' status'.

- 2) To therefore, welcome the decision by Policy & Strategy to agree the proposal by Green Councillors requesting that a briefing note be circulated prior to this meeting of the full Council that details what plans are in place for each one of these areas to improve performance to within target levels, the expected date for achieving the target or trend and indicating who is the responsible officer.
- 3) To request that this briefing note is included in the Business Bulletin for the next Policy and Strategy Committee.
- 4) To further welcome the Policy and Strategy Committee decision to agree the proposal by Green Councillors that revised targets for carbon emissions reduction, specifying the annual increments required to achieve net zero by 2030 and requests that these incremental targets are brought forward to committee before the end of this year.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

Amendment 3

To continue consideration of the report to the next meeting of the Council.

- 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 terms of Standing Order 21(4), the Lord Provost ruled that a first vote be taken for or against the motion for continuation

Voting

First Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the motion for continuation	-	25 votes
Against the motion for continuation	-	34 votes

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

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

As the vote for continuation was lost, a second vote between the adjusted motion by Councillor McVey and Amendment 1 by Councillor Whyte was then taken.

Voting

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	35 votes
For Amendment 1	-	19 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, 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, Doggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.

Abstentions: Councillors, Aldridge, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To note the annual performance report for the 2019/20 financial year.
- 2) To note that the development of a revised performance framework was underway as part of the Adaptation and Renewal programme and the development of a revised Council Business Plan.
- 3) To endorse the decision of Policy and Strategy Committee on 20 August as detailed in the report including to:

‘note with serious concern that 27 of the Council’s performance indicators show that performance has declined in the last year and that significant performance challenges remain across the Council’

and

‘that there are 18 council performance areas for which performance is greater than 5% behind the required target or trend and are flagged as having ‘Red’ status and also 15 areas for which performance is behind target or trend and are flagged as having ‘Amber’ status.’;

- 4) To therefore, welcome the decision by the Policy and Sustainability Committee to agree the proposal by Green Councillors requesting that a briefing note be circulated prior to this meeting of the full Council that detailed what plans were in place for each one of these areas to improve performance to within target levels, the expected date for achieving the target or trend and indicating who was the responsible officer.
- 5) To request that this briefing note be included in the Business Bulletin for the next Policy and Strategy Committee.
- 6) To further welcome the Policy and Sustainability Committee decision to agree the proposal by Green Councillors that revised targets for carbon emissions reduction, specifying the annual increments required to achieve net zero by 2030 and request that these incremental targets be brought forward to committee before the end of this year.

(Reference – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 20 August 2020 (item 5); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

8 Coalition Commitments Progress Update - August 2020 - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report which provided the third annual update on the 52 coalition commitments and an update on the progress against each commitment, to the City of Edinburgh Council for consideration.

Motion

- 1) To note the progress at August 2020 on delivering the 52 coalition commitments that the Council had committed to deliver by end 2022 (Appendix A of the report by the Chief Executive).
- 2) To note the steps that would be taken in 2020/21 to progress delivery of the commitments.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the report and that previous Conservative amendments in 2017, 2018 and 2019 sought to improve both the pledges and the reporting process but were rejected by the SNP/Labour Administration which has sought to continue the approach of its predecessor in wasting officer time attempting to measure and justify a number of unmeasurable political statements.
- 2) To therefore agree that the current politically based pledge and reporting process is flawed and notes that this is likely to be superseded by the development of a revised performance framework and Council Business Plan already underway as part of the Adaptation and Renewal programme and that the public of Edinburgh will make their own judgment on the success of this Administration based on the quality and availability of core services at the end of its term.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Johnston

Amendment 2

- 1) To note that commitment 6, to deliver the city region deal, does not include the need for the city region deal to facilitate Edinburgh's commitment to be net zero carbon by 2030.
- 2) To note that commitment 8, to 'explore' rent pressure zones, is indicated as fully achieved but regrets that, in practice, nothing has happened to tackle high private rents.

- 3) To regret that allocation of budget through participatory budgeting has fallen to 0% in 2019-20
- 4) To note that commitment 48, on greater financial autonomy for the council, is indicated as fully achieved but, while welcoming moves towards transient visitor levy, workplace parking levy and greater autonomy over non-domestic rates, considers that a huge amount of work remains to be done.
- 5) To note that a large part of commitment 52, to devolve local decisions to four Locality Committees, has been abandoned.
- 6) Therefore to urge the coalition to reword commitment 6 to include a drive to make the city region deal facilitate Edinburgh's aim to be zero carbon by 2030 and to replace outdated commitments such as 8 and 52 with commitments that reflect the changes to have occurred over the last three years in particular the need to be zero carbon within ten years and the challenges presented by Covid-19 which are best met with a Green Recovery programme.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Burgess

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the contents of this report.
- 2) To believe the status of "partially achieved" is so broad as to fail to provide a meaningful assessment of the degree to which a commitment is being delivered and notes that some commitments have been 'fully achieved' by virtue of the administration taking no action.
- 3) To call for a renewed focus on the delivery of core services for the remainder of this Council term given that;
 - 60% into the term, only 36% of the promised 10,000 affordable homes have been built.
 - resident satisfaction with roads, pavements and footpaths remains lower than when this administration came to power.
 - recycling rates have continued to decline when the coalition committed to increase recycling in the city.
 - no progress has been made to expand existing or create new park and ride sites.
 - the school building programme is substantially behind schedule.

- the number of air quality management areas remains unchanged at six.
 - library usage through transaction numbers has declined when an increase was targeted.
 - the decision to remove all Council funding for community policing has, as confirmed by Police Scotland, reduced the dedicated police presence in each ward.
- 4) To believe a report on delivery against a set of commitments made by two political groups is ultimately a political document and therefore agrees that, in future, the data required for the key measures section of each commitment should be compiled by officers but that the narrative and conclusions should be written and submitted by the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

Voting

First Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	25 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes
For Amendment 2	-	10 votes
For Amendment 3	-	8 votes

(For the Motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

For Amendment 2: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Howie, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bridgman, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 3 fell, and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendments 1 and 2.

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	25 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes
For Amendment 2	-	10 votes

(For the Motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

For Amendment 2: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Howie, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.

Abstentions: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bridgman, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 2 fell, and a third vote was taken between the Motion and Amendment 1.

Third Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	25 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes

(For the Motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Perry, Watt, Wilson and Work.

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

Abstentions: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Booth, Bridgman, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Gloyer, Graczyk, Howie, Lang, Main, Miller, Osler, Rae, Neil Ross, Staniforth and Young.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 20 August 2020 (item 6); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted)

9 Tramworks Traffic Displacement – Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council:

Notes that:

- 1) road diversions for the tram works has displaced traffic into surrounding streets which is causing congestion, making the routes more unpleasant for active travel and increasing traffic volumes on residential and shopping streets;
- 2) concerns have also been raised about the use of heavy vehicles on unsuitable streets with speed bumps and setts which is causing concerns to residents in the properties on these streets;
- 3) that notification for additional road closures have been publicised which will further divert traffic from main roads onto residential streets.

Council therefore calls for a report detailing:

- 1) A traffic count of vehicle numbers on Broughton Road, Bonnington Road, Bellevue Road, East London Street, Broughton Street, Albany Street, Abercromby Place, London Road, Drummond Place, Queen Street Gardens East, Great Junction Street, Duke Street, Easter Road, Ferry Road, Salamander Street/Bernard Street/Commercial Street and Hermitage Place/East Hermitage Place and compares these with the numbers expected by traffic modelling done to design the diversion routes;
- 2) A review of traffic light timings throughout these routes to ensure that there is sufficient time for safe passage for pedestrians and efficient movement of vehicular traffic;
- 3) A review of the closure of Links Gardens to determine whether reopening this previously signed route would ease congestion on Duke Street/Great Junction Street;

- 4) A review of all active travel routes within Leith and from Leith to the City Centre to maximise the capacity given that the Water of Leith path is suspended between Connaught Place and West Bowling Green Street to ensure that people can make a safe choice to use active travel and are not being diverted onto congested streets; this should also review whether additional measures are needed to ensure pedestrian and cyclist safety on routes which are now carrying more traffic.

The report to be reported in two cycles to the Policy and Sustainability Committee.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment 1

To note that:

- 1) There are necessary road diversions currently in place to permit continued delivery of the tram extension project now that closure of construction sites has been lifted.
- 2) That residents' concerns have been raised about the use of heavy vehicles including buses and construction traffic on some streets with traffic calming and setts and the subsequent impact on noise and vibrations.
- 3) That this issue has already been raised, particularly for Bellevue Road, and that work is underway to mitigate the impact including discussions with Lothian Bus to change speed around speed bumps, the re-routing of heavy vehicles in relation to the tram project contractors and the removal or alteration of some of the traffic calming measures.
- 4) Acknowledges that the continued closure of Links Gardens will be reviewed as expected under the Spaces for People programme

To request

- 5) That officers identify further possible mitigating actions including the use of traffic vehicle counters and a review of traffic signalling timing to help offset impact and to provide further information on the current situation within this part of the city. Recognises that walking, wheeling and cycling should be prioritised and increased through any further mitigation, encouraging reduced use of car journeys where possible through this area. Officers should report

back to the Transport and Environment Committee at the earliest opportunity with a clear indication of resource commitments for any proposed changes.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 2

- 1) To note that road diversions for the tram works have been required, and that the initial effect has been an increased volume of traffic on alternative routes.
- 2) To regret that more people have not chosen to leave the car at home and seek a lower impact mode of travel.
- 3) To note the negative effects of these increased volumes of vehicles on alternative through routes and work done by council officers to support residents and mitigate negative effects so far.
- 4) To call for data to be collected throughout the tram programme and analysis to be reported to members identifying any “traffic evaporation” and other effects which can inform future council strategy.
- 5) To additionally call for officers to identify specific measures that should be taken to prioritise and incentivise walking, wheeling and cycling throughout the area affected, including re-opening any active travel routes where possible, introducing filtered permeability, and providing segregated alternatives, and to prioritise rapid implementation all modal shift initiatives that will reduce the total amount of vehicular traffic across the affected area.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Booth

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Amendment 1 and Paragraph 4 of Amendment 2, were accepted as addendums to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Paragraphs 2 and 4 of Amendment 2 were accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	25 votes
For the Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	35 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): 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.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted amendment by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note that there were necessary road diversions currently in place to permit continued delivery of the tram extension project now that closure of construction sites had been lifted.
- 2) To note that residents' concerns had been raised about the use of heavy vehicles including buses and construction traffic on some streets with traffic calming and setts and the subsequent impact on noise and vibrations.
- 3) To note that this issue had already been raised, particularly for Bellevue Road, and that work was underway to mitigate the impact including discussions with Lothian Bus to change speed around speed bumps, the re-routing of heavy vehicles in relation to the tram project contractors and the removal or alteration of some of the traffic calming measures.
- 4) To acknowledge that the continued closure of Links Gardens would be reviewed as expected under the Spaces for People programme
- 5) To request that officers identify further possible mitigating actions including the use of traffic vehicle counters and a review of traffic signalling timing to help offset impact and to provide further information on the current situation within this part of the city. To recognise that walking, wheeling and cycling should be prioritised and increased through any further mitigation, encouraging reduced use of car journeys where possible through this area. Officers should report back to the Transport and Environment Committee at the earliest opportunity with a clear indication of resource commitments for any proposed changes.
- 6) To regret that more people had not chosen to leave the car at home and seek a lower impact mode of travel.
- 7) To call for data to be collected throughout the tram programme and analysis to be reported to members identifying any "traffic evaporation" and other effects which can inform future council strategy.

10 Public Health - Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

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

“Council

Notes the local Public Health containment measures that, regrettably, have had to be implemented in Aberdeen, Leicester, Greater Manchester and other areas in the UK to suppress transmission of the Coronavirus.

Further notes that local containment measures seem consistent with international best practice in combating the Coronavirus pandemic and historic Public Health infectious disease control.

Recognises that Edinburgh, a city with strong international connections that has traditionally seen many visitors and residents enjoy excellent transport connections, is at an elevated risk of a local Coronavirus outbreak; a risk illustrated by the February outbreak associated with the Nike conference held in the city.

Calls for an urgent report from the Chief Executive to the next meeting of the Policy and Sustainability Committee to address the following points:

- 1) The public authority powers and responsibilities available in terms of implementing local disease control measures in Scotland, covering a Local Authority Area, or part of a Local Authority Area and the body or bodies with which these powers sit.
- 2) The responsibilities of the City of Edinburgh Council in matters of Public Health.
- 3) An outline of the contingency planning that the Council and Partner organisations have been involved with should local disease control measures be required in Edinburgh.
- 4) The criteria used to consider the appropriateness of implementing disease control measures both covering a whole Local Authority, or only part of a Local Authority, in terms of Public Health and community cohesion.

Furthermore, Council requests that when this report is presented to committee, the Public Official, or officials, responsible for Public Health in the City of Edinburgh makes themselves available to committee for discussion.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Amendment

- 1) To note the ongoing need to follow national advice and guidance and for partners at a regional and City level to respond to national advice and guidance.
- 2) To note the constructive partnership working between relevant agencies and organisations in Edinburgh to ensure public health was protected.
- 3) To agree that a Members briefing should be issued setting out the powers the Council had to act on public health guidance and the process for partnership working to implement guidance set nationally or for Edinburgh specifically.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	22 votes
For the amendment	-	35 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor McVey.

11 Council Arms-Length External Organisations (ALEOs) Full Financial Disclosure – Motion by Councillor Hutchison

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

“Council:

Recognises the vital role played by the Council’s ALEOs in Edinburgh which were fully or majority owned by Council.

Notes the significant financial pressures that these organisations are under according to press reports in which senior staff of the ALEOs have made comment, and the limited reporting available to the Policy and Sustainability Committee and delay in reporting to Executive Committees which has reduced opportunities for scrutiny.

Requires the Chief Executive to provide an urgent report fully disclosing the financial health of all Council ALEOs, to either the Council or to the Finance and Resources Committee, whichever meets first.”

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Hutchison:

“Council:

Recognises the vital role played by the Council’s ALEOs in Edinburgh which are fully or majority owned by Council.

Notes the significant financial pressures that these organisations are under according to press reports in which senior staff of the ALEOs have made comment, and the limited reporting available to the Policy and Sustainability Committee and delay in reporting to Executive Committees which has reduced opportunities for scrutiny.

Notes that a members’ briefing was issued on 24/08/20 on the financial position of Council ALEOs.

Given the uncertain economic climate created by the Covid-19 pandemic and a continually moving picture with regards to direct financial support for many organisations, Council ALEOs circumstances have been changing and continue to. Therefore, Council requests that the Chief Executive provides an update to the Finance and Resources Committee in one cycle on the up to date position of ALEOs’ financial position, recognising the situation is subject to significant change and also that the report, or at least some of its content may have to be in the form of B agenda.”

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Munn

Declaration of Interests

Members declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members/Directors of outside organisations/Council Companies as follows:

Councillor Bruce	Edinburgh Leisure
Councillor Cameron	Capital City Partnership CEC Holdings Ltd EDI Edinburgh International Conference Centre Edinburgh Leisure
Councillor Kate Campbell	CEC Holdings Ltd EDI Marketing Edinburgh
Councillor Dixon	Edinburgh Leisure
Councillor Doran	Transport for Edinburgh
Councillor Gordon	Capital City Partnership EICC (Chair) Edinburgh Leisure
Councillor Laidlaw	Transport for Edinburgh
Councillor Macinnes	Transport for Edinburgh (Chair)
Councillor Miller	Marketing Edinburgh Transport for Edinburgh
Councillor Osler	Edinburgh Leisure
Councillor Smith	Capital City Partnership Edinburgh International Conference Centre
Councillor Staniforth	Edinburgh Leisure
Councillor Watt	Capital City Partnership Edinburgh Living Marketing Edinburgh

12 Pavements and People – Motion by Councillor Webber

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

“Council:

Reconfirms pedestrians are at the top of the urban transport hierarchy, and therefore agrees to:

- 1) A moratorium on the introduction of any new floating bus stops in the City of Edinburgh until a thorough consultation with bus operators, bus passengers' groups, and groups representing pedestrians and less able citizens is completed.
- 2) A brief report detailing the number and nature of pavement obstructions reported to the Council since March 2020 and any resulting enforcement action taken to ensure that pavements are clear spaces for everyone to enjoy.

This report should be provided to the re-convened Transport and Environment Committee at its first meeting.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment 1

Council:

Reconfirms that pedestrians are at the top of the City of Edinburgh Council transport hierarchies.

Notes the concerns expressed by Living Streets Edinburgh about the introduction of further floating bus stops and bus boarders into the road infrastructure in Edinburgh.

Recognises that the floating bus stops have been installed on Leith Walk for some time and that monitoring does not indicate any significant risk of increased pedestrian/cyclist conflicts and therefore limited impact on pedestrian safety.

Notes that the floating bus stop concept is used extensively and successfully, in various forms, in other mainland European countries.

Notes that any blanket halt on the installation of floating bus stops would significantly delay and obstruct the delivery of the Spaces for People programme of emergency measures.

Notes the Spaces for People commitment to remove street clutter as well as the Council's ongoing commitment to reducing pavement obstructions including the A board ban.

Requests that after analysis of the spaces for people project, any area that requires the use of floating bus stop, a meeting with the relevant stakeholders will take place to ensure all options to finalise a safe and effective design have been considered, and provide a public campaign to highlight new floating bus stop arrangements, to further emphasise the pedestrian priority when this design is used, including for example the use of "STOP" markings rather than "GIVE WAY" markings or zebra markings and tactiles to ensure everybody in the space is fully aware of pedestrian priority.

Further requests additional engagement with Lothian Buses, Living Streets Edinburgh, Guide Dogs Scotland, Spokes RNIB and the Access Panel to explore any additional actions and to report back to P&S at the earliest opportunity.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

- 1) Confirms pedestrians are at the top of the urban transport hierarchy, and therefore agrees to:
- 2) Implement well designed floating bus stops on streets where there is continuous segregated cycling infrastructure, including local consultation, which will ensure that all pedestrians are able to safely and confidently board buses.
- 3) Hold a workshop including people from groups representing pedestrians, people who are disabled, bus passengers, people who cycle, and bus operators in order to explore how to provide safe bus boarding where comprehensive floating bus stop infrastructure cannot be provided and to revise the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance to include floating bus stop designs.
- 4) A business bulletin update to the Transport and Environment Committee detailing the number and nature of pavement obstructions reported to the Council since March 2020 and any resulting enforcement action taken to ensure that pavements are clear spaces for everyone to enjoy.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Booth

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Paragraphs 3 and 4 of Amendment 2 were accepted as an addendum to Amendment 2.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	24 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	34 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To reconfirm that pedestrians were at the top of the City of Edinburgh Council transport hierarchies.
- 2) To note the concerns expressed by Living Streets Edinburgh about the introduction of further floating bus stops and bus boarders into the road infrastructure in Edinburgh.
- 3) To recognise that the floating bus stops had been installed on Leith Walk for some time and that monitoring did not indicate any significant risk of increased pedestrian/cyclist conflicts and therefore limited impact on pedestrian safety.
- 4) To note that the floating bus stop concept was used extensively and successfully, in various forms, in other mainland European countries.
- 5) To note that any blanket halt on the installation of floating bus stops would significantly delay and obstruct the delivery of the Spaces for People programme of emergency measures.
- 6) To note the Spaces for People commitment to remove street clutter as well as the Council's ongoing commitment to reducing pavement obstructions including the A board ban.

- 7) To request that after analysis of the spaces for people project, any area that required the use of floating bus stop, a meeting with the relevant stakeholders would take place to ensure all options to finalise a safe and effective design had been considered, and provide a public campaign to highlight new floating bus stop arrangements, to further emphasise the pedestrian priority when this design was used, including for example the use of “STOP” markings rather than “GIVE WAY” markings or zebra markings and tactiles to ensure everybody in the space was fully aware of pedestrian priority.
- 8) To further request additional engagement with Lothian Buses, Living Streets Edinburgh, Guide Dogs Scotland, Spokes RNIB and the Access Panel to explore any additional actions and to report back to the Policy and Sustainability Committee at the earliest opportunity.
- 9) To agree to hold a workshop including people from groups representing pedestrians, people who were disabled, bus passengers, people who cycled, and bus operators in order to explore how to provide safe bus boarding where comprehensive floating bus stop infrastructure could not be provided and to revise the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance to include floating bus stop designs.
- 10) To agree a business bulletin update to the Transport and Environment Committee detailing the number and nature of pavement obstructions reported to the Council since March 2020 and any resulting enforcement action taken to ensure that pavements were clear spaces for everyone to enjoy.

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Arthur declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of Spokes

13 Flooding – Motion by Councillor Corbett

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

“Council:

Notes the exceptional weather events overnight on 11/12 August 2020; notes that such events are predicted to become more frequent as a result of climate breakdown; warmly thanks staff for outstanding efforts in dealing with flooding and other weather-related consequences; notes widespread concern from residents that poorly maintained and choked street gullies contributed to floodwater pooling in public areas and into residents’ properties; notes the report from the Centre of Ecology and Hydrology in 2019 that Edinburgh has lost 282 hectares of green land

since 1990 which otherwise acted as a soak for rain and surface water; and therefore agrees to a report within three cycles, including dialogue with Scottish Water, on what steps can be taken to mitigate the scale of flooding in the future.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Corbett.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Booth

Amendment

To add to the motion by Councillor Corbett:

Council:

- 1) Notes reports of a number of drains which had had recent repairs failed leading to serious flooding of properties and requests that the dialogue with Scottish Water includes details of plans on how such heavy rainfall can be accommodated within the drainage system so that the historic buildings of the city can be protected;
- 2) Notes the importance of maintaining and therefore the unblocking of street gullies to ensure the city can cope with the exceptional weather events we have experienced recently and given the likely increase in frequency recognise the importance of ongoing winter maintenance and preparedness.
- 3) Requests an update to TEC, in one cycle, on the operational and financial impact the Spaces for People schemes have had in relation to the ability to carry out the planned winter maintenance and preparedness programme including but not limited to, the ability to clear and sweep the gutters and gullies, road and footpath maintenance, access for gritters and snow ploughs.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Webber

In accordance with Standing Order 19(12), Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the amendment were accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Corbett:

- 1) To note the exceptional weather events overnight on 11/12 August 2020.
- 2) To note that such events were predicted to become more frequent as a result of climate breakdown.

- 3) To warmly thank staff for outstanding efforts in dealing with flooding and other weather-related consequences.
- 4) To note widespread concern from residents that poorly maintained and choked street gullies contributed to floodwater pooling in public areas and into residents' properties.
- 5) To note the report from the Centre of Ecology and Hydrology in 2019 that Edinburgh had lost 282 hectares of green land since 1990 which otherwise acted as a soak for rain and surface water.
- 6) To therefore agree to a report within three cycles, including dialogue with Scottish Water, on what steps could be taken to mitigate the scale of flooding in the future.
- 7) To note reports of a number of drains which had had recent repairs failed leading to serious flooding of properties and request that the dialogue with Scottish Water include details of plans on how such heavy rainfall could be accommodated within the drainage system so that the historic buildings of the city could be protected.
- 8) To note the importance of maintaining and therefore the unblocking of street gullies to ensure the city could cope with the exceptional weather events have experienced recently and given the likely increase in frequency recognise the importance of ongoing winter maintenance and preparedness.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Arthur declared a financial interest in the above item as an employee at Heriot Watt University who had submitted a bid to the Scottish Government in relation to flooding.

14 James Harrison – Motion by Councillor Burgess

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

“Council;

Regrets with sadness the death of James Harrison who was fatally injured at the junction of Gilmerton and Mount Vernon on 25th June while cycling to his work at the Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh;

Notes that colleagues knew James as a charming, highly talented athlete, and hard-working senior research nurse who chose to be redeployed from his research post to the Intensive Care Unit at the Royal Infirmary, caring for patients on ventilators during

the COVID19 lockdown - his own life ending in the same intensive care unit on the day after his accident;

Recognises James' heroic efforts during the pandemic and his tragic death while cycling to work;

Requests that the Lord Provost conveys the Council's sincere condolences and respects to James' family in an appropriate manner;

Further requests that all reasonable action is taken to continue to improve road safety for cyclists including that a new Edinburgh 'Vision Zero' Road Safety Plan - which aims that '*all users are safe from the risk of being killed or seriously injured*' on the City's roads - is developed to replace the existing plan and is reported to the Transport & Environment Committee."

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Miller

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

15 Senior School Students – Motion by Councillor Burgess

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

"Council:

Congratulates senior school students on their hard work and resilience in achieving grades in assessed subjects in 2020; recognises unique challenges for students and for staff in making assessments in 2020; regrets the failure of SQA and ministers to heed repeated warnings about the flaws in the marking process; welcomes the decision on 11.8.20 to revert to teacher-based assessments; and agrees that the Education Convenor will write to Cabinet Secretary for Education seeking assurances that more credible systems of assessment be put in place for 2021 should exams not take place, in full or part, next year."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Mary Campbell

Amendment

To congratulate senior schools students on their hard work and resilience in achieving grades in assessed subjects in 2020; recognises unique challenges for students and for staff in making assessments in 2020; notes the apology by the Cabinet Secretary of Education after listening to the voice and concerns of young people themselves; welcomes the decision on 11.8.20 to revert to teacher-based assessments and the forward review into how to best capture the qualifications and achievements of every individual learner; and agree that the Education Convener will write to the Cabinet Secretary for Education seeking earliest information on the assessment system for 2021 should exams not take place, in full or part, next year.

- moved by Councillor Perry, seconded by Councillor Dickie

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Burgess:

- 1) To congratulate senior school students on their hard work and resilience in achieving grades in assessed subjects in 2020.
- 2) To recognise unique challenges for students and for staff in making assessments in 2020.
- 3) To regret the failure of SQA and ministers to heed repeated warnings about the flaws in the marking process.
- 4) To welcome the decision on 11 August 2020 to revert to teacher-based assessments and welcome the forward review into how to best capture the qualifications and achievements of every individual learner.
- 5) To agree that the Education Convenor would write to the Cabinet Secretary for Education seeking assurances that more credible systems of assessment be put in place for 2021 should exams not take place, in full or part, next year.

16 Saroj Lal, An Inspiring Teacher and Equalities Campaigner – Emergency Motion by Councillor Watt

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

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

“That Council celebrates the inspirational life of Saroj Lal who, sadly, has recently passed away, aged 82;

Recognises that 20 August 2020 represents 50 years since Saroj started teaching at South Morningside Primary School as one of the first BAME teachers in the country; commends her work in challenging stigma and narratives in school curriculums, including campaigning for equal and balanced representation of minority ethnic communities in teaching materials and children’s books;

Notes that Saroj, who had been a Director of Lothian Racial Equality Council, chair of Nari Kallyan Shangho and the founder of Milan, was one of Scotland’s pioneering race relations activists, feminists and equality campaigners;

Notes that she was a trailblazer in seeking fairness for all, and, in particular, disadvantaged and marginalised BAME women, and was the first Asian-born Scottish woman to be appointed as a justice of the peace;

Sends its condolences to Saroj’s family, friends and colleagues, and takes a moment to commend all racial equality campaigners across Scotland, whose commitment and work in helping to end racial discrimination will have a long and lasting impact.”

- moved by Councillor Watt, seconded by Councillor Dickie

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Watt.

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 2 of 25 August 2020)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Main for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Question

In the past 10 years Council has made decisions to close some public toilets across the city, and to dispose of the buildings. Please provide detail of the current situation for each public toilet closed: when it was closed, whether it remains unsold and if so why, or if sold when this was and what the gross income for the sale, and whether this has been received or is subject to planning permission or other conditions.

Answer

Please find below an update for each of the toilet blocks as requested.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost. I do have a brief supplementary. The information given shows that there are some public toilets across the city that remain closed and unused and while the sale of others has raised over £1m, for clarity I wonder would the Convener consider reviewing the current state of the closed facilities in light of both the need for public conveniences across the city and also to ensure that the Council estate is being best used for the benefit of residents?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you Councillor Main for the supplementary. You're correct to note that there is quite a variety in terms of the moneys raised by previous sales of toilet facilities, the one you're referencing in particular in terms of raising that amount was where planning permission had been granted, so it's something of an anomaly in the rest of the scheme. As you will probably also be aware, because it's been discussed Policy and Sustainability Committee relatively

recently, there is a review going on around public toilets and our provision across the city, and I will be certainly be very happy to ask officers to include what you've just raised as part of that.

Location	Address	Date Closed	Status	Gross Income	Conditions
Ardmillan Terrace	1 Gorgie Road	September 2015	Sold 8 March 2019	Sale value - £13,500	None
Canaan Lane	7 Canaan Lane	September 2015	Sold 29 March 2019	Sale value - £955,000	Planning was granted 18/01506/FUL
Canonmills	50 Brandon Terrace	September 2015	Sold 19 February 2019	£80,000	None
Currie	215A Lanark Road West	September 2015	Not currently being used.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Granton Square	9 Granton Square	September 2015	Unsold due to title issue and location within a roundabout.	Not applicable	Not applicable
Juniper Green	531 Lanark Road	September 2015	Policy and Sustainability Committee on 16 May 2020 approved a Community Asset Transfer.	£23,000	None
Joppa	82 Joppa Road	September 2015	Under offer for lease subject to contract negotiations.	Under offer subject to lease contract	Not applicable
Corstorphine	199 St Johns Road	September 2015	Sold 16 August 2017	Gross Income £40,000	None

London Road	3 Royal Terrace Gardens	September 2015	Sold 5 June 2017	Gross Income £189,500	None
Tollcross	5 West Tollcross	September 2015	Sold 29 June 2018	Gross Income £105,000	None
Hunters Square	11 Hunters Square	2017	Closed following request from Police Scotland due to extensive anti-social behaviour.	Not applicable	Not applicable
The Mound	2 The Mound	2018	Closed. Extensive repairs work required	Not applicable	Not applicable
Middle Meadow Walk	1 Meadow Walk	2018	This property is not owned by the Council. Quartermile Ventures Ltd have secured Planning permission to demolish and re-design area including this toilet block.	Not applicable	Not applicable

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

- Question** (1) How many suggestions for safer walking and cycling measures were received through the Commonplace online portal since it was launched in May, broken down by ward?
- Answer** (1) Over the period that Commonplace was live there were a total of 4,105 comments and 31,687 agreements were registered. This information has not been broken down on a ward by ward basis.
- Question** (2) What percentage of these suggestions have so far been implemented as a result of one or more of the spaces for people projects?
- Answer** (2) The map included in the Spaces for People report presented to Policy and Sustainability Committee on [20 August](#) provides a visual representation of the Spaces for People programme with an overlay showing the locations of comments received and the number of agreements with these comments.
- Question** (3) Can she provide a table listing all the spaces for people projects either implemented or approved for implementation, showing in each case the number of people who had suggested such a change through the Commonplace online portal?
- Answer** (3) It is not possible to link the comments and agreements received directly to the schemes which have been implemented. The comments and agreements have been analysed by designers of the existing schemes to integrate any changes arising from the comments or are being considered by officers for development into a future scheme.
- Question** (4) Given current funding levels, what percentage of the suggestions made through the Commonsplace online portal so far are likely to be implemented by the end of 2020?

Answer (4) The report which was considered by Policy and Sustainability Committee on 20 August included a breakdown of the budget allocated to each existing scheme and showed that additional funding has been set aside to progress schemes directly arising from comments received which do not form part of the planned schemes to date. It is not possible to provide this breakdown as a percentage of the comments received by scheme.

Supplementary Question Yes thank you very much Lord Provost. In Question 2, I had asked what percentage of suggestions made through the portal had been delivered so far and the answer that was given to me didn't really answer it and pointed me to a heat map of the city showing where comments had been received. Given the fact that we're now three months on from asking people for their ideas, I think it was a fair question to ask what percentage of ideas had actually been acted on, so is Councillor Macinnes honestly saying that 3 months on nobody knows?

Supplementary Answer This is again a topic which has been covered recently at Policy and Sustainability and was indeed covered in some detail from the senior officers involved. As you'll recall from that conversation Councillor Lang there is quite a lot of complexity attached to this not least the fact that we're still waiting for the analysis of this to come through from Sustrans because it is in fact a very complex project in order to try and answer the question in a way in which you posed it. It's not possible to answer in the way that you posed it because each commonplace comments made by individuals, those comments don't necessarily equate to a proposed project, for example comment may only relate to a short section of a proposed project, or they may propose multiple solutions or simply flag issues in a location. There has already been a commitment undertaken by the service to fully consider the information that's come through via the commonplace tool and is being used to try and inform decision making as we've gone through it at this point. There's more yet to come as has been explained on many occasions and as we get the information through from commonplace analysis we will be able to be much more open with the information as it relates to the projects that are currently under development, thank you.

QUESTION NO 3**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Leader of the Council at a meeting of
the Council on 25 August 2020**

At the meeting on 11 June 2020, the Policy & Sustainability Committee resolved that the Council Leader should write to the Board of Lothian Buses asking them to reconsider the inclusion of a bonus for the company's managing director and take the first opportunity to remove this aspect of remuneration when making a permanent appointment.

- Question** (1) On what date did the Council Leader write to the Board of Lothian Buses?
- Answer** (1) Verbal communication on this matter was followed up in writing on 19 August 2020. This is in advance of the Lothian Buses Remunerations Committee consideration expected in February 2021.
- Question** (2) Will he publish a copy of the letter sent?
- Answer** (2) Yes.
- Question** (3) Has the Council Leader received a response?
- Answer** (3) Not yet
- Question** (4) If he has received a response, will he publish a copy of the reply received?
- Answer** (4) Yes, assuming there is no information contained in the response that would be inappropriate to publish.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you. On what date did the verbal communication take place and was it just a coincidence that the letter was sent just after I submitted my question?
- Supplementary Answer** I'm more than happy to ask Councillor Macinnes who led that verbal exchange obviously after Committee with the Chair of Lothian Buses as obviously Transport and Environment Convener and indeed as Transport for Edinburgh Chair. No it is not a coincidence, there were about 10 letters that I had to work through, they're prioritised in terms of information I'm getting from officers so that I

have the right information I'm sending and indeed, prioritised in terms of patient getting officers throughout the by implication of sending and indeed prioritised in terms of what has to be done as quickly as possible as Councillor Lang will see from the answer the deadline that we're working to is essentially February next year, which I think most people would see as quite a timeous response.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 August 2020**

- Question** (1) How many complaints have been received regarding the obstruction of public footways because of overgrown trees, shrubs or hedges in each of the last five months?
- Answer** (1) From 01/03/2020 - 17/08/2020 there have been a total of 1,324 enquires received in relation to obstruction of public footways due to overgrown trees/shrubs/hedges.
- Question** (2) Of these complaints, how many have been inspected by an officer and how many have yet to be inspected?
- Answer** (2) These enquiries are recorded on our systems as actioned or outstanding. To date:
- 857 have been actioned; and
 - 467 remain outstanding.
- Question** (3) Of those inspected by an officer, how many have resulted in
- a) advisory letters being issued and
 - b) statutory notices being issued?
- Answer** (3) This information is recorded in a paper-based system and it has not been possible to collate all of this information in preparing this response. It is intended to circulate this information to Elected Members by the end of August 2020.
- Question** (4) How many officers are currently employed for the purpose of dealing with issues relating to the obstruction of public footways due to overgrown trees, shrubs or hedges?
- Answer** (4) There are five Safety Inspectors whose responsibilities include recording these types of obstructions, as part of their safety inspections and five Roads Inspectors who respond to issues as these are raised.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you and I'm very grateful for confirmation from the Convener that there will be some follow up information provided by the end of this month and I think that that's very helpful, but given her answer to question 2, which confirmed that a third of complaints about obstructions from trees and bushes are still to be actioned, can the Convener clarify, and this may be a follow up that may need to go in the briefing I appreciate, but can the Convener clarify if the Council has any target times for acting on complaints of this kind and if we don't, does she think new targets should be introduced?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I don't have that specific information to hand Councillor Lang as you might imagine because it's a purely operational matter, but yes indeed I think targets are always helpful in any area of service delivery and it's certainly something that I'll be discussing with head of service on this. As you know the whole issue around blockages to footpaths, in particular from overgrown tree, is an area that's fraught with problems because inevitably a lot of that lies with the responsibility of private landowners whether it's a garden, whether it's a larger facility and our ability to effect immediate action around that is actually quite difficult sometimes. I will certainly ask the head of service to come back to yourself and to the rest of the Councillors with some indication of how we might be able to absorb what you just said.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 August 2020**

The opportunity to renew a garden waste collection service permit opened on 30 July for the year starting on 9 November 2020. This renewal period ends on 9 September.

Question (1) Why is it necessary to have a two month gap between the deadline for renewal and the commencement of the next service year, given that surely most permit holders are expected to renew?

Answer (1) The two month period between the permit registration period closing and the new service starting enables the routing system to be updated with any additions or changes and to address any operational issues which have arisen in the previous period. This period also allows for eligibility checks to be completed and any issues resolved and to complete the preparation and mailing of permits to customers in advance of the service commencing.

Question (2) How many email reminders will the Council issue to existing permit holders before the deadline on 9 September?

Answer (2) One email was sent at the start of the registration window for garden waste customers with email address details. The remaining customers (including those with a failed email or out of office) were sent a letter.

No further email reminders are planned.

Question (3) What proposals does the Council have, either under consideration or in progress, to automate the entire permit process in future?

Answer (3) Officers are working on plans to simplify and automate the back office processes for garden waste permits to allow more flexibility to reduce the time taken between registration and the service commencing and to extend the mid-year sign up window.

Question (4) Given the objective to increase space on pavements to help people to keep a safe distance, would it be possible to include a polite message in the next communication to garden waste permit holders, for example as suggested at 2. above, to cut back shrubs and trees that overhang onto pavements and footways?

Answer (4) This will be included in future correspondence to garden waste permit holders and will also be added to wider communications about garden waste.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and my thanks to the Convener for her answers. By way of supplementary, with regard to the second question, would the Convener agree that issuing a reminder by e-mail around a week or so before the end of the registration window might increase take up and therefore also revenue to the council?

Supplementary Answer Thank you Councillor Ross. Inevitably we could put in a whole campaign of e-mail reminders to go through this process, but there is a question of officer resource attached to it, there's a question of what response that produces. As it is reasonable amount of time for people to make that decision to contact us, there are also reminders out on the street, one of my neighbours just very recently mentioned it to me, that she had seen the reminder of the time scales attached to the access period and so on. How far do we take it, I am concerned particularly about giving our team enough space and resource to actually deliver on the service that we've got. We've seen a very high quick take-up anyway of the garden waste registration, it was above and beyond anything that we expected when we first started the whole process, so I think the system that we've got at the moment is working relatively effectively. Having said that there's always room for improvement, I'll be asking the head of service to take notice of that and to see whether or not as you get to the end of this process taking a slight difference in circumstances that this year with the extension of the period due to Covid to see whether or not this would be appropriate for future years.

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Question (1) Prior to a pop up cycle lane being implemented what measures are put into place to ensure that the road surface is fit for this purpose safe to use and not full of potholes/ loose gravel?

Answer (1) As part of the Spaces for People Programme, an inspection of the route is carried out and any actionable defects identified are addressed. A budget allocation has been set-aside to undertake appropriate road patching where issues are identified. Over the last 6 weeks significant repairs have been completed on Forrest Road, George IV Bridge, the Mound, Old Dalkeith Road and Crewe Road South.

Question (2) What measures are in place to make sure these pop up lanes are cleaned regularly and safe to use?

Answer (2) There have been some challenges in ensuring that road space and segregated cycleways are kept clean but Waste and Cleansing and Spaces for People teams are working hard to put measures in place to improve the on-going cleanliness of new cycleways.

Question (3) How (and who to) do members of the public report issues such as debris within the pop up cycle lanes?

Answer (3) The most efficient way to report any on-street issue is through the Report It section on the Council Web Page <https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/report> .

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and thank you very much indeed Convener for your answers. It's just a quick follow-up, aside from being full of potholes, the biggest complaint I get from cyclists about cycle lanes is that they're often full of debris which makes them dangerous and slippery and if you look at

the conditions today you can probably understand why. So in answer to my question there on how individuals can report this, the suggestion was to log it through the report-it section on the council web page, a helpful link was provided which if you click on it gives you roughly 36 additional options, but it's not apparent under which one you could actually log the cycle paths and how to clear the debris. So I'm just wondering if it's possible to ask the Convener to have a look at this to see whether it would be possible to actually make it a lot clearer, a lot easier, so that individuals can do this in that way hopefully encourage more individuals to do so and then use some of the cycle lanes, thank you very much.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Osler. I'm always keen on finding ways to make it easier for people to participate on these kinds of topics and to make their feelings known and to direct us to where we need the attention. The answer is yes to your question, I'll ask the head of service to look at it although I am conscious that we can expand some of these response mechanisms till the cows come home and there will always be an additional piece that we need to look at, however, we do need to make it as clear as we possibly can. I do recognise it as a regular commuter cyclist myself, I recognise the issue. One of the issues that we always have is getting access to clean those areas, you'll note your reference earlier on to potholes in cycle lanes you'll note there we're actually doing as part of spaces for people programme and our wider road maintenance we're actually doing quite a lot of resurfacing projects which I hope will help take care of some of the issues in certain key parts of the city as we go through the next few months.

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

- Question** **(1)** To detail the pupil attendance rate for:
- a) secondary schools as a whole
 - b) primary schools as a whole
 - c) special schools as a whole
- for each of the days w/b 17 August and to give the comparable figures for the first full week of term in 2019-20.
- Answer** **(1)** 12/8/20 – Primary 96.21%, Secondary 98.74%, Special 86.3%
13/8/20 – Primary 96.52%, Secondary 97.75%, Special 86.46%
- 14/8/20 - Primary 94.84%, Secondary 97.78%, Special 84.43%
- 17/8/20 – Primary 95.40%, Secondary 95.90%, Special 91.11%
- 18/8/20 – Primary 95.50%, Secondary 95.08%, Special 90.44%
- Question** **(2)** To detail the percentage of school-based staff present in school for each of the day's w/b 17 August.
- Answer** **(2)** This information has been collected and will be circulated to Elected Members when it has been fully verified.
- Question** **(3)** To indicate which schools have raised concerns about shortages of materials to ensure adequate hygiene standards in schools.

- Answer** (3) Schools that indicated issues in respect of shortages of materials were Broughton High School, Holyrood High School, Craigmoynton High School, Leith Academy and Currie High School. Where there were issue this has been responded to immediately by a dedicated delivery coordinator.
- Question** (4) What pre-symptomatic Covid19 testing is in place or is planned for school staff following the return to school?
- Answer** (4) No plans with regards to testing for asymptomatic staff have been shared with the authority by Health Protection (14.08.20).
- Question** (5) Whether sufficient provision has been made for space around school gates to allow parents to achieve distancing requirements at drop-off and pick-up times?
- Answer** (5) Schools are managing this as part of Scottish Government advice on reopening schools through risk assessment. Where required (again through risk assessment) Temporary Traffic Restriction Orders are in place. As with all risk assessment this should be managed dynamically.
- Supplementary Question** Thanks very much Lord Provost and thanks to the Education Convener for providing this set of answers. In part 4 of the answers, it's about the provision of COVID-19 testing for school staff in schools, this morning the GMB Union have added to calls to provide COVID-19 testing in schools, can the Education Convener clarify whether he is satisfied that no such testing is in place and if not, whether the Council's prepared to make representation to the Scottish Government about providing such testing in schools?
- Supplementary Answer** I can clarify the testing is not the Council's responsibility, it's the Health Protection responsibility, but clearly a number of unions, a number of parents, a number of teachers have been asking about this question and we have been suggesting that we need to have an answer to say no we're not testing, yes we are testing, and at what level that testing should be and that's an ongoing discussion and I am hopeful that that will be clarified soon.

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Chair of the Licensing Board at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Question

What systems are in place for police to report to council officers and Licensing Board on investigations into alleged or confirmed breaches of coronavirus-related public health regulations in licensed premises?

Answer

The Health Protection (Coronavirus) (Restrictions) (Scotland) Regulations 2020 include measures which businesses (including licensed premises) must comply with, in order to protect public health. Both the Council and Police Scotland can take appropriate action should a business be found in breach of the Regulations. If not resolved, a breach of the Regulations would ultimately be reported to the Procurator Fiscal.

Regulatory Services officers are in regular contact with Police Scotland, often several times a week. Regular weekly meetings between senior Council officers and senior Police officers have oversight of any COVID-related activity, including monitoring licensed premises.

Police Scotland and the Council's Licensing Standards Officers have existing powers and well-established processes under the Licensing (Scotland) Act 2005. These powers can be used to call for a review of a premises licence in order to bring a matter to the Licensing Board's attention.

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Corbett for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Question

For the current growing season (2020) what volume of glyphosate herbicide has been used to date and projected by season end, compared to 2019; and what changes have been made to operational guidelines on application compared to previous years?

Answer

The table below provides details of the glyphosate herbicide used in 2019 and 2020.

Type of glyphosate herbicide	2019 Usage Litres	2020 Usage (to date) Litres
Round Up	180	90
Nomix	1,200	145
Asteroid	1,800	N/A
Roseate 360 TF	N/A	360
Total	3,180	595

It is anticipated that 820 litres will be used in 2020.

There have been no changes to the operational guidelines in 2020, compared to previous years. Our policy to reduce Glyphosate has been in place since 2016.

Supplementary Question

Thanks very much to the Convener for the answer. Just for clarification on the issue around operational guidelines, my understanding was that glyphosate wasn't being applied in

play parks, green spaces and public parks and that also where households had no weeds near their home, that wouldn't be applied to footway. So I just wanted to clarify if indeed the operation guidelines are the same this year as in previous years?

**Supplementary
Answer**

My understanding is that that is the case, I mean clearly it's very clearly an operational issue, I'll follow up afterwards to get confirmation of that, but my understanding is that is the case. You'll see in the written answer that you had we've had a dramatic drop in the use of glyphosate across the city between last year and this year, a number of reasons for that, but one of the reasons is that we do clearly recognise a desire within the city to limit or eradicate its use but we have to find a way to balance the demands that we get from some parts of the city for a weed free environment and other areas where there's a slightly greater acceptance of the preferred route of reducing the use of herbicides of this nature and allowing us to find alternative methods.

As you'll know from some of the previous discussions we've had around alternatives to glyphosate there are issues around cost, particularly on a city wide basis and efficacy. We have however recently had detailed conversations with Pesticide Free Balerno who are looking at doing some hand weeding and then taking a set of streets and the adoption of that method might be possible in other parts of the city. All of those moves will help us to further reduce the use of glyphosate across the city and still maintain the standards that are expected of us by residents in terms of the environmental look and facility sometimes within the city. You'll see from the written answer that we've actually dropped use between last year and this year, down to almost a sixth of what was used last year, and I think that's something that most people across the city would welcome.

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 25 August 2020

Question (1) Please provide, broken down by school, the number of high school pupils whose proposed grade was lower than the teacher estimate (prior to the u-turn confirmed by the minister this week).

Answer (1) See below table. Note that this gives the number of presentations rather than the number of pupils. We are unable to give the pupil-level data at the moment but this can be provided later if necessary.

School	Total number of estimates	Number of estimates moved down	% of estimates moved down
Balerno Community High School	1389	493	35%
Boroughmuir High School	2726	455	17%
Broughton High School	1734	487	28%
Castlebrae Community High School	181	30	17%
Craigmount High School	2167	479	22%
Craigroyston Community High School	571	206	36%
Currie Community High School	1349	302	22%
Drummond Community High School	471	150	32%
Firrhill High School	2469	602	24%
Forrester High School	835	309	37%
Gracemount High School	560	267	48%
Holy Rood High School	1500	421	28%
James Gillespie's High School	2604	506	19%
Leith Academy	1343	538	40%
Liberton High School	723	384	53%
Portobello High School	2285	807	35%
Queensferry High School	1236	320	26%
St Augustine's High School	1104	357	32%
St Thomas of Aquin's High School	1555	385	25%
The Royal High School	2547	667	26%
Trinity Academy	1432	390	27%
Tynecastle High School	837	284	34%
Wester Hailes Education Centre	247	85	34%
All secondaries	31865	8924	28%

Question (2) If known, please provide the same information, by school, for the independent secondary schools within the Edinburgh Council area.

Answer (2) We have no access to this data.

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 25 August 2020

Question

As of 17/08 please confirm the following:

- a) How many council run clubs have recommenced? How many are still not operating? And when will the start back up?
- b) How many independent clubs who use council venues (eg. Schools or community centres) are recommenced and how many are still not operating?
- c) Of those Independent clubs not operating, how many have asked to use the venue but the request has been denied (and please state reasons).

Answer

- (a) 88/89 schools have a breakfast club and should be available to parents by 1 Sept at the latest. Data will be gathered at that point.

All OOSC clubs have been supported to open by 31st August. Data will be gathered at this point.

- (b) 10 Community Centres are accessed by 10 providers delivering OoSC. One provider is not yet able to access the Community Centre

34 providers deliver OoSC in 67 schools. Services were requested to commence Monday 17th August.

- (c) None. 1 is currently in process.

Supplementary Question

Thank you very much Lord Provost and again thank you to the Convener. I totally understand about the information regarding clubs all being up and running between 31 August

and 7 September, so could I just ask that a follow up briefing note is circulated to all councillors within a week of that date just to advise us of the numbers in terms of fully operational, partly operational, and not operating, with details of any that are still remaining closed?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Yes I think that's a reasonable request. Obviously it wasn't possible to give a full answer on this one because I didn't want to put too much pressure on schools because they have a hundred and one things to do, but these are the sort of timescales I think it's reasonable to suggest that all these clubs, the breakfast clubs and out of school clubs will be operational, but I'll get a report back to members of the Council.

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Young for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Question

Recognising the extended deadline to implement 1140 hours in early years provision please confirm:

- a) how many children who were already receiving 1140 hours have had their allocation reduced - please list affected nurseries if any have a greater than average proportion
- b) How many children who had been advised of an 1140 allocation (but had not started it yet) have now been allocated a lower amount? Please list affected nurseries if any have a greater than average proportion.
- c) For children who were having their allocation reduced, when was this information given to parents?

Answer

- a) 1140 funded places have not been removed from children already receiving this.
- b) 293 children were allocated a lower amount of hours.
- c) Following the SG guidance published on 30 July headteachers were informed of their revised models of delivery on 5 August. Returning parents were informed of their new offer on 7 August, with new start families being informed from 10 August.

Supplementary Question

Thank you very much Lord Provost and again thank you to the Convener for the information. Totally recognising the difficulty having to await Scottish Government clarity until 30 July, but also the impact this of course has on parents who are expected in their place of work have had their childcare,

proposed childcare cut without cover, I wanted to ask the Convener therefore could you advise how soon those almost 300 affected families can hope to have their previously offered allocation reinstated, whether this is dependent on further Scottish Government changes or indeed if we should be managing expectations that won't be until August next year, what information can you provide?

**Supplementary
Answer**

That's a good question, you know that we are producing a report following Callum's motion about 1140, about where we're going in the future with this and there will be a lot more detail in that and I'm hoping that report will come back quickly. As you know before lock down, we were confident that by August we would be able to fulfil our commitment for 1140, unfortunately that didn't happen for all the reasons we know, I don't want to build peoples hopes up, but there is some flexibility within the system if people are willing to move from their locality into different localities, the officials are working out exactly how many additional places we can release and where they're going to be and how we're going to manage that expectation, but we should get that as part of the report back which will come pretty soon.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

In July, the Convener told Council that Safe Travel to Schools proposals would be subject to consultation with Parent Councils. After his answer, that same message was available on the Council's website for all to see. Inexplicably, this message can no longer be found on the Council website

- Question** (1) Can the convener confirm the form of consultation that Parent Councils can expect to be part of when enhancements are being considered to the Safe Travel to their Schools?
- Answer** (1) As part of the School Travel Plan review commencing in September, this will be developed in full consultation with Schools, Parent Councils, Parents and Ward Councillors.
- Question** (2) How can Parent Councils request that their school is considered for an enhanced safe travel plan?
- Answer** (2) All schools within Edinburgh will have their travel plans reviewed over the next 18 months. Officers from the Road Safety team will be in touch with schools and parent councils in due course.
- Question** (3) How can Parent Councils suggest specific changes they believe their Parent Forum would support in terms of improvements to the safe travel to their school?
- Answer** (3) This will be part of the school travel plan review process; we will ask the full school for their suggestions.
- Question** (4) Would the Convener agree that safe Travel to Schools should be a priority for the Spaces for People programme and support Spaces for Pupils?

Answer (4) Under Spaces for People, council and sustrans officers are undertaking assessments at all schools across the city, to assess for the possibility for immediately taking action to aid social distancing around schools such as one-way gates, pavement widening, road closures etc. Due to time constraints, this is not being done with the Parent Councils but in liaison with head teachers for each school.

Supplementary Question Thank you Convener for your answer. I was wondering if you can maybe help me out a wee bit though because I asked in question 1, what form the consultation can take place with Parent Councils and you state that the consultation will take place in full, with schools, Parent Councils, parents and ward councillors, and then your answer to my question 4 asking about the safe travel programme, and it states there that, due to time constraints it's not been done with Parent Councils but liaising with head teachers and each school, so I'm just I suppose looking to find out how these are actually being developed given that the answers are quite different?

Supplementary Answer I apologise if that's not clear. There's really 2 parts to the process, there's the immediate school return and what we've done is with the officials within the transport department is look at what immediately needs to be done and I think there's about 60 interventions in primary and secondary schools, for instance, in my own ward Preston Street Primary School has had their pavements widened so there's a number of these interventions going on. In terms of the desire to look at the whole safe schools plan over a longer period, that will take a lot longer because clearly we've got 137 schools that will probably take about 2 or 3 meetings if that's about 300 meetings of Parent Councils and everybody interested that's a longer process, but we needed to assess what was required in the short term to get schools back.

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Whyte for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 25 August
2020**

Question **(1)** Can the Leader confirm the potential financial impact on the Council under the terms of the Growth Accelerator Model agreement to finance the St James Quarter redevelopment should future employment and business rates income not achieve the targets set?

Answer **(1)** The grant offer letter from the Scottish Government provides a payment mechanism for the Council, whereby the prudential borrowing costs linked to the purchase of the Growth Accelerator Model (GAM) growth assets are supported in full, subject to meeting targets on (i) resultant growth in both the St James Centre's rateable value and that of the surrounding area and (ii) employment and training. Achievement of these targets will be measured initially over three years and extended for a further three years if not fully met.

Borrowing has been secured at a rate below that assumed in the model which will help to mitigate any reduction in income received from the payment mechanism.

Question **(2)** Whether the Council has been able to secure any change to the legal agreements to lower its potential liabilities, either through negotiation with the developer the Scottish Government or both, considering the impact of the Coronavirus pandemic?

Answer **(2)** Payment to the developer is capped at £61.4m and will only be made upon satisfactory completion of the growth assets. Regular tripartite discussions involving the Council, Scottish Government and the developer have been in place since the project's inception and these remain on-going. Based on information received to date, no changes to legal agreements are considered necessary at this time.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. In Answer 2, the Council Leader says that based on information received to date no changes to legal agreements are considered necessary at this time. Could the Council Leader enlighten us to when he thinks that decision should be reviewed again given the economic situation that surrounds us?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Whyte for the supplementary. Essentially when we have information that points to the necessity to do it and this, as well as a whole host of other decisions that were taken are based on the circumstances as they are changing and it isn't appropriate to try and take further decisions or try and reassess things when either the information picture is incomplete or the information doesn't support a deviation for the course of action that we're on but anything which highlights a need to go back and speak to the government and other partners delivering in relation to the GAM, then there will be no need to do so. If there is a need to do so, then we'll take action at the appropriate time.

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Question Provide details of the number of Drain/Gully clearing trucks that are operational and non-operational?

Answer (1) There are currently four gully motors and one towable high pressure jetter operating within the Council.

Question (2) Provide details of how many staff are used to help unblock drains/gullies across the city?

Answer (2) The team includes:

- 9 Skilled Roadworkers;
- 1 Team Leader;
- 1 Technician; and
- 1 Team Manager.

In addition, a Nightshift Team regularly undertake gully works as part of their duties. This team includes:

- 1 Team Leader; and
- 2 Skilled Roadworkers

Question (3) Provide details of how many complaints/notifications for blocked drains/gullies there have been for each ward for the last 13 months including August 2020?

Answer

- (3) Below you'll see a table for all enquires raised in relation to blocked drains/gullies between 01/06/2019 and 18/08/2020

Ward	Enquiries Raised
Ward 1	565
Ward 2	881
Ward 3	377
Ward 4	329
Ward 5	482
Ward 6	687
Ward 7	400
Ward 8	495
Ward 9	404
Ward 10	995
Ward 11	659
Ward 12	278
Ward 13	231
Ward 14	412
Ward 15	790
Ward 16	498
Ward 17	381
Total	8,864

Question

- (4) Provide details of how many drains/gullies have been unblocked in the last 13 months per ward including August 2020?

Answer

- (4) The table below shows both the amount of attended enquiries as well as the number of gullies cleaned on inspection routes per ward.

Officers do not record the outcome of each enquiry raised however the column 'Inspected and Cleaned' shows the number of enquires which have been attended and the number which have been inspected and cleaned by ward.

This information covers the period 01/06/2019 to 18/08/2020.

Ward	Enquiries Attended	Inspected and Cleaned
Ward 1	558	1,901
Ward 2	874	1,680
Ward 3	375	571
Ward 4	325	295
Ward 5	478	510
Ward 6	678	757
Ward 7	396	1,086
Ward 8	482	808
Ward 9	397	593
Ward 10	985	1,080
Ward 11	646	813
Ward 12	272	358
Ward 13	228	778
Ward 14	409	1,307
Ward 15	779	803
Ward 16	483	740
Ward 17	375	2,955
Total	8,740	17,035

Supplementary Question

Thank you, Lord Provost, and thank you to the Convener for her answers. Just a quick couple of follow ups.

Comments by the Lord Provost

One follow up please Councillor Bruce.

Supplementary Question

Does the Convener think it would be useful for officers to record the outcome of each inquiry?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Bruce. It's an interesting question, but it depends I suppose on how you define the outcome attached to it. The question of gully cleaning is actually quite a complex one, first of all there's some issues sometimes with access because of parked cars etc. that make it difficult for us to get our machinery in there, so that can cause delays, sometimes in trying to get back to, particularly to deal with a specific gully that's been requested some attention for. There's also a whole background really to gully cleaning which I think is worthwhile expanding on, we have a programme which does regular maintenance cleaning but we've also got a section within that of gullies that are recognised as being sensitive in terms of the impact that they have on the wider piece, so there's often a much faster response time around that one so there's a six monthly cleaning programme that deals of those specific types of gullies where we know that there are existing issues. There's also an issue about the role of gullies in dealing with adverse weather effects, we've seen a massive increase in the number of extreme weather events and the question of what is often ascribed to problems with gullies actually can often relate to the capacity that Scottish Water's provided through the drainage system. So there's a number of issues attached here to how all of this affects our residents either in general or during periods of adverse weather effects. How we deal with outcome, yes we can talk about something's been cleaned, we can talk about how it's been cleaned, but what would be difficult for us to do would be to assess the degree of impact that that might have on any future extreme weather event where people might see issues. So the answer to your question is I will ask the head of service to look at it, see whether there is any possibility of us being able to record that in a way which is useful and understandable by ourselves and by the wider public and if that is possible I'll do so.

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Given the financial challenges community organisations face and the reliance that so many communities have on their services, can the Convener please confirm:

Question (1) Which community organisations (by Neighbourhood Networks area) have submitted applications for the Neighbourhood Grant Scheme that are now outstanding for assessment and the amount in each application?

Answer (1) The following applications have been submitted for community grants funding:

Western Neighbourhood Network

St Thomas Church - £4,276.48 approved and awaiting signed grant conditions acceptance form to be returned.

Gogarloch Community Park Association - £3,495 approved and awaiting signed grant conditions acceptance form to be returned.

Rannoch Community Centre Management Committee - £5,000 approved conditionally, awaiting quotes.

Corstorphine Rugby Football Club - £5,000 approved conditionally, awaiting outcome from another funding source.

City Centre Neighbourhood Network

Edinburgh Lothian Greenspace Trust - £5,000 awaiting assessment and decision.

Pentlands Neighbourhood Network

19th Pentland Scout Group - £1,700 awaiting assessment and decision.

Pentland Community Space - £5,000 awaiting assessment and decision.

South West Neighbourhood Network

Sighthill Community Education Centre - £4,500 awaiting assessment and decision.

Question (2) When the Neighbourhood Grant Scheme will be live and able to assess each application?

Answer (2) The scheme is live currently with applications being assessed under delegated authority or via e-funding panels as appropriate to each locality.

Question (3) When these community groups can expect to hear if their application has been successful?

Answer (3) All community groups in the Western Neighbourhood Network have been informed of the outcome of their application.

The community group in the City Centre Neighbourhood Network is anticipated to be notified of the outcome of its application by 28 August 2020.

Applications in the South West and Pentlands Neighbourhood Networks are still subject to assessment and decision. The timescale for notifying community organisations of the outcome is subject to the arranging of virtual panels to carry out this process but anticipated to be by mid-September.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and thank you for the answer. Can I seek some clarity then on your answer to question 3 and specifically in relation to the timescale for notifying community organizations of the outcome is a subject to arranging virtual panels, what steps have been taken to arrange these, are the usual local members of these panels from ward 2 yet to be contacted and what assurances therefore that this will be done to reach the mid-September timescale?

**Supplementary
Answer
(by Councillor
Griffiths)**

My apologies I didn't have my microphone on, I was halfway through answering before I realised, my apologies.

I am unable to give you an answer to that question at this point, but I will have officers check that and get back to you. The aim will be to have the panel set up by mid September but I really would like clarity on that first and will get back to you and inform other Councillors as well.

QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Education, Children and Families
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 25 August 2020**

Can the Convener explain in regard to the Statutory Requirements of Parent Councils:

Question (1) What support has the Council provided to Parent Councils since March 2020, so that Parent Councils could support their school in its work with pupils; represent the views of all parents and carers; encourage links between school, carers, pupils and the wider community?

Answer (1) Headteachers have been working with their own Parent Councils since March 2020. Headteachers have been reminded in August 2020 to use Microsoft Teams for PC Meetings.

Locality Meetings and CCWP resumed in June 2020.

A new QIEO (Marie Lyon) has taken on Parental Engagement as part of her remit and will be joining Jack Simpson, Arran Finlay and Anna Gray at Locality Meetings in session 2020/21 to discuss this with PC Chairs.

Question (2) What guidance and support the Council has produced to help Parent Forums set up Parent Councils this school year, when Government guidelines would preclude in person meetings of parents or carers?

Answer (2) Headteachers have been reminded in August 2020 to use Microsoft Teams for PC Meetings.

Parent Councils have been asked to share their updated contact details for this session to ease communication.

Question (3) What steps has the Convener taken since lockdown to facilitate meetings between Parent Councils, Head Teachers and other Council Officers within the ICT guidelines set out by this Council?

Answer (3) Locality Meetings and CCWP resumed in June 2020. These have been held on Microsoft Teams.

During August and September 2020, additional Locality meetings have been put in the diary to share updates with PC Chairs on

- Meeting 1 – Health & Safety and Health & Wellbeing
- Meeting 2 – Equalities, Equity and Inclusion
- Meeting 3 – Teaching, Learning (including Digital) & Assessment

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer, I always enjoy the Conveners answers. I just wondered, can the Convener just make clear, is the ambition this term to try and engage Parent Councils a little bit more effectively using information technology than we achieved last term?

Supplementary Answer

I'm not 100% sure what you mean by information technology we used last term, but I'm sure if we used it last term then we'll definitely use it this term.

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

As part of the Spaces for People programme covering Safe Travel to Schools, can the Convener confirm how many schools have had:

- Question** (1) Enhancements implemented before students return for the start of the new school year?
- Answer** (1) There have been six enhancements implemented to support students returned for the start of the school year.
- Question** (2) Enhancements planned and shared, in line with the curtailed consultation of the Spaces for People programme?
- Answer** (2) All schools within Edinburgh, including independent schools, are currently being assessed for a variety of measures to assist in physical distancing around schools. Outwith this project, officers are looking to review routes to school, and measure the success of school streets, park smart, and park and stride travel plans in place at many schools.
- Question** (3) No changes compared with February this year?
- Answer** (3) Every school has been or will be offered the opportunity to make interventions. These are being or will be assessed and it hoped that most changes will be in place by mid-September.
- Supplementary Question (by Councillor Webber)** Thank you very much. So we heard coming back to the answer that the Education Convener gave, so we've said there's 6 that have had enhancements made before the school year and there's now 137 schools. So given that we knew the date of return was 11 August for either full-time or blended education, did we not think it might be useful to prioritise the safe spaces for school given that there's an undisputed link between the increase in traffic and when schools go back?.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Councillor Webber, there is already existing work that goes on within the transport department around safer aspects of entry to school and that's an ongoing programme. In terms of specifics attached to spaces for people, we've had a number of thematic priorities as you'll know from studying the programme, a number of things which have been put in place, we have put in place to keep our priorities so yet more notifications came out I think yesterday and the day before, looking at further enhancements beyond the ones that are limited here. The full intention is to work closely with the schools as much as possible. However I would make a public plea which is, as many people as possible who are taking their children into school, if they can do it in a way which allows first of all for safe social distancing, it would be very helpful, and also if cars cannot be used to deliver children to school, instead of having children walk, wheel, scoot, cycle as much as possible, that would allow a greater degree of safe physical distancing around schools and would be beneficial on a number of fronts, for the management of access to the schools for children. So the programme is ongoing, we're moving as quickly as we can, but there are a number of priorities within the spaces for people programme of which the schools are a key part, but we've prioritised it and we've done the greatest degree of intervention that we can at this point .

QUESTION NO 19

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 August 2020**

Will the Convener please detail:

Question (1) The range of Council employees that have been furloughed and the time frame for which job retention scheme applications were made?

Answer (1) The range of Council employees/workers placed on Furlough leave was previously detailed in the Members Briefing Note 640 issued by the Head of Human Resources on 10 June 2020, specifically within Section 5, "*Eligible Groups within CEC*".

In terms of the time frame for making applications, employees/workers were required to be placed on furlough leave by 10 June 2020 at the latest and the last date that applications in respect of those employees could be made to HMRC was 31 July 2020.

Question (2) The date from which council employees were unable to work due to Covid- 19?

Answer (2) This varies depending upon the nature of the role employees/workers were undertaking, for example when the Council implemented the lockdown arrangements a number of employees/workers were unable to work due to the office, building or school they are normally based in being closed. Other employees/workers have been able to continue to work remotely or were repurposed to undertake necessary alternative duties.

Question (3) Any engagement undertaken with Dundee Council, CoSLA or any other Scottish local authorities as to their job retention scheme applications?

Answer (3) Senior Council Finance and Human Resources Officers engaged with their counterparts at Dundee City Council in respect of their Job Retention Scheme (JRS) applications to discuss implementation mechanisms. No other Scottish local authorities were engaged with in respect of this matter and CoSLA did not provide any guidance or comment upon on Local Authorities accessing the JRS.

Question (4) What consideration has been given to applying for the job retention scheme bonus from February 2021 and the current status of this work?

Answer (4) As reported to the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 23 July 2020, which Councillor Johnston attended, in section 4.12 of the Revenue Budget 2020/21 Update, there was the potential for the Council to consider applying for a payment for each employee/worker “returning” from furlough leave. This was subject to confirmation of the scheme’s full applicability to the Council.

The details of this scheme have only recently been published by the UK Government. This will be given consideration, in due course, and will be reported to the Finance and Resources Committee, as necessary.

Question (5) Whether any Council employees have been 'flexibly' furloughed since 1st July 2020 and, if so, how many and in which department(s)?

Answer (5) No Council employees/workers have been 'flexibly' furloughed.

Supplementary Question A point of clarification on answer 4, the answer states that no employees have been flexibly furloughed, does that mean the employees that were furloughed continue to be furloughed, and are fully furloughed?

Supplementary Answer Councillor Johnston, my understanding that is the case but rather than give you information that is not correct I will have that clarified and get back to you on it.

(by Councillor Griffiths)

**Comments by
the Lord
Provost**

If it's possible to circulate to all Councillors on that.

**Answer (by
Councillor
Griffiths)**

I will do, yes.

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Question (1) Can the Convener confirm how many newly qualified (probationer) teachers have been offered roles within City of Edinburgh schools?

Answer (1) 147 (50 so far in secondary. An advert with a closing date of 24th August is currently on *Myjobscotland* targeted at the current CEC supply list, including NQTs without substantive posts, for 23 fixed-term secondary and 9 fixed-term special vacancies as per the Scottish Government's initiative.)

Question (2) What percentage of those meeting employment conditions at interview earlier this year have been offered contracts?

Answer (2) Primary – 100% (if this is referring to the central recruitment)
Secondary – 100% in a variety of recruitment tranches since January 2020

Question (3) Can the Convener confirm how many have been offered permanent vs temporary positions?

Answer (3) 66 permanent (45 permanent in secondary)

Question (4) Can the Convener confirm if hiring has been affected by COVID-19 and if so what is the percentage decrease in hires in 2020 versus 2019?

Answer (4) Hiring has not been affected by Covid-19 for teaching posts and we have been able to offer more posts as a result of Government funding received to support closing the attainment gap.

QUESTION NO 21

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Can the Convener confirm in regard to Spaces for People TTROs:

- Question** Whether there have there been any legal challenges intimated or underway to the use of TTROs for the implementation of Spaces for People Measures?
- Answer** (1) There has been one intimated legal challenge.
- Question** (2) The outcome of any such legal challenges?
- Answer** (2) No legal challenge was progressed.
- Question** (3) Whether any guidance has been changed as a result of any initiated or actual legal challenge?
- Answer** (3) No guidance has changed.
- Question** (4) Whether any Councillors were informed of the legal challenges, and if yes, who?
- Answer** (4) There was no legal challenges just an intimation of a legal challenge.
- Question** (5) What types of parking/loading bays can be suspended under the current TTROs and whether there has there been any change in advice on this since the start of the project?
- Answer** (5) Under the current TTROs all types of parking/loading bays can be suspended and there has been no change in the advice provided at the start.
- Question** (6) Whether there has been any actual change in the type of bays suspended and the reason for this?
- Answer** (6) There has been no change.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost. I'm sorry my page has gone completely blank with my notes on, I go from 5.20 to 5.22, however, given that a legal challenge was intimated, can I ask to which Councillors it was intimated and whether there will be an update on this, and can that be circulated to all councillors, the progression on what is happening with this legal challenge that was the intimation of the legal action that was intimated, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

I'm sorry I was having some slight difficulty in hearing you there Councillor Mowat and Lord Provost, but if I've heard correctly you were asking whether or not we would have further information coming out about that one specific intimated legal challenge, if that's the case, then it states quite clearly that no legal challenge was progressed, now I will ask the service whether or not we are able to provide any further information about that intimated legal challenge, but I'll have to get advice from the service as to how much information we can bring forward and I'd be happy to do so if we can.

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 25 August 2020

Can the Convener please advise:

Question **(1)** In respect of Edinburgh's £1.65million share of the Scottish Government's Food Fund, how much of this money has been allocated and who in the Council is responsible for identifying those in need and qualifying for food deliveries and other essential items?

Answer **(1)** In March 2020 the Council was allocated £1.651m from the Scottish Government Food Fund to support the supply and distribution of food to vulnerable citizens.

The Council's use of the Fund has included direct payments for free school meals (£1.037m), the provision of food boxes to families with vulnerable children (£0.251m) and payments to EVOC (£0.312m) to facilitate the provision of food support through community organisations. Expenditure on small grants totalling £20k and emergency food boxes totalling £31k have also been incurred.

Those who contacted the Council through the special helpline which was established as required by the Scottish Government and met the Scottish Government's criteria were referred to EVOC so they could be given the support they required.

Question **(2)** In respect of the £50,000 announced as being made available by the Council to provide targeted support to smaller scale community groups in their efforts to help vulnerable residents should they fail to be successful in applying for available grants, how much of this money has been allocated and to which community groups?

Answer

- (2) From the allocated 50k grant fund, the Council received 14 applications from which the following allocations were made. The criteria for applications was set out as follows;

Criteria

- 1) A CEC fund of £50,000 will be made available to Edinburgh third sector organisations, voluntary projects, faith groups and other projects undertaking work to support vulnerable groups amid the COVID-19 crisis. Funding must be used to meet new and additional need or demand as a result of COVID-19, not to back-fund an existing resource or project. Funding is subject to approval by City of Edinburgh Council, at its discretion.

- 2) In order to be eligible to apply, groups must:

Have applied for Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations (SCVO) or other funding and been declined. I.e.
<https://scvo.org.uk/support/coronavirus/funding/for-organisations/wellbeing-fund/guidance-for-applicants>.

or

Have been approved for funding, but for financial reasons are likely to cease operating before the payment is released.

or

Because of their status are ineligible to apply for the funding outlined above and require financial support to sustain their project.

- 3) Fund allocations will be made in tiered amounts, from £100 to a maximum of £5,000.

- 4) Following referral, funds can be made available the following day if required. An application form must be completed by each requester in order to have a documented audit trail. Each application is assessed by a sub-group of the Board. There is no ceiling in terms of what groups can apply for i.e. maximum amount in combined grants and support.

Organisation Name	Number	Status	Amount
Corstorphine Community Hub	6	Successful	5000
Steps to Hope	4	Successful	2000
Mia's Hope	3	Successful	230
Edinburgh Food Social	2	Successful	5000
Goodtrees Neighbourhood Centre	14	Successful in part	2500
Pilmeny Youth Centre	13	Successful in part	240
Empty Kitchens Full Hearts	10	Successful in part	3000
			£17, 970.00

QUESTION NO 23

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 25 August 2020**

In relation to Spaces for People proposals for:

- Comiston Road / Buckstone Terrace
- Wester Hailes Road

Question (1) How many comments were received in total for each scheme?

Answer (1) The total number of comments received were as follows:

- Comiston Road / Buckstone Terrace – 167
- Wester Hailes Road - 26

Question (2) How many comments were

- (a) from individuals and
- (b) from organisations in respect of each?

Answer (2) (a) The total number of comments from individuals were as follows:

- Comiston Road / Buckstone Terrace – 152
- Wester Hailes Road - 9

(b) The total number of comments from organisations were as follows:

- Comiston Road / Buckstone Terrace – 15
- Wester Hailes Road - 11

Question **(3)** For each proposal, how many were

- (a) for/supportive of the proposals;
- (b) against/objections to the proposals;
- (c) neutral

Answer **(3)** For Comiston Road/Buckstone Terrace:

- 38 were for/supportive;
- 123 were against/objections; and
- 6 were neutral.

For Wester Hailes Road:

- 2 were for/supportive;
- 17 were against/objections; and
- 1 was neutral.