

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 15 October 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
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
Cameron Rose
Neil Ross
Jason Rust
Stephanie Smith
Alex Staniforth
Mandy Watt
Susan Webber
Iain Whyte
Donald Wilson
Norman J Work
Louise Young

1 Response to Council Motion on Whistleblowing Culture – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

On 17 September 2020, the City of Edinburgh Council considered an emergency motion by Councillor Whyte on Whistleblowing Culture. This motion was referred onto the Policy and Sustainability Committee of 6 October 2020 to allow any relevant information relating to the process and timeline of investigations to be presented by officers and then brought back to Council on 15 October 2020 for a full discussion.

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred the report which provided a response to Councillor Whyte's motion and which also set out some details in relation to the current confidential ongoing investigation, to the Council for decision.

Tom Stocker of Pinsent Masons was present to answer questions.

Decision

To approve the following motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) Council notes:
 - a) that the Chief Executive has commissioned Pinsent Masons to undertake an independent review into certain specific matters and this is currently expected to complete its work in the Spring next year. Group Leaders have been consulted on the remit of this review, it is now underway as set out in paragraph 4.7 of the report by the Chief Executive, and that an independent Chair will join this work when appointed;
 - b) that Pinsent Masons have already recommended names of potential independent Chairs for this and a wider inquiry into Council culture and an approach has been made to the Dean of the Faculty of Advocates seeking suggestions for additional candidates;
- 2) Building on the decision made at Council on 17 September 2020 Council agrees that:
 - a) a further independent inquiry into organisational culture and relevant processes will be undertaken as outlined in paragraphs 4.17-4.22 of the report by the Chief Executive as called for in the motion in Appendix 1 to the report;
 - b) the appointment of an independent Chair will be undertaken through a selection process by Group Leaders following meetings with suitable available candidates identified through the process at 1b) above;

- c) the remit of the investigation into organisational culture will be determined by the independent chair after consultation with Group Leaders as set out in paragraph 4.18 of the report.
 - d) regular updates will be provided to Group Leaders as set out in paragraph 5.1 of the report and requests that these meetings be clerked to ensure formal minuting of this reporting structure.
- 3) That the Chief Executive provide a briefing on other Councils who have adopted this Council's best practice in respect of Whistleblowing and the use of Safecall and how they have taken that forward, together with details of Safecall's current reporting structure.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Whyte

(References: Act of Council No 16 of 17 September 2020; Policy and Sustainability Committee of 6 October 2020 (item 1); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

2 Spaces for People – East Craigs Low Traffic Neighbourhoods – referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

(a) Deputation – Low Traffic Corstorphine

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Low Traffic Corstorphine.

The deputation noted there was good evidence from other places in the UK and Europe that showed it was likely a low traffic neighbourhood (LTN) would bring benefits to East Craigs and west Edinburgh. The deputation acknowledged there had been some opposition to this scheme but hoped that the Council would support the trial and all the potential that came with it.

(b) Deputation – Drum Brae Community Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Drum Brae Community Council.

The deputation raised concerns about the introduction of the East Craig's LTN and particularly about democratic accountability, the need for greater transparency from the Council administration about the strategy and methodology, and equality impact and emergency service access, especially given the older demographic of the area.

They indicated that many residents believed that they were already in a 'low traffic neighborhood' and therefore sought to engage with the Council around

focused interventions on specific issues, rather than what they viewed as an extreme measure.

(c) Deputation – Corstorphine Community Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Corstorphine Community Council.

The deputation stated that Corstorphine Community Council was entirely supportive of the health and safety rationale behind the 'Spaces for People' measures; recognised the intent behind Low Transport Neighbourhoods; continued to advocate for traffic management measures including combating parking and 'rat running' issues; and encouraged provision for cyclists and walkers. They strongly advocated for an exacting Low Emission Zone (LEZ) for the whole City and not the two-tier LEZ that was currently proposed.

The deputation indicated that they would continue to engage with the City Council in a collaborative manner and to solicit the views of all members of their community to represent them faithfully as they worked with the Council in helping find solutions that addressed issues in ways that commanded community support.

(d) Deputation – Get Edinburgh Moving

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Get Edinburgh Moving.

The deputation believed that the Council's process in advancing the LTN proposals had been far from optimal, and its divisive methods had created a lack of trust on the part of the community. There were deep concerns about the extent to which the transport agenda was being driven by SusTrans as key council staff were seconded from SusTrans, funding was provided by them, and implementation responsibility ceded to them by the Council.

The deputation urged the Council to cancel or at least pause the process and give the community a say and proper consultation.

(e) Referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report on proposals for the introduction of temporary Low Traffic Neighbourhood (LTN) in East Craigs to the Council for approval.

Details were provided on further plans for temporary LTNs and a Quiet Route which were being developed as part of the Spaces for People programme.

Motion

Council:

Notes that the report by the Executive Director of Place was examined in full, with detailed officer responses, at the Transport and Environment Committee on 1 October 2020 where it was agreed by the Committee, before being referred to Full Council for further consideration under the relevant standing orders.

Notes that questions emerged from some residents over the legal basis of the LTN proposal and that this was detailed in a deputation to Transport and Environment Committee received immediately prior to the meeting.

Requests officers provide a summary of legal advice provided to members prior to the next Transport and Environment Committee meeting on 12 November 2020 to allow full scrutiny of this matter by elected members.

Agrees that, if necessary, options for further compliant revised designs should be brought forward to that 12 November 2020 meeting which would address any issues resulting from legal advice and ensure the safety of the public and better conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling on a temporary basis during the public health crisis.

Notes the agreement of the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 14 May 2020 to a composite motion proposed by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day, to move forward as early as possible, and that the report included a proposal to “Close selected roads to enable local trips to be made safely, especially to parks etc and schools” in the East Craigs area.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

Council:

- 1) Agrees that until legal counsel has been received and made available, Members are not in a position to approve this report.
- 2) Agrees that in absence of same, Council will refer this back to Full Council next month for further scrutiny.
- 3) Irrespective of the outcome of 1), agrees no part of the programme will be progressed unless or until a redesign is in place that gains local support and therefore requests a full, comprehensive consultation with the local community.
- 4) Agrees that this will include a) road safety audits b) equalities impact assessments c) plans for significant improvements to current path network in

East Craigs. D) prioritises the views of residents living within the proposed area.

- 5) Notes with concern that the West Edinburgh Link Consultation is being used as evidence of wide-spread approval for this scheme.
- 6) Agrees to implement an immediate and ongoing programme of works to strip back the overgrown vegetation on pavements on both sides of Maybury Road in order to reclaim the full pavement area as space for people.
- 7) Agrees to a full review of the East Craigs Path Network to make it safe underfoot to make it enjoyable for all residents to use in line with social distancing guidelines under Spaces for People.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Brown

Amendment 2

Council:

- 1) notes the substantial opposition expressed by residents in East Craigs, North Gyle and Craigmount; local ward councillors and the local community council to the original Low Traffic Neighbourhood proposals for this area.
- 2) acknowledges the considerable concerns that remain around the revised scheme and that a number of issues raised in regards to the original plans have still not been addressed.
- 3) notes the external legal opinion presented to the Transport and Environment Committee which questions the legality of pursuing a scheme of this scale through emergency TTRO powers, and that no alternative opinion was provided to councillors in time for proper consideration before the Council meeting.
- 4) therefore agrees not to proceed with implementing the East Craigs Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme until (a) a full public consultation has been carried out and a report presented to the Transport and Environment Committee on the consultation findings and (b) clarity is provided by the Council's inhouse legal team on the issues around the process for implementing a LTN through TTRO powers.
- 5) further agrees that other LTN and Quiet Route proposals should be subject to the same level of public consultation and committee scrutiny before being introduced.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Lang

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), paragraphs 1) and 6) of Amendment 1 and paragraph 1) of Amendment 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), paragraphs 1), 2), 4) and 5) of Amendment 2 were accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1 with paragraphs 2) and 3) being removed from Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	34 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	25 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 (as adjusted): 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.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note that the report by the Executive Director of Place was examined in full, with detailed officer responses, at the Transport and Environment Committee on 1 October 2020 where it was agreed by the Committee, before being referred to Full Council for further consideration under the relevant standing orders.
- 2) To note that questions emerged from some residents over the legal basis of the LTN proposal and that this was detailed in a deputation to the Transport and Environment Committee received immediately prior to the meeting.
- 3) To request that officers provide a summary of legal advice provided to members prior to the next Transport and Environment Committee meeting on 12 November 2020 to allow full scrutiny of this matter by elected members.
- 4) To agree that, if necessary, options for further compliant revised designs should be brought forward to that 12 November 2020 meeting which would address any issues resulting from legal advice and ensure the safety of the

public and better conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling on a temporary basis during the public health crisis.

- 5) To note the agreement of the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 14 May 2020 to a composite motion proposed by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day, to move forward as early as possible, and that the report included a proposal to “Close selected roads to enable local trips to be made safely, especially to parks etc and schools” in the East Craigs area.
- 6) To agree that until legal counsel had been received and made available, Members were not in a position to approve this report.
- 7) To agree to implement an immediate and ongoing programme of works to strip back the overgrown vegetation on pavements on both sides of Maybury Road in order to reclaim the full pavement area as space for people.
- 8) To note the substantial opposition expressed by residents in East Craigs, North Gyle and Craigmount; local ward councillors and the local community council to the original Low Traffic Neighbourhood proposals for this area.

(References – Transport and Environment Committee of 1 October 2020 (item 5); referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

3 Adaptation and Renewal Programme Update – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

a) Deputation - Joint trade unions of City of Edinburgh Council SJC trade unions; UNISON, GMB and Unite the union.

A written deputation was presented on behalf of the Joint trade unions of City of Edinburgh Council SJC trade unions; UNISON, GMB and Unite the union.

The deputation was concerned at the proposals which would enable council officials to access the full transformation reserve of £14.8 million with the only highlighted use for this cash being voluntary severance payments. They stressed that the workforce and services were already at breaking point and to cut more jobs and hours would only compound the problems.

b) Referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report which provided the fifth iteration of regular updates on the Adaptation and Renewal Programme, as was agreed at the meeting of 28 May 2020, to the Council for approval of the use of earmarked reserves up to £14.8m from the Workforce Transformation Fund.

The progress update covered decisions taken in period 14 August to 13 September 2020, the latest COVID-19 Dashboard and a wider programme update together with details on the planning that was underway for the 21/22 Budget process.

Decision

To approve the use of earmarked reserves up to £14.8m from the Workforce Transformation Fund.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 6 October 2020 (item 10); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

4 Public Safety Improvements at Junction of Liberton Brae, Kirk Brae, Mayfield Road and Braefoot Terrace TSB Closures - Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

a) Deputation - Liberton and District Community Council

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Liberton and District Community Council.

The deputation expressed concerns about the safety of this junction for pedestrians and cyclists due in part to the increase in vehicle and pedestrian traffic. They believed that active travel could be encouraged if this junction was made more manageable for pedestrians and cyclists, which included walking to the Cameron Toll retail complex, accessing the Braid Hills area for recreation, walking to school and also accessing the bus stops in Liberton Road for non car travel.

b) Deputation - Liberton Primary School Association

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Liberton Primary School Association.

The deputation expressed concern at the lack of a Safe Route to School for Liberton Primary School children. Whilst the Active Travel Department had been extremely helpful in keeping the Association up to date and involving them as far as possible in this project, they indicated that they would like to ensure that their input to the final designs was taken on board to ensure that the crossing met the needs of children, parents and careers using this route to travel to and from school and that the crossing was put in place next summer as planned.

c) Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

The following motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council notes constituent concerns and representations to Liberton and Gilmerton Ward Councillors and the Liberton and District Community Council, regarding public safety at the major road junction where Liberton Brae, Kirk Brae, Mayfield Road and Liberton Road converge, caused by increasing traffic flows into, and from, this part of South Edinburgh.

Council calls for an assessment of conditions for pedestrians and cyclists to be made at this junction; and a report thereon to be submitted to the Transport and Environment Committee within 3 cycles, outlining what steps can be taken to promote, protect and improve public safety at this major junction, and to encourage more people to adopt and embrace Active Travel choices in this part of South Edinburgh.

The report to include indicative costs and timescales.”

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron.

5 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 17 September 2020 as a correct record.

6 Questions

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

7 Leader's Report

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

- New restrictions which Edinburgh is included in
- Re-opening of facilities
- Support for hospitality providers
- Funding for businesses

- Resignation of the Executive Director for Communities and Families

The following questions/comments were made:

Councillor Whyte	- East Craigs Low Traffic Neighbourhood – working with communities
Councillor Main	- Covid19 - cases and deaths in care homes - testing regime
Councillor Aldridge	- Alistair Gaw, Executive Director for Communities and Families
	- Availability of Counsel's opinion on TTROs for low traffic neighbourhoods
Councillor Dickie	- Black History month – support for young people
Councillor Johnston	- Grants for businesses forced to close – applications process
Councillor Staniforth	- Best wishes to Alistair Gaw, Executive Director for Communities and Families
	- Edinburgh Poverty Commission final report – housing crisis
Councillor Neil Ross	- Local Businesses in Morningside and Bruntsfield – traders concerns following the introduction of Spaces for People measures
Councillor Munro	- Eradicating poverty – meeting with the Scottish Government to ensure that Edinburgh was fully and properly funded
Councillor Gardiner	- Black History month – role of Andrew Watson in Scottish sporting history
Councillor Cook	- Potential for reduced capacity of Administration in the Council
Councillor Osler	- Request to meet with representatives from businesses in the Stockbridge area

Councillor Wilson	- Congratulations to Parks staff and friends groups for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the award of 34 green flag status in 2020 competition - Thriving Green Spaces project funding
Councillor Rust	- East Craigs LTN – unheard voices – consultation process
Councillor Cameron	- Small Business Champion – involvement to help and support work being carried out
Councillor Mowat	- Footfall from outwith the city centre area – concerns around christmas
Councillor Rae	- Congratulations to Linda Somerville for appointment as general secretary to the STUC

8 Supplementary Agreement to Minute of Agreement for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland Region Joint Committee

Details were provided on the Draft supplementary agreement to the Minute of Agreement for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region (ESESCR) Deal. The supplementary agreement had been approved by the ESESCR Joint Committee at its meeting on 4 September 2020.

Decision

To approve the supplementary agreement to the Minute of Agreement for the Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region (ESESCR) Deal.

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

9 The Scheme of Delegation

Details were provided on proposed amendments to the Council's Scheme of Delegation to Officers, in relation to the delegated powers to proper officers.

Decision

- 1) To repeal the Scheme of Delegation to Officers and approve in its place Appendix 1 in the report by the Chief Executive, such repeal and approval to take effect from 1 November 2020.

- 2) To designate the proper officer functions currently appointed to the Head of Strategy and Communications to the Chief Executive from 1 November 2020.
- 3) To designate the function of the Senior Information Risk Officer to the Democracy, Governance and Resilience Senior Manager from 1 November 2020.
- 4) To designate the function of the Investigation Officer (Community Council Complaints) to the Democracy, Governance and Resilience Senior Manager from 1 November 2020.

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

10 Lothian Pension Fund Audited Annual Report (and Financial Statements) 2020 referral from the Pensions Committee

The Pensions Committee had referred a report which set out the Audited Annual Report and Financial Statements for 2020 for the Lothian Pension Fund (LPF) and Scottish Homes Pension Fund to the Council for information.

Motion

Council:

- 1) Notes the audited Annual Report (and Financial Statements) for the year ended 31 March 2020 for Lothian Pension Fund and Scottish Homes Pension Fund;
- 2) Notes the content of the Lothian Pension Fund (LPF) Annual Report 2019/20 relating to Environmental and Social Governance (ESG) and particularly Climate Change and recognises the quality and transparency of reporting by LPF on these issues and its activities in relation to them;
- 3) Notes the decision of this Council to declare a Climate Emergency and to seek to reduce the City's contribution to climate-changing pollution to net zero by 2030;
- 4) Welcomes the recent decision by LPF in its 'Statement of Responsible Principles' not to make any new investments in companies deemed not to be aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris UN agreement on Climate Change;
- 5) Notes that LPF has established a sizeable portfolio of renewable energy assets within its infrastructure asset class and that the growing market in renewable energy and energy efficiency services provide an opportunity for pension funds such as LPF to make further secure and profitable investments in these clean energy companies;

- 6) Notes that LPF intends to be measuring the carbon intensity of 100% of its assets by the end-2022 reporting cycle and believes that this would provide a basis on which to consider a fossil fuel divestment strategy;
- 7) Recognises the role of the Pension Committee in determining matters relating to Lothian Pension Fund and agrees that these issues should be considered further by that committee.

- moved by Councillor Munn, seconded by Councillor Child

Amendment

- 1) To note the audited Annual Report (and Financial Statements) for the year ended 31 March 2020 for Lothian Pension Fund and Scottish Homes Pension Fund.
- 2) Notes the content of this Lothian Pension Fund (LPF) Annual Report 2019/20 relating to Environmental and Social Governance (ESG) and particularly Climate Change.
- 3) Notes the decision of this Council to declare a Climate Emergency and to seek to reduce the City's contribution to climate-changing pollution to net zero by 2030 and that the current policy of LPF to continue to invest in fossil fuel companies is not compatible with this aim.
- 4) Notes that across the world hundreds of institutions with trillions of investments have already committed to divest from fossil fuels.
- 5) Notes that pension funds in the UK local government scheme including the Environmental Protection Agency, Haringey, Hackney, Waltham Forest, Southwark, South Yorkshire and Cardiff have already committed to cut their fossil fuel investments and that two of the the UK's largest pension funds the National Employment Savings Trust (NEST) and Aviva are actively divesting.
- 6) Recognises the 'fiduciary duty' of the LPF to make returns for its members and notes that there are financial and reputational risks to the fund as a result of continuing with investments in fossil fuels, including the possibility of having stranded assets.
- 7) Notes yesterday's Pensions and Lifetime Savings Annual (PLSA) conference keynote session on 'Investing for Good - Climate change poses a systemic risk to nearly all businesses and sectors. It will impact the value of scheme investments and, ultimately, that of individuals retirement savings'.
- 8) Notes the recent negative oil price and low value of shares in fossil fuel companies and the expectation that as global agreements to reduce climate-

changing pollution continue to take effect, investment in fossil fuel companies is likely to become increasingly unprofitable and risky and the Financial Times recent report on scaling back of oil exploration by the industry.

- 9) Notes the massive growing market in renewable energy and energy efficiency services and the opportunity for pension funds such as LPF to make secure and profitable investments in these clean energy companies.
- 10) Believes that many individual members of the LPF would not wish to see their investments continuing to contribute to the global Climate Emergency and that continued fossil fuel investment poses a risk to members and their savings.
- 11) Welcomes the recent decision by LPF in its 'Statement of Responsible Principles' not to make any new investments in companies deemed not to be aligned with the goals of the 2015 Paris UN agreement on Climate Change. However, notes that this policy allows LPF to expand its existing investments in such companies.
- 12) Notes that LPF intends to be measuring the carbon intensity of 100% of its assets by the end-2022 reporting cycle and believes that this would provide a basis on which to implement a fossil fuel divestment strategy.
- 13) Notes the Short-Window Improvement Plan approved by this Council on 25 October 2019 on those actions that can be taken by the Council with immediate effect to improve the organisation's approach to sustainability, included working with LPF 'to seek a wholesale shift away from investment in hydrocarbons' as a way of reducing emissions.
- 14) Therefore this Council believes that the Lothian Pension Fund should divest from companies whose business is the extraction and trading in fossil fuels and requests that it produces a report as to how this will be achieved.

- moved by Councillor Milller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

Voting

For the motion	-	48 votes
For the amendment	-	10 votes

(For the motion: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Cameron, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Child, Cook, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doggart, Doran, Douglas, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Lang, Macinnes, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rose, Neil Ross, Rust, Smith, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Work

For the amendment: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Howie, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Munn:

(References – Pensions Committee of 29 September 2020; referral from the Pensions Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Aldridge declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the recipient of a pension from Lothian Pension Fund

Councillors Burgess, Child and Munn declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of the Pension Committee

Councillor Rose declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a Trustee of the Lothian Pension Fund.

Councillor Neil Ross, declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a Trustee of the Lothian Pension Fund and a member of the Pensions Committee

11 Edinburgh Leisure – Request for Additional Funding Support, 2020/21 – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on a proposal to increase the contract payments to Edinburgh Leisure (EL) in 2020/21 by up to £6m to safeguard the on-going operation of the charity and to support the safe re-opening of venues and services in line with Scottish Government guidance, to the Council for approval.

Decision

To agree to increase the contract payments to Edinburgh Leisure (EL) in 2020/21 by up to £6m.

(References – Finance and Resource Committee of 24 September 2020 (item 5); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Barrie declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a paid up member of Edinburgh Leisure.

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

12 Re-opening of Public Conveniences – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report which provided an update on how the public conveniences which had been reopened in July 2020 were operating and the next steps for developing a public conveniences strategy for Edinburgh.

Decision

To approve the measures and investment required to continue with opening seven public conveniences to the end of the financial year.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 6 October 2020 (item 14); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

13 West Edinburgh Update – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report which provided an update on recent progress and developments including the spatial study for West Edinburgh to maximise inclusive and sustainable growth, and included details of Phase 2 of the study which would be developed alongside the preparation of the proposed City Plan 2030, to Council for approval of the authorisation for the Executive Director of Place to enter into the contract for Phase 2 of the project.

Decision

To authorise the Executive Director of Place to enter into the contract for Phase 2 of the project.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 6 October 2020 (item 23); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

14 Child Protection - Motion by Councillor Dickie

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

“Council:

Welcomes the introduction of the Scottish Government’s landmark ‘UNCRC Incorporation (Scotland) Bill to incorporate the UNCRC into Scots law.

Notes, in particular, Article 19 and the right for children and young people to be protected from all forms of violence, abuse, neglect and mistreatment.

Notes, the section on child protection in the Annual Performance Report to Full Council on 25th August, specifically,

‘There has been a steady reduction in the number of children on the Child Protection Register over the last 12 months which is now at historical lows. End of year figures also show reductions over the last four years from 288 in 2016 to 121 in 2019.’

Recognises, the impact of lockdown on children and families, and on normal engagement with them, and that a spike in child protection concerns is possible as children reconnect with trusted adults in school.

Notes that two elected members (Cllr Alison Dickie for child protection and Cllr Ricky Henderson for adult protection) were invited onto the Chief Officers Group for Public Protection last year to promote best practice and an open dialogue about the service provision and processes for ensuring child (and public) protection.

Further notes, the self-evaluation discussion at the COG on Public Protection on 18 June 2019, about the need to provide elected members with sufficient and appropriate information to help them feel fully assured about the protection of children (and the public) in our city, in line with Scottish Government child protection guidance which states that we all have a role to play in keeping children and young people safe.

Acknowledges, the improved information available to support this assurance, particularly the ‘Children’s and Adult’s Dataset Returns Report’ from the Scottish Government, which provides benchmarks on child protection across local authorities and an analysis of trends.

Further acknowledges, the decision to submit the Child Protection Committee’s Annual Report to the Education, Children and Families Committee to further support accountability and scrutiny.

Council therefore requests,

That the Council, as a whole, reaffirms its commitment to the protection of children in our city, and elected members to actively seeking assurance about their protection.

That the Annual Child Protection Committee Report be submitted to Full Council, in one cycle, to ensure the widest commitment to open dialogue and the protection of children – and every year thereafter.

That the ‘Scottish Government and SOLACE Weekly Dataset on Vulnerable Children’ and ‘Children and Adult’s Dataset Returns Report’ be regularly sent to

elected members on the COG for Public Protection, and all elected members on the Education, Children and Families Committee.

The Chief Social Worker and Head of Safer and Stronger Communities (and Chair of Edinburgh's Child Protection Committee) reports to Education, Children and Families Committee in two cycles, referred onto full Council, on any increase in child protection issues that have been reported since the return to school in August.

Recognising that appropriate information for elected members acting on behalf of constituents is essential in child protection case which may relate to whistleblowing reports, asks that a review of the present arrangements be undertaken in order to suggest ways in which it can be improved.

The report to include action that can further promote public awareness of child protection issues and support for young people to speak out.

A review of the training given to all staff working with children and all councillors be undertaken to suggest how this can be improved including information and guidance about elected members assurance in relation to individual child protection cases.

That consideration be given to extending the whistleblowing audit and review to include,

The recommendations of all whistleblowing reports relating to child protection over the past 10 years, reporting the outcomes to the Governance, Risk and Best Value and Education, Children and Families Committees, and those committees consider any ward callings, or callings to any other elected members as appropriate.

A recommendation that all current and forward whistleblowing reports relating to child protection issues go appropriately to the Governance, Risk and Best Value and Education, Children and Families Committees, and those committees consider any ward callings, or callings to any other elected members as appropriate."

- moved by Councillor Dickie, seconded by Councillor Perry

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Dickie.

15 TSB Closures - Motion by Councillor McVey

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

"Council regrets the decision of TSB to close branches in Pilton, Gorgie and Corstorphine.

Notes for many digitally excluded residents and customers, this will have a negative impact on their ability to carry out essential banking.

Agrees that the Council Leader write to TSB in the strongest possible terms to urge a reversal of this decision and request a meeting with senior TSB management to discuss this issue further, inviting local Councillors, MPs and MSPs in affected areas of the City."

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Perry

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

16 Edinburgh International Activity - Motion by the Lord Provost

The following motion by the Lord Provost was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

"Council notes;

That the Edinburgh International Activity Report was passed by Policy and Sustainability on the 6th August 2019.

That Recommendation 1.3 in the above report was "to work with partners to establish a new International Edinburgh Group as a collaborative way of working".

Instructs the Chief Executive to report, in one cycle, on progress to establish this group and on the detail of any meetings which have taken place."

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

17 University response to Covid Crisis - Motion by Councillor Staniforth

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

"Council:

- 1) Notes that Edinburgh is a university city, with 3 major universities within the city and one further just outside; as well as Edinburgh College.

- 2) Notes that the city's 80,000 students make up a huge part of the city's population, economy and social fabric.
- 3) Acknowledges the huge challenge faced by higher education institutions in the context of the coronavirus pandemic.
- 4) Recognises widespread concern among the student population about the way that the beginning of the 20-21 term has been managed: such concerns including arrangements for and fees for halls of residence; access to food and other support; support for student wellbeing; inconsistent messaging on student movement; and access to testing.
- 5) Therefore agrees that the council leader shall write to the main higher education institutions and to Universities Scotland on behalf of the council seeking assurances that concerns about the welfare of students are addressed and identifying ways in which the council, partners and the higher education sector can work more effectively together to support students through this period."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Corbett

Amendment

To delete paragraph 5 of the motion by Councillor Staniforth and replace with:

"Notes the work that has been done with the city's universities and colleges in relation to student welfare and agrees that CEC will remain in close contact with these organisations with a view to continuing support."

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Perry

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Staniforth:

- 1) To note that Edinburgh was a university city, with 3 major universities within the city and one further just outside; as well as Edinburgh College.
- 2) To note that the city's 80,000 students made up a huge part of the city's population, economy and social fabric.

- 3) To acknowledge the huge challenge faced by higher education institutions in the context of the coronavirus pandemic.
- 4) To recognise widespread concern among the student population about the way that the beginning of the 20-21 term had been managed: such concerns included arrangements for and fees for halls of residence; access to food and other support; support for student wellbeing; inconsistent messaging on student movement; and access to testing.
- 5) To note the work that had been done with the city's universities and colleges in relation to student welfare and agree that CEC would remain in close contact with these organisations with a view to continuing support.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Arthur declared a non-financial interest as a member of UCU and a financial interest as an employee at Heriot Watt University and took no part in the Council's consideration of the above item.

18 Community Factoring – Motion by By Councillor Laidlaw

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

“Council

- 1) Recognises the economic challenges the coronavirus pandemic has wrought and the likelihood of redundancies and increased unemployment as part of the economic recession.
- 2) Notes that factoring of new developments, especially those in mixed tenure, has often been challenging to enforce and there has been a lack of clarity as to whom holds responsibility for certain actions between Council and factors.
- 3) Recognises the challenges that Council Parks and Greenspaces teams face in maintaining verges and borders in traditional social housing schemes.
- 4) Notes the opportunity to outsource some maintenance work to community-led social enterprise factoring schemes.
- 5) Recognises the interest expressed in such an initiative by the Craigmillar Neighbourhood Alliance, and the offer of a pilot scheme at no cost to the Council.
- 6) Agrees a report is produced by the Directorate of Place Management for the next meeting of the Finance and Resources committee to examine how

Council procurement could support the development and implementation of a community factoring scheme and what steps local groups would need to undertake to be able to tender.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Bruce

Amendment

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

Council:

- 1) Recognises the contribution to the regeneration of Craigmillar by the Neighbourhood Alliance and the valuable local knowledge they possess. Recognises further that organisations rooted in their communities have a contribution to make to the ongoing enhancement of the area.
- 2) Therefore, instructs officers to engage with partner organisations; including the Neighbourhood Alliance and Registered Social Landlords, co-operatives and social enterprises to discuss opportunities for community factoring in new developments.
- 3) Agrees that officers report back to the Housing Homelessness and Fair Work committee in two cycles on the outcomes of these discussions, what the next steps could be, and how they could support other local groups with similar aims.

- moved by Councillor Kate Campbell, seconded by Councillor Watt

In accordance with Standing order 22(2) the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Laidlaw:

- 1) To recognise the contribution to the regeneration of Craigmillar by the Neighbourhood Alliance and the valuable local knowledge they possessed. To recognise further that organisations rooted in their communities had a contribution to make to the ongoing enhancement of the area.
- 2) To therefore, instruct officers to engage with partner organisations; including the Neighbourhood Alliance and Registered Social Landlords, co-operatives

and social enterprises to discuss opportunities for community factoring in new developments.

- 3) To agree that officers report back to the Housing Homelessness and Fair Work committee in two cycles on the outcomes of these discussions, what the next steps could be, and how they could support other local groups with similar aims.

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Kate Campbell and Cameron declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Directors of EDI, of which the organisation being discussed was a tenant.

19 Emissions Profile of Scotrail's Inter7City Fleet - Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

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

“Council:

Notes the low numbers of passengers currently traveling by all modes of public transport, including intercity train. Recognises this has substantially increase the emissions and the costs of public transport, when expressed in terms of passenger kilometres.

Wishes to understand the environmental impact of Scotrail's Inter7City fleet, which are anticipated to be a significant source of diesel emissions in the Waverley Valley and therefore instructs the Executive Director of Place to write to the Engineering Director of Scotrail to request:

- a) Information on the emissions standards these engines conform to; and
- b) The projected engine emissions in the Waverley Valley of the Inter7City fleet of trains running a full timetable, in terms of CO₂, NO_x and Particulate matter.

Should this not be forthcoming to Council by the end of 2020, suggests the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee to pursue this matter with Scotrail and, if necessary, the Cabinet Secretary for Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Amendment

To delete from “instructs the Executive Director of Place” in Paragraph 2 of the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell but keeping a) and b) and replace with:

“Request the Transport Convener write to Scotrail to seek their direct commitment to Edinburgh’s 2030 net-zero carbon target and get assurance that their investment plans will reflect this aim.”

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12) the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Jim Campbell:

- 1) To note the low numbers of passengers currently traveling by all modes of public transport, including intercity train. Recognise this had substantially increased the emissions and the costs of public transport, when expressed in terms of passenger kilometres.
- 2) Wish to understand the environmental impact of Scotrail’s Inter7City fleet, which were anticipated to be a significant source of diesel emissions in the Waverley Valley and therefore request the Transport Convener to write to Scotrail to seek their direct commitment to Edinburgh’s 2030 net-zero carbon target and get assurance that their investment plans will reflect this aim with:
 - a) Information on the emissions standards these engines conformed to; and
 - b) The projected engine emissions in the Waverley Valley of the Inter7City fleet of trains running a full timetable, in terms of CO₂, NO_x and Particulate matter.

20 A Fab Currie, Mr Hugh Thomson – Motion by Councillor Webber

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

“Council:

Recognises the heroic efforts of one man in Currie, Mr Hugh Thomson, an ex-employee of the City of Edinburgh Council, who has mobilised an elite group of crack commandoes.

Notes, if you have a problem with weeds, overgrown hedges, sorry looking parks, pavements or public spaces, if the council can’t help, and if you can find him, maybe you can hire... the A-Fab-Currie Team

As a special thanks, asks that Lord Provost invites Mr Hugh Thomson to share a socially distanced cool beverage at a local establishment, which is the way Hugh likes to relax after a hard day grafting across the community.”

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Bruce

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

21 Pavements Clear of Signs – Motion by Councillor Webber

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

“Council:

Understands the need for temporary signs to inform road users of changes and limitations to the road network.

Notes that in many locations, it is highly undesirable for these temporary signs to be placed in the roadway or on the pavement.

Therefore, instructs the Executive Director of Place to seek to explore the barriers to displaying these signs at a high level, making use of lampposts or other Council infrastructure, so that messages are clear to drivers but do not restrict the pavement or the roadway. This should include sounding out other Local Roads Authorities, Local Government associations, levels of Government and Government Agencies.

Asks the Executive Director to report his findings to the Transport and Environment Committee within six cycles.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Cook

Amendment

To insert the following additional text into paragraph 3 of motion by Councillor Webber to read:

“Therefore, instructs the Executive Director of Place to seek to explore the barriers to displaying these signs at a high level, making use of lampposts or other Council infrastructure, so that messages are clear to drivers but do not restrict the pavement or the roadway, with the ultimate aspiration of removing all redundant poles and street clutter, from roads, pavements and cycle tracks. This should include sounding out disability groups and charities, other Local Roads Authorities, Local Government associations, levels of Government and Government Agencies.”

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Webber:

- 1) To understand the need for temporary signs to inform road users of changes and limitations to the road network.
- 2) To note that in many locations, it was highly undesirable for these temporary signs to be placed in the roadway or on the pavement.
- 3) To therefore, instruct the Executive Director of Place to seek to explore the barriers to displaying these signs at a high level, making use of lampposts or other Council infrastructure, so that messages are clear to drivers but do not restrict the pavement or the roadway, with the ultimate aspiration of removing all redundant poles and street clutter, from roads, pavements and cycle tracks. This should include sounding out disability groups and charities, other Local Roads Authorities, Local Government associations, levels of Government and Government Agencies.

- 4) To ask the Executive Director to report his findings to the Transport and Environment Committee within six cycles.

22 Seasonal Maintenance – Spaces for People – Motion by Councillor Webber

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

“Council:

Notes that autumn and winter bring seasonal challenges in maintaining our roads and pavements with leaves collecting in road gutters and pavements, making surfaces slippery for all and can block and obstruct gullies with other consequences, for example localised flooding.

Notes that as we plan for winter the role of our gritters gaining access to keep roads clear is key to ensuring the city stays connected across all the communities.

Requests a report for next Transport and Environment Committee, on the impact of the active and planned Spaces for People schemes on the ability to carry out winter maintenance and preparedness including but not limited to street sweeping, gully cleaning and road and footpath maintenance. That will also include any operational adaptations needed and their financial impact to the directorate.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Cook

Amendment 1

- 1) To accept Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the motion by Councillor Webber.
- 2) To replace paragraph 3 of the motion with:

“Notes that there are existing, well-developed operational measures and plans for winter maintenance and preparedness including but not limited to street sweeping, gully cleaning and road and footpath maintenance. This includes, for example, recent winter maintenance operational plans which include use of advanced technology to direct where operational activity is most effectively deployed.

Notes that any likely financial impact of changes to those operational activities as a result of Spaces for People road space reallocation will be treated as a

project-related cost and will be recovered from the Scottish Government funding provided for Spaces for People.

Requests a Business Bulletin item to November's Transport and Environment Committee which illustrates any additional activity required and likely impact of Spaces for People projects.

That if necessary a briefing note be provided to elected members after the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee to provide a more detailed update."

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 2

To delete paragraph 3 of the motion by Councillor Webber and insert:

- "3) Notes that overhanging branches can also reduce the safety of paths if they are not sufficiently trimmed back, by creating hazards at head height and blocking light from street lamps.
- 4) Notes that access to roads and paths for gritting, gully-cleaning, leaf-sweeping or maintenance is very often difficult due to parked vehicles, and notes that Spaces for People projects help in this regard.
- 5) Commends the Sustrans "Traffic-free routes and greenways design guide", particularly section 11 on management and maintenance.
- 6) Therefore agrees that council officers will consult with key stakeholders such as Lothian Buses, the Edinburgh Access Panel, Sustrans, Spokes and Living Streets and will present a draft maintenance plan for the council's footpaths, off-road paths and on-street cycle lanes to Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles; this plan to include, but not be limited to, the following:
 - a) an inspection regime for routes and all physical assets associated with them, including structures, drainage, signage, interpretation panels, benches, access barriers and any artwork, and including any trees or other vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the path;
 - b) a timetable for proactive winter gritting and autumn leaf sweeping;
 - c) a timetable for proactive vegetation management, including verges and any overhanging vegetation.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Booth

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Webber:

- 1) To note that autumn and winter brought seasonal challenges in maintaining our roads and pavements with leaves collecting in road gutters and pavements, making surfaces slippery for all and can block and obstruct gullies with other consequences, for example localised flooding.
- 2) To note that as we plan for winter the role of our gritters gaining access to keep roads clear was key to ensuring the city stayed connected across all the communities.
- 3) To note that there were existing, well-developed operational measures and plans for winter maintenance and preparedness including but not limited to street sweeping, gully cleaning and road and footpath maintenance. This included, for example, recent winter maintenance operational plans which included use of advanced technology to direct where operational activity was most effectively deployed.
- 4) To note that any likely financial impact of changes to those operational activities as a result of Spaces for People road space reallocation would be treated as a project-related cost and would be recovered from the Scottish Government funding provided for Spaces for People.
- 5) To request a Business Bulletin item to November's Transport and Environment Committee which illustrated any additional activity required and likely impact of Spaces for People projects.
- 6) That if necessary a briefing note be provided to elected members after the meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee to provide a more detailed update.
- 7) To note that overhanging branches could also reduce the safety of paths if they were not sufficiently trimmed back, by creating hazards at head height and blocking light from street lamps.
- 8) To note that access to roads and paths for gritting, gully-cleaning, leaf-sweeping or maintenance was very often difficult due to parked vehicles, and note that Spaces for People projects helped in this regard.
- 9) To commend the Sustrans "Traffic-free routes and greenways design guide", particularly section 11 on management and maintenance.

- 10) To therefore agree that council officers would consult with key stakeholders such as Lothian Buses, the Edinburgh Access Panel, Sustrans, Spokes and Living Streets and would present a draft maintenance plan for the council's footpaths, off-road paths and on-street cycle lanes to Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles; this plan to include, but not be limited to, the following:
- a) an inspection regime for routes and all physical assets associated with them, including structures, drainage, signage, interpretation panels, benches, access barriers and any artwork, and including any trees or other vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the path;
 - b) a timetable for proactive winter gritting and autumn leaf sweeping;
 - c) a timetable for proactive vegetation management, including verges and any overhanging vegetation.

23 Leadership Pure and Simple? – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

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

“Council:

Agrees that the Leader and Depute Leader write to the Aberdeen City Council to congratulate it on its recent achievement in being named UK Local Authority of the Year at the prestigious Municipal Journal Achievement Awards.

Recognises the judges' comments that, “The council has an impressive story to tell in terms of its changing economic context and the bold steps it is taking to deliver an unprecedented transformation of the city through a pioneering capital programme and significant investments in the social and cultural future of its communities.”

Suggests the Leader and Depute Leader enquire what qualities the Co-Leaders of Aberdeen City Council have demonstrated to help their organisation win this award.”

Motion

Council:

Agrees that the Leader and Depute Leader write to the Aberdeen City Council to congratulate it on its recent achievement in being named UK Local Authority of the Year at the prestigious Municipal Journal Achievement Awards.

Recognises the judges' comments that, "The council has an impressive story to tell in terms of its changing economic context and the bold steps it is taking to deliver an unprecedented transformation of the city through a pioneering capital programme and significant investments in the social and cultural future of its communities."

Suggests the Leader and Depute Leader consider enquiring what qualities the Co-Leaders of Aberdeen City Council have demonstrated to help their organisation win this award.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Cook

Amendment

To delete the last paragraph of the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell and replace with:

"Notes the positive impact of the Aberdeen City deal in helping drive this change and the similar work ongoing in the Capital to drive forward inclusive growth through the Edinburgh City Region deal, as well as world-leading developments like Granton Waterfront and Bio-quarter."

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Perry

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), the amendment was adjusted to remove the words "To delete the last paragraph of the motion and replace with", and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	17 votes
For the amendment	-	42 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Duggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.

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

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor McVey as follows;

- 1) To agree that the Leader and Depute Leader write to the Aberdeen City Council to congratulate it on its recent achievement in being named UK Local Authority of the Year at the prestigious Municipal Journal Achievement Awards.
- 2) To recognise the judges' comments that, "The council has an impressive story to tell in terms of its changing economic context and the bold steps it is taking to deliver an unprecedented transformation of the city through a pioneering capital programme and significant investments in the social and cultural future of its communities."
- 3) To note the positive impact of the Aberdeen City deal in helping drive this change and the similar work ongoing in the Capital to drive forward inclusive growth through the Edinburgh City Region deal, as well as world-leading developments like Granton Waterfront and Bio-quarter.

24 Re-Prioritise within the Spaces for People Programme - Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

"Council:

Notes many other Local Authorities have had to modify their proposals and schemes brought forward without proper planning and scrutiny in the immediate aftermath of the Coronavirus Pandemic and associated Public Health Emergency.

Further notes the significant objections that have been raised by different communities in Edinburgh to some of the Spaces for People schemes in this Authority; not least from groups representing disabled people; from businesses and from residents directly impacted by schemes in their local area.

Is concerned that the implementation of the Spaces for People programme is undermining public confidence in Local Government amongst significant sections of our City at a time of great shared risk.

Nonetheless, recognises the intention of Spaces for People to provide safe, distanced space and encourage active travel.

Therefore, in order to re-build public confidence, and deliver on elements that are likely to command widespread support, instructs the Executive Director of Place to immediately re-prioritise the Spaces for People programme in this Council towards:

- 1) Bringing forward “Safe Transport to Schools” proposals for every school in Edinburgh
- 2) Clear all overgrowing vegetation from the Council’s off-road path network, including a clear verge of 400mm where this is possible, so that users can freely travel the full width of these paths irrespective of the permitted mode.
- 3) Commence the process of serving Statutory Notices where vegetation is overgrowing pavements, restricting the available width by more than 100mm.
- 4) Accelerate the removal of railings on Pavements, in line with agreed Council policy.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment 1

Replaces all of the motion by Councillor Mowat with:

Notes that the COVID pandemic and resulting public health emergency has required local authorities to adjust normal procedures, including expected levels of public consultation and scrutiny, to permit a more flexible, responsive approach to alleviating the pressures of the pandemic on residents, the local economy and the provision of services.

Notes, however, that this Council agreed new structures of decision-making early in the pandemic period to allow progress to be made in a timely way.

Recognises that Council agreed, within the Spaces for People initiative, that feedback on proposed schemes would be sought from elected ward members, and key stakeholder groups including Community Councils and special interest groups and that this has led to changes to proposed schemes, where applicable.

Recognises that an ongoing review of schemes was built into the Spaces for People initiative from the start and welcomes that this will be reported to the Transport and Environment Committee in November, for full scrutiny and agreement by elected members.

Notes that the work themes and prioritisation within Spaces for People were brought forward and agreed in May by the Policy and Sustainability Committee.

Welcomes continued input from local groups on specific projects and will continue to work with residents to ensure that the Spaces for People initiative is both effective and understood.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 2

Council:

Notes the finite amount of funding awarded to implement Spaces for People and the difficult work which has been carried out to prioritise measures;

Calls on Scottish Government to provide complete funding for the full suite of measures that are required across the whole of Edinburgh, and to work collaboratively with the Government to continue to encourage everyone who can to travel by walking, wheeling and by bike.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

Amendment 3

In paragraph 3 of the motion by Councillor Mowat, after “implementation of”, insert: “parts of”.

In paragraph 5 of the motion, delete “to immediately re-prioritise the Spaces for People programme in this Council towards” and insert: “to ensure the Spaces for People report coming to [the 12 November](#) meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee covers the following”.

In 4) of the motion, insert at end: “and unnecessary barriers located on footpaths which force cyclists and pedestrians to come in close proximity to one another.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	19 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	34 votes
For Amendment 3	-	6 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors ~Barrie, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Doggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, Laidlaw, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.

For Amendment 1 (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 3: Councillors Aldridge, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note that the COVID pandemic and resulting public health emergency had required local authorities to adjust normal procedures, including expected levels of public consultation and scrutiny, to permit a more flexible, responsive approach to alleviating the pressures of the pandemic on residents, the local economy and the provision of services.
- 2) To note, however, that this Council agreed new structures of decision-making early in the pandemic period to allow progress to be made in a timely way.
- 3) To recognise that Council agreed, within the Spaces for People initiative, that feedback on proposed schemes would be sought from elected ward members, and key stakeholder groups including Community Councils and special interest groups and that this had led to changes to proposed schemes, where applicable.
- 4) To recognise that an ongoing review of schemes was built into the Spaces for People initiative from the start and welcomes that this would be reported to the Transport and Environment Committee in November, for full scrutiny and agreement by elected members.
- 5) To note that the work themes and prioritisation within Spaces for People were brought forward and agreed in May by the Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 6) To welcome continued input from local groups on specific projects and would continue to work with residents to ensure that the Spaces for People initiative was both effective and understood.
- 7) To note the finite amount of funding awarded to implement Spaces for People and the difficult work which had been carried out to prioritise measures.

- 8) To note the Council would continue to work collaboratively with the Government to continue to encourage everyone who could to travel by walking, wheeling and by bike.

25 Bonaly Scout Centre – Possible Provision of Outdoor Adventure Days for Edinburgh’s School Children, Spring 2021 - Motion by Councillor Rust

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

“Council:

- 1) Is aware that during the on-going Covid-19 pandemic, outdoor education and activity centres through Scotland are substantially closed down, particularly those more remote centres which rely on residential stays by children and adults, with trained activity instructors out of work.
- 2) Regrets that Bonaly Scout Centre and Campsite has been severely impacted, with staff made redundant, accommodation lying idle and with no instructors, activities being limited to a few visits from Scouting and the forest nursery, therefore meaning loss of revenue and diminishing funds. As a result, Bonaly Scout Centre has the space to host adventure days for children (and adults).
- 3) Notes schools are cancelling their planned residential adventure weeks for certain school years.
- 4) Further notes an offer by the Centre to provide every child across Edinburgh (and West, Mid and East Lothian) who would normally be offered a residential outdoor adventure week during the current school session (at least) 1 adventure day to remember at Bonaly Scout Centre.
- 5) Therefore commits the Education, Children and Families department and appropriate Council officers to work with Bonaly Scout Centre’s staff (and volunteers where appropriate) to explore possible opportunities for outdoor adventure days for young people to be provided in 2021, bringing the young people, facilities and funding together to provide a memorable and revitalising adventure experience during challenging times.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rust.

- moved by Councillor Rust, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Amendment

- 1) Before Paragraph 1 in the motion by Councillor Rust, insert new paragraph:

“Notes that since 1931 Bonaly Scout Centre has welcomed young people from the local, national and international Scouting movement. These children have benefited from the outdoor setting and learnt skills that will last a lifetime.”
 - 2) After Paragraph 2 in the motion, insert 2 new paragraphs:

“Recognises the work Annette Mackenzie, Barbara Murray and others in the local community have undertaken recently to raise substantial funds for the Centre.

Notes the work Council staff have undertaken to ensure Bonaly Scout Centre pays the correct rate of Council Tax.”
 - 3) In the original Paragraph 4 of the motion, replace “notes” with welcomes.
 - 4) In the original Paragraph 5 of the motion, replace “commits” with asks.
 - 5) Inserts after “2021” “subject to public health guidance.
- moved by Councillor Arthur, seconded by Councillor Gardiner

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rust:

- 1) To note that since 1931 Bonaly Scout Centre had welcomed young people from the local, national and international Scouting movement. These children had benefited from the outdoor setting and learnt skills that will last a lifetime
- 2) Council is aware that during the on-going Covid-19 pandemic, outdoor education and activity centres through Scotland were substantially closed down, particularly those more remote centres which relied on residential stays by children and adults, with trained activity instructors out of work.
- 3) To regret that Bonaly Scout Centre and Campsite had been severely impacted, with staff made redundant, accommodation lying idle and with no instructors, activities being limited to a few visits from Scouting and the forest nursery, therefore meaning loss of revenue and diminishing funds. As a

result, Bonaly Scout Centre had the space to host adventure days for children (and adults).

- 4) To recognise the work Annette Mackenzie, Barbara Murray and others in the local community had undertaken recently to raise substantial funds for the Centre.
- 5) To note the work Council staff had undertaken to ensure Bonaly Scout Centre paid the correct rate of Council Tax.
- 6) To note schools were cancelling their planned residential adventure weeks for certain school years.
- 6) To further welcome an offer by the Centre to provide every child across Edinburgh (and West, Mid and East Lothian) who would normally be offered a residential outdoor adventure week during the current school session (at least) 1 adventure day to remember at Bonaly Scout Centre.
- 7) To therefore asks the Education, Children and Families department and appropriate Council officers to work with Bonaly Scout Centre's staff (and volunteers where appropriate) to explore possible opportunities for outdoor adventure days for young people to be provided in 2021 subject to public health guidance, bringing the young people, facilities and funding together to provide a memorable and revitalising adventure experience during challenging times.

26 Public Health Emergency Measures - Motion by Councillor Duggart

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 Rust was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“Council:

- 1) Notes the measures implemented on 9 October to deal with the increase in Covid-19 cases across NHS Lothian.
- 2) Requests a briefing in one cycle to the Policy & Sustainability Committee from the Chief Executive setting out the Council's participation in discussion with the Scottish Government and NHS Lothian in relation to the revised measures.

- 3) Regrets the briefing promised in the Administration amendment of 25 August to Cllr Jim Campbell's motion has not been provided and instructs that this is expedited."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Doggart.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment

Deletes all of the motion by Councillor Doggart and replaces with:

Notes that on August 25th Council agreed:

- 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.
- 4) To also agree to add to that briefing any pertinent information in relation to point 3 relevant to the current extension of restrictions and requests this is sent to elected members in one cycle.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Perry

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	25 votes
For the amendment	-	34 votes

(For the motion: 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.

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 amendment by Councillor McVey.

27 Granton Marina - Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

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 Rust was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

- “1) Council notes that:
- a) On or around October 7, 2020 a “blight notice” was served on CEC’s Chief Executive on behalf of Granton Central Developments Ltd (GCDL).
 - b) GCDL believes its land is under an informal threat of compulsory purchase and this is known to a third party.
 - c) The notice alleges that a third party funder was advised by a council representative that on acquiring the GCDL land through compulsory purchase the funder could participate in a joint venture with CEC to develop the property.
 - d) It is further alleged CEC advised it was willing to acquire the GCDL property to facilitate delivery of regeneration of the entire Granton Waterfront site at as low a price as possible under the statutory compensation code.
- 2) Council therefore requests a report on these allegations to be submitted to the next Policy & Sustainability Committee. The report should include:
- a) The full background and circumstances of any discussions held with third parties in relation to land owned by GCDL
 - b) A full explanation of the council’s policies towards GCDL and the development of the entire Waterfront site.
 - c) Full explanation of the implications of the Council’s position on the blight notice.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor McLellan

Amendment 1

Deletes all of the motion by Councillor McLellan and replaces with:

Regrets the motion is based on unsubstantiated and incomplete information and presented as an “emergency motion”.

Notes that the Council has been served with legal notices and is taking legal advice in relation to these in order that it can consider its position and that for the time being these are operational issues.

Notes any actions relevant to the delivery of the Graton Waterfront regeneration will be brought to relevant committees in due course if required.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Perry

Amendment 2

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

Voting

In terms of Standing Order 24(4), the Lord Provost ruled that a first vote be taken for or against the motion for no action.

First Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the motion for no action	-	8 votes
Against the motion for no action	-	49 votes

(For the motion for continuation: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bridgman, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Neil Ross and Young.

Against the motion for continuation: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Cameron, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Dickie, Dixon, Duggart, Doran, Douglas, Gardiner, Gordon, Gracyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Macinnes,

Main, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rose, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson and Work.)

As the vote for no action was lost, a second vote between the motion by Councillor Rose and Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey was then taken.

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	16 votes
For Amendment 1	-	33 votes

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

For Amendment 1: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, 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.

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

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey.

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 6 of 15 October 2020)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 15 October 2020

Question **(1)** How many households hold resident parking permit(s), broken down by zone?

Answer **(1)** The table below shows the number of permits broken down by permit type and zone.

Question **(2)** How many permits are currently in issue, broken down by zone and by households with 1 permit or multiple permits?

Answer **(2)** The table below shows the breakdown of permits by households.

Question **(3)** How many spaces are available for permit holders, broken down by zone?

Answer **(3)** The table below shows the total number of permit and shared use parking spaces.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and my thanks to the Convener for the answer to my written question. I wondered if I could please ask the Convener to clarify for me that I've interpreted the figures correctly and that the Council has sold permits for more spaces than it can actually provide in the central peripheral zones across the board by I think 40% more than the number of spaces on offer and in some zones as much as 80% more, and if I have understood the Convener's answer correctly, can she explain what is being done to help reduce car ownership and to enable different transport choices for those who can make them?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Miller. Yes that certainly appears to be the case that that has occurred. I mean clearly we have an issue here with an over stocking of cars on public roads which is what this represents and there are a number of means of us encouraging people to meet alternative transport choices that wouldn't require them then to look, to search for a parking permit or indeed space to use afterwards, and that centres around our active travel and our support for public transport in particular. If you want to follow this up in more detail I'd be happy to do so.

Table 1 - Residents Parking Permits

Central	Zone	Households with a permit	Households with 1 permit	Households with 2 permits	Total active permits	Total number of permit and shared use parking places
	1	1015	826	189	1204	804
	1a	540	422	118	658	628
	2	248	210	38	286	315
	3	596	551	45	641	503
	4	1052	940	112	1164	864
Peripheral	5	944	749	195	1139	778
	5A	1083	889	194	1277	793
	6	1494	1245	249	1743	1254
	7	1268	1082	186	1454	796
	8	1200	1024	176	1376	851
Extended	N1	1681	1509	172	1853	2339
	N2	718	604	114	832	1299
	N3	1175	990	185	1360	1377
	N4	98	88	10	108	373
	N5	275	232	43	318	1243
	S1	1069	858	211	1280	2414
	S2	1421	1189	232	1653	1831
	S3	1279	1062	217	1496	1932
	S4	1129	1026	103	1232	1301
Priority Parking Area	B1	448	365	83	531	740
	B2	321	265	56	377	450
	B3	19	14	5	24	71
	B4	47	39	8	55	155
	B5	30	25	5	35	169
	B6	170	135	35	205	465
	B7	135	107	28	163	420
	B8	21	18	3	24	117
	B9	226	165	61	287	573
	B10	60	55	5	65	207

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 15 October 2020

Question (1) Please list all current strategic gaps in the cycle network.

Answer (1) It is not possible to provide a list of the strategic gaps in the cycle network however the maps below show the current, planned and future investment plans for Active Travel investments.

Map 1 shows the existing Quiet Routes network, the planned Active Travel schemes and the longer term proposals.

Map 2 shows the completed Quiet Routes network 2019-2023.

Map 3 shows the Spaces for People temporary interventions which are currently in progress.

Question (2) Please provide the current status and date for completing all strategic links in the cycle network as listed in the answer to question 1.

Answer (2) Table 1 below provides a status update for all cycle route schemes in the current approved Active Travel investment programme. These schemes correlate with the red lines on the Map 1. There are also a small number of schemes listed below which are still to be added to the Map.

In addition to the Active Travel investment programme, there are a small number of roads renewal schemes which will also enhance the cycle network by providing new infrastructure, but which are not shown on the maps. These include cycle segregation along sections of Portobello Road and Gilmerton Road (both of which are due to be completed in the 2020/21 financial year).

A refresh of the Active Travel Action Plan is due to be progressed over the coming year and will identify any further gaps.


**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and again thank you to the Convener for her answer to my written question which is very helpful, however raises quite a large number of additional questions, but don't worry Lord Provost I know I'm only allowed to ask one clarifying supplementary question. I would just like to seek a bit of clarity around the Convener's answer to point 2 please. She says that there are a small number of roads renewal schemes which will also enhance the cycle network and it sounds like a point of grammar but I just want to check, can she please tell me does she mean that they're only a small number of roads renewal schemes or are there only a small number of those schemes which will enhance the cycle network with new infrastructure, and if it is the latter, could she assure me that she will ensure that all further schemes are designed to achieve this please?


**Supplementary
Answer**

I think that last point would follow our intention that sits behind the Edinburgh Street Design guidance and so yes I would certainly hope that that is the case. As you'll know there's sometimes constraints on what we can do in certain road spaces because the space does not allow us to fully implement all aspects of that, but that's where the transport hierarchy has to come into play, and so that's where we have to place pedestrians at the top, followed by cyclists, then followed by motor vehicles, and increasingly I think we're able to take quite a useful position on that when looking at the design of these schemes.


Map 1: Active Travel Network: Existing Quiet Routes and Planned Active Travel programme



Map 2 - Quiet Routes network following completion of 2019-2023 programme



Map 3 - Spaces for People programme (excluding pedestrian shopping street improvements)



Key

Travelling Safely Package

- Segregated cycling
- Potential bus lane and cycle improvements
- On hold subject to further design/budget review
- Quiet link

- New quiet connection
- Road closure on hold subject to design/budget

Spaces Exercise

- Bus gate and additional pedestrian/cycling space
- Road Closure On hold subject to design/budget
- Segregated cycling and 1 way vehicle traffic
- Shared space for walking and cycling

for package

- Segregated Cycling
- Point closure
- Crossing
- Access for local vehicles only

City Centre Interventions

Low

Neighbourhoods

- Closure
- Segregated cycling
- Bus gate
- Segregated cycling and footway widening
- Widened footway
- Subject to further design review

National Cycle Network

Existing Quiet Routes

Traffic

Table 1 – Status Update on Cycle Route Schemes in Active Travel Investment Programme

Scheme	Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)	Location and route Short summary	Date completed or Anticipated completion
City Centre West to East Link	Stage 4 Technical Design	Segregated cycle lanes, crossings and street improvements from Roseburn via Haymarket to George St and from George St to York Place.	May 2022
Meadows to Union Canal	Stage 2 Concept Design	Segregated cycle lanes and toucan and Street Improvements.	May 2023
West Edinburgh Link	Stage 3 Developed Design	Segregated cycle lanes, crossings, street and path improvements and a bridge over Fife Railway linking East Craigs and Wester Hailes to Edinburgh Park/Gyle.	October 2023
Main Roads Study	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Feasibility study of potential on road cycle lanes/segregation and enhancements to yellow line restrictions. Further assessment required for potential delivery opportunities under Spaces for People.	End of Preparation and Brief by Summer 2020
Princes Street East End	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Under review	Under review
Roseburn Path – Union Canal	Stage 3 Developed Design	Connection from North Edinburgh Path Network at Roseburn to Union Canal via new off-road path, including bridges and Dalry Park improvements.	June 2022
Meadows to George Street	Stage 3 Developed Design	Street improvements and segregated cycle lanes.	November 2023

Scheme	Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)	Location and route Short summary	Date completed or Anticipated completion
North Edinburgh Active Travel (NEAT) Connections	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	New segregated cycleways, crossings and street improvements.	August 2023
Leith Connections / Foot of the Walk to Ocean Terminal	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Improved walking and cycling connections from the Foot of Leith Walk to Ocean Terminal and development of other local proposals.	Under review
Morrison Street	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Street improvements, including to footways, crossings and cycle provision.	June 2023
Marchmont to Blackford	Stage 3 Developed Design	New cycle lanes, junction and crossing improvements.	July 2021
QuietRoute 8 – Balgreen to Edinburgh Park	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	October 2022
Cameron Toll to BioQuarter	Stage 4 Technical Design	Segregated cycleways and shared footpaths.	April 2022
Fountainbridge / Dundee Street	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Segregated link between Telfer Subway and Union Canal. Optioneering for remainder of street. Further assessment required for potential delivery opportunities under Spaces for People.	June 2023
Maybury Road	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Feasibility study of potential to improve cycle provision along Maybury Road, taking account of dependencies with proposals under the Local Development Plan Action Programme (LDPAP).	Preparation and Brief complete early 2020.
QuietRoute 6 – Grange Road	Stage 4 Technical	New crossings, including footway and path	November 2020

Scheme	Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)	Location and route Short summary	Date completed or Anticipated completion
Crossings	Design	improvements.	
St Leonards – Canongate / Holyrood Drive	Stage 2 Concept Design	On carriageway cycle provision, crossings and path improvements.	June 2021
QuietRoute 9	Stage 2 Concept Design	Pedestrian and cycle improvements to paths and crossing and Quiet Streets.	September 2021
QuietRoute 5 – Holyrood Park	Stage 3 Developed Design	Improved cycle and foot paths and new crossings.	July 2022
QuietRoute 61 - Niddry to Moredun via Bioquarter	Stage 3 Developed Design	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	December 2020
A8 Gyle – Newbridge	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Path widening between Middle Norton and Gogarstone and new road layout at Gogarstone Road junction with A8.	September 2021
QuietRoute 30 – Holyrood Park to Ratcliffe Terrace	Stage 2 Concept Design	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	Summer 2022
QuietRoute 6 – Meadows to Bread Street	Stage 2 Concept Design	Quiet street improvements and new crossings.	March 2022
One-way Street Exemptions	Stage 2 Concept Design	City-wide signs, markings and traffic management.	November 2021
QuietRoute 60 – Davidson's Mains Park	Stage 7 In use	Footpath widening and lighting from Queensferry Road to Barnton Avenue.	Complete 2019/20
Lower Granton Road	Stage 7 In use		Complete 2019/20
Marchmont Filtered Permeability	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief		Under review
Deanhaugh	Stage 4	Pedestrian crossings upgrade	March 2021

Scheme	Current Stage (RIBA Plan of Work)	Location and route Short summary	Date completed or Anticipated completion
Street and Leslie Place	Technical Design	at junction.	
Minor Improvements	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	City-wide low cost and delivery risk package of interventions to support walking and cycling.	Under review
QuietRoute 60 – Davidson's Mains Park (Phase 2)	Stage 2 Concept Design	Improvements to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements.	July 2021
Salvesen Steps	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief		Under review
Powderhall Railway	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Repurposing disused railway into green active travel corridor for cycling and walking.	March 2023
Cultins Road Cycleway	Stage 1 Preparation and Brief	Improved cycle and walking link between the Canal and QuietRoute 8.	Under review
The Causey Project	Stage 2 Concept Design		Under review
Minor Lighting Schemes	Stage 3 Developed Design	Lighting upgrades at Innocent Path.	October 2020

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Leader of the Council at a meeting of
the Council on 15 October 2020**

At the 28 July meeting of the Council, the Leader of the Council said a series of small business champion networks would be established “in the next four to six weeks”.

Question **(1)** How many small business networks have been established since 28 July?

Answer **(1)** Since 28 July 10 Business Champions Networks (BCN) have been established. These are:

- Portobello
- Queensferry
- Morningside/Bruntsfield/Tollcross
- Old Town
- Greater Grassmarket
- Stockbridge
- Leith/Leith Walk
- Gorgie/Dalry
- Corstorphine
- Southside

These are in addition to the established relationships with the Business Improvement districts in the City Centre and West End. An internal BCN has also been established within the Council.

Question **(2)** How have the members of each small business network been recruited?

Answer **(2)** Initial invitations were issued to people within these local areas who have previously worked with the Council. As well as an initial introduction to the BCN and its function, it encouraged recipients to pass the invitation to anyone in their local community who would also be interested in participating.

Question	(3) How have the members of each small business network been recruited?
Answer	(3) See answer 2 above
Question	(4) What actions or suggestions have emerged from each small business network so far?
Answer	<p>(4) Initial discussions have focused on the proposed actions for the Shop Local programme. These have received good feedback with some suggestions for change now incorporated into the plans including less focus on physical 'shop local' posters etc. but instead providing support for businesses with things like distance markers, printing 'good to go' posters, and further social media engagement with the local areas (utilising the channels available to the Council to amplify activity in the areas etc.).</p> <p>Feedback received on other Council or city activities, like Spaces for People and Edinburgh Christmas, have been fed back to relevant colleagues and/or initiating contact between the businesses and the relevant Council contact.</p>
Question	(5) How many small business networks are still to be established?
Answer	(5) Initial meetings have taken place with all BCNs except Stockbridge (although email contact has been established). Work is now progressing with the BCNs on specific projects such as Shop Local.
Supplementary Question	<p>Yes thank you Lord Provost and my thanks to the Council Leader for the information that he provided and it was very encouraging to see these networks being up and running. To clarify on the memberships, back in July we were assured that ward Councillors would be kept fully informed as to which people were serving on which networks in their area, I know I'm not alone in not having been provided with that information, so can the Council Leader please just ensure that ward councillors are kept informed of who is sitting on these groups because I think these are bodies that we as ward Councillors would very much like to engage with too?</p>

**Supplementary
Answer**

Yes, I thank Councillor Lang for that the supplementary. I think from information that's come back in relation to how these are developed, they're very much tried to mould into a shape to fit the businesses themselves, Councillor Lang and other members will appreciate that some of the dialogue is happening on the terms of the businesses and therefore is a little bit more organic and less perhaps a table that people are sitting round format even if it's an online table that we perhaps envisaged at the start of this process, but absolutely, I will go back to officers to see whether it's that engagement and there are flashpoints of engagement from those businesses, that ward members are fully updated on what's coming back, I think that's entirely appropriate.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 15 October 2020**

Question

What is the current status of the proposal to create a quiet cycle route through Silverknowes, as issued by the Spaces for People team on 18 August 2020?

Answer

Following the Notification period and in response to stakeholder feedback, it was decided to revisit the original design and develop an alternative proposal.

An alternative layout will now be developed for the main section of Silverknowes Road (South section) and will be shared with the stakeholder notification group.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 15 October 2020**

In August 2018, there was an in-principle decision to install a new speed table on Rosshill Terrace near Dalmeny Station. Council officials initially offered to carry out the work “in the first weeks” of the 2019 school summer holidays. This was then delayed until autumn 2019 then to spring 2020 and, in the most recent answer provided by the Convener on 12 March, to summer 2020.

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Question | (1) Can the Convener confirm that the tendering of the work is complete? |
| Answer | (1) Unfortunately, the tendering of this work has not yet been completed |
| Question | (2) Can the Convener give the latest expected installation date? |
| Answer | (2) This is not available at present. However, I have asked the department to provide an expected installation date to myself and local members as quickly as possible. I have also highlighted my concern at such a lengthy delay. |
| Question | (3) Does the Convener agree that the proposed one-way system on the Queensferry High Street, which will direct more traffic along Rosshill Terrace, should be paused until the new speed table is installed? |
| Answer | (3) It is acknowledged that some existing traffic displaced by the proposed one-way arrangement on Queensferry High Street may make use of alternative routes in a westbound direction. |

In anticipation of this, additional signage and traffic calming features will be placed on the Station Road/Rosshill Terrace corridor to mitigate any increase in traffic levels. Traffic diversion signage is also proposed on the A90, directing drivers to stay on the local arterial routes which is expected

to reduce some level of traffic using the area as a through route.

It should be acknowledged that the proposed scheme for Queensferry High Street aims to deliver pavement widening in the Town Centre. This is critical to reduce the likelihood of danger to the public and support the recovery of the local economy.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you and again my thanks to the Convener both for her answer and for agreeing to come back with that follow up information and I hope her answer recognises the frustration which I have and which the residents have here when we see lots of the other things happening, emergency powers being used, that we still have these issues of very long standing, a really simple thing is taking a long time. Can I just ask the Convener, she's promised to come back to me on the timing of the installation, if she can succeed even more where I have failed and try to get an explanation as to why something that is to my mind so simple, really is taking so long?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary Councillor Lang and as you'll no doubt have noted by numerous responses I've given around Council questions, often what appears to be a simple option can be much more complicated because it has a knock on effect on something else, I'm talking in generalities not necessarily about this specific project but when there are asks given to the transport team, they're often a lot more complicated in nature to implement or to design than those who are doing the asking can appreciate, because of our requirements to meet statutory guidelines because of our requirements to meet the Edinburgh street guidance for example and certainly to meet the transport hierarchy. So on this particular note as I've said, I definitely will come back to you with some more information on this and I will endeavour to get this in place. I don't think it should be underestimated however that there is no reason to conflate the requirement on us to put in place emergency powers in the midst of a pandemic with the progress made around longer term or strategic projects that we've got in

place. There's not an organisation or a business in the land which is not having to juggle that balance between short term responses and longer term normal procedure. So we're trying to do our best to get that balance right, in some instances it won't be to the satisfaction of a particular community or requirement, it may not even be understandable but I would say that that is a genuine effort being made to balance those twin requirements of us as a Council, thank you.

QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 15 October 2020**

Question

What policies or procedures are in place to ensure that new council housing is accessible to disabled people?

Answer

All new build affordable Council homes are designed and built to Housing for Varying Needs standard which allows homes to be adapted to meet the needs of the household where these change over time. These homes are designed to be 'barrier free' and will be suitable for those with visual and mobility impairments. In addition, most ground floor properties will also be suitable for wheelchair users as they also provide main door, level-entry access. As a minimum 10% of all new homes will be fully wheelchair accessible. These standards are integrated into the new build design guidance for new Council homes.

As part of the Housing Contribution statement to the Edinburgh Health & Social Care Partnership Strategic Plan there is a commitment to deliver 4,500 of the 20,000 new homes to support health and social care priorities. A working group of Council officers are progressing work on this and homes in design and under construction are already being delivered for specific client groups.

When tenants or households seeking social housing have mobility issues in their existing home that cannot be adapted to meet their needs, they can be awarded a gold priority to help them access ground floor accessible homes. New build homes are advertised in same way as existing council homes on Edindex and so the same allocations policies apply.

Urgent cases such as hospital discharge can be awarded urgent gold priority. Any award of priority and the needs of the household would normally require an Occupational Therapist Assessment.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her answer. The answer says that most ground-floor properties will also be suitable for wheelchair users, please can the Convener clarify, at what proportion of ground-floor properties are suitable for wheelchair users and what are the barriers to making all of them suitable?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I'd first like to thank Councillor Booth for his question, it is a very very important part of our house-building programme and I sometimes think we get very distracted with some of the big challenges around homelessness, and it's good that he's brought this to attention because it is fundamental and vital that we get this right. So in terms of new build Council houses, around 10% are built as wheelchair accessible ground-floor properties, the reason we don't build all of them to a wheelchair accessible standard is that not all of them are necessarily required for wheelchair access, so it does depend on the level of need, but all new Council homes are built to the Housing for Varying Needs Standards, so that means that the doors are wider, there's level access and that means that the vast majority of homes could be adapted to wheelchair use if that was needed although they're not necessarily built to that standard initially.

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Planning
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 15 October 2020**

Question (1) What requirements are in place through planning or building standards to ensure that new buildings, including social and private housing, in Edinburgh are accessible to disabled people?

Answer (1) Planning decisions are made with regard to the Equalities Act 2010 which places on the Council a public sector duty regarding socio-economic inequalities and identified “Protected Characteristics” e.g. age, disability, race, sexual orientation etc....

There are planning policies in place that support accessibility including:

- Edinburgh Local Development Plan Policy Des 7 c) which states that planning permission will be granted where safe and convenient access and movement in and around the development will be promoted, having regard to the needs of people with limited mobility or special needs. Planning application decisions are made with regard to Local Development Policy.
- Policy Hou 2 and the Edinburgh Design Guidance reference the need to meet a range of housing needs.

The principle way in which the detail of accessibility is considered is through the Building Standards system. This requires routes from streets to buildings to be accessible and ensure that internal layouts of buildings are accessible. The Technical Standards which set out the minimum requirements have evolved to ensure that current standards are better than historical standards.

Question (2) What future changes to requirements for accessible buildings are being considered through planning or building standards?

Answer

- (2) The Building Standards Division of the Scottish Government issues the Building Regulations and national guidance on what requirements there should be for any new building. Officers are not aware of any pending or imminent changes to the requirements of the Building Regulations for accessibility issues into or throughout buildings. Any changes will follow a period of consultation established by the Scottish Government.

In Choices for City Plan 2030, Choice 2, part A proposes:

‘We want all development (including change of use), through a design and access statement, to demonstrate how their design will incorporate measures to tackle and adapt to climate change, their future adaptability and measure to address accessibility for people with varying needs, age and mobility issues as a key part of their layouts.’

Consultation responses to this proposed policy are generally supportive and the proposed plan will consider the evidence provided in those responses in finalising a new policy on this matter.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and again I thank the Convener for his answer. Please can he clarify, my understanding of the answer that he's given is that there are no requirements under planning policy, aside for the need for an Access Statement for major developments, for developers to go further than the building standards in terms of accessibility for disabled people, is that correct and if so does he feel that's adequate?

Supplementary Answer

Like Councillor Campbell I thank Councillor Booth for the very relevant question. I'll have to answer that factually and then he's asked for my opinion and I'm happy to give that as well. So factually you're correct, planning policies have to be competent and robust and focus on matters which is within the remit of planning, so building standards deals with individual buildings, planning deals with other things including the wider site, in City Plan choices there is something about accessibility and you're on the leadership forum where you make good contributions to that and I'm happy for that to be a topic of a future leadership forum, in

terms of that, what we look at is site layout and matters like that for forward planning. Yesterday at the Committee for example we talked about the Waverley Valley strategy and I made a very clear point as did officers about the problems of access out of the gardens up to Princess Street and how we need to address that I'd also bring your attention to the A-board at ban where we removed A-board clutter and I was happy to see my former colleague and friend Councillor Howie there on the broadcast and I know he was very pleased to see that and walking down the street I know what an impact that will have on people that have disabilities, so in essence it's really about the outside spaces, that's the way it works and building standards works the inside of building so there's an opportunity to lobby the Government through Holyrood to change the building regulations and I'd advise him and I'm happy to work with him on that to see if we can take that further, but currently planning only deals really with outside of buildings. I'm happy for that to be the subject of the leadership forum. As I say, in answer to his question to me, yes I think we should be going further but we can only work within the remit that we've been given, so I hope that answers his question.

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 15 October 2020**

Question (1) When devising the Spaces for People measures in our local town centres, involving the widening of pavements by suspending 'Pay and Display' parking and single yellow lines, what consideration has been given to ensuring that disabled people have preferential access to shops?

Answer (1) Access for blue badge holders has been and will continue to be considered as part of the Spaces for People (SfP) town centre measures. In doing so, the Mobility and Access Committee for Scotland (MACS) guidance is being taken into consideration alongside any reports from blue badge holders.

Question (2) There is only one Disabled parking space along the entire length of both Morningside Road and Bruntsfield Place for the exclusive use of blue badge holders. In each of the local town centres with Spaces for People measures, how many disabled parking bays are there?

Answer (2) No blue badge bays have been suspended with SfP town centre measures. The blue badge bays in each town centre are as follows:

- There are no blue badge bays in the boundaries of Gorgie/Dalry, Bruntsfield or Tollcross;
- There is one in Morningside which remains open;
- There is one in Stockbridge which remains open; and

There are no impacts on existing blue badge bays within Portobello, Corstorphine or Great Junction Street.

Question	(3) I recently visited a disabled constituent and her husband who live on Comiston Road/Pentland Terrace. When they asked about disabled parking, they were given, without any consultation, a disabled parking space in the middle of the road outside their house which they feel is too dangerous to use. In future, will the provision of disabled parking spaces involve full consultation with the disabled resident prior to implementation?
Answer	(3) A request was received from local residents to incorporate a disabled parking bay within the Comiston Road scheme. After a robust risk analysis for the designed parking bays in the area, a disabled parking bay (in accordance with the national guidance) was provided on Pentland Terrace at the edge of the parking bay. Disabled parking bays are for those who have a blue badge, a bay does not belong to any one single individual and as you are aware usual consultation processes do not apply under these emergency schemes.
Supplementary Question	Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answers. With regard to the third part of my question, as the Convener knows there is a 5-day consultation for Councillors on the Spaces for People measures before implementation, given this disabled bay was a late addition to the original cycle scheme and in this case I was involved in helping to raise my disabled resident's request, would it be possible to engage with a Councillor, if even only briefly , in advance, should this situation arise again?
Supplementary Answer	I'm sorry Councillor Ross I'll need to ask you to clarify your question here because I'm just wondering what it is that you're looking for, are you looking for the team to anticipate where there might be a request from an individual resident that needs to be acted upon or are you requesting further involvement from the Councillor when that request has already been made?
Councillor Neil Ross	The latter Convener so that there might be a little bit of feedback before action is taken to implement, that might be helpful, thank you.

**Councillor
Macinnes**

I am not too sure how often though that situation will occur again, I know in this particular instance there was considerable effort put in to try to provide something that would suit the resident as much as is possible. I think yes, clearly if the request has come via an individual Councillor then yes that would be the case, however there is also the established feedback mechanism when any proposals have gone out to local Councillors and indeed any other key stakeholders so they get to see what officer responses around the specific asks that have of come in via councillors and/or via other stakeholder groups, so there is that opportunity for individual Councillors to pick up and continued that dialogue.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 15 October 2020**

Question

Traffic volumes in the city are reported to have been significantly lower during lockdown but rising more recently. A report has been issued showing a 10% increase in the number of vehicles on the A702 at Morningside Station and at Greenbank crossroads. What are the recorded volumes of traffic at the same, or similar, time periods on the A70, the A701, the A772 and the A7, or any of the main arterial routes into Edinburgh where data is available?

Answer

The attached graphs display traffic trend data from 01/01/2019 to 31/12/2019; and 01/01/2020 to 06/10/2020 for the following arterial routes – A8 (inbound & outbound); A71 (inbound); A70 (inbound & outbound); and A701 (inbound & outbound).

The A71 outbound data contained several outages and anomalies and is not of a high-enough quality to include.


There is no infrastructure to provide any traffic trend data for the A772 in this format.

Traffic trend data for the A1; A199; A90; A7; A702; and Ferry Road is included in the dashboard which is distributed to Elected Members on a monthly basis.


Overall, the trend shows that traffic levels are at approximately 70-90% of what they were in 2019.

A8 – Inbound: St John’s Road / Manse Road

2019




2020




Approximately 80 – 90% of 2019 levels.

A8 – Outbound: St John's Road / Manse Road

2019




2020




Approximately 70 – 90% of 2019 levels.

A71 – Inbound: Gorgie Road / Chesser Avenue

2019




2020




Approximately 80 – 90% of 2019 levels.

A70 – Inbound: Slateford Road / Craiglockhart Avenue

2019




2020




Approximately 80 – 90% of 2019 levels.

A70 – Outbound: Slateford Road / Craiglockhart Avenue

2019




2020




Approximately 90% of 2019 levels.

A701 – Inbound: Grange Road / Causewayside

2019




2020




Approximately 80 – 85% of 2019 levels.

A701 – Outbound: Grange Road / Causewayside

2019



2020



Approximately 90% of 2019 levels.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Howie for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 15 October 2020

Question (1) What specific measures have been put in place as a result of consultations with disability charities on the guideline and licensing requirements for street furniture?

Answer (1) Pavement obstructions, contrasting colours of crossing paving and ramps were all raised at a focus group of stakeholders including the Royal National Institute for Blind People (RNIB) in 2013. From this, the Council changed its practices to place solid barriers (tapping rails) around every location where tables and chairs were located, not just specific city centre ones (as had previously been the case).

In addition, the [Edinburgh Street Design Guide](#) covers all aspects of street furniture and was developed in consultation with various bodies such as the RNIB and Edinburgh Access Panel.

Question (2) Do licensing requirements mean all street furniture must allow space on the pavement to allow people to pass each other while maintaining social distancing and if so, what is the minimum distance required?

Answer (2) In response to COVID-19, tables and chairs permit applications will only be considered if it can be demonstrated that a clear unobstructed footway width of **3m** can be maintained (although in some cases a smaller width could be considered depending on the location of the premises i.e. footfall, side streets, availability of space on the carriageway etc.).

New guidance for Tables and Chairs was developed to accommodate all new and amended applications to allow a 3m clear walkway. All Tables and Chairs permits that were in place prior to COVID-19 are still permitted to keep their previous space, but these will be monitored and businesses

are asked to amend their allocated area if it creates an issue with access along the footway. This is an attempt to balance the need for safety and also to support business recovery.

Prior to the COVID-19 restrictions, a minimum from 1.4m of clear footway had to be available for the passing public.

Question (3) What are the requirements for any barriers around the areas of street furniture to prevent them being a threat to disabled people?

Answer (3) It is a mandatory requirement that solid barriers are placed surrounding the tables and chairs area specified in the permit. A detailed description of barriers must be provided with permit applications for Tables and Chairs. Failure to include adequate details of barrier proposals mean applications will not be considered.

Barriers should:

- Be at least one metre in height from the footway level;
- Extend the full width of your tables and chairs area. Incorporate a tapping rail or other demarcation approximately 150mm above ground level to guide blind or partially sighted pedestrians;
- Be capable of withstanding winds blowing from any direction;
- Be fixed to suitable mountings and substantial enough to resist collapse if walked or stumbled into;
- Not be Rope and pole fixtures;
- Not contain any advertising or advertisements;
- Not contain the name of your premises;
- Be of a colour and design that takes account of the needs of people with a visual impairment, ideally providing a contrast with its surroundings; and
- Be of a high-quality design and materials.

In addition, planters are encouraged, while other solutions including fabric banners and metal, or timber panels are

also acceptable (as long as they meet the other requirements). Plastic is not acceptable.

Question (4) What measures have been taken to ensure compliance with these requirements and have any licenses for street furniture been withdrawn because of failure to comply?

Answer

(4) The Street Enforcement Team provides a compliance patrol service which operates during all permitted hours, seven days per week. Permit holders who fail to comply with the conditions or allow their area of pavement to cause undue nuisance, will initially receive a verbal warning, confirmed in writing, which will be followed by any of the following actions should non-compliance or nuisance continue:

- Reduction of extended hours;
- Suspension of Permit;
- Withdrawal of Permit for remainder of term;
- Confiscation of furniture.

If a permit is suspended or withdrawn because of permit condition breach, no payment will be refunded.

Confiscation of furniture will be considered if tables and chairs remain on the pavement or roadway:

- Without permit approval.
- Out with permitted hours.
- After your permit has been withdrawn or suspended.

This matter may also result in a report being submitted to the Procurator Fiscal for the offence of obstructing the public pavement. The Council reserves the right to suspend any Tables and Chairs permit at any time where sufficient reason exists in relation to matters of public safety.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answer. The issue of the supplementary is to do with enforcement and I wondered if the Convener could provide details of the enforcement actions taken out over the past 12 months please?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Councillor Howie. I don't have specific information about the number of enforcement actions that have been taken over the last 12 months, as you can imagine I didn't prepare anything in terms of that particular timeframe but what I can do is give you a little bit of augmented information around what types of enforcement action are possible under this situation. So for example enforcement action can include the suspension of permits for 4 weeks if there have been repeated breaches of permit conditions, where they have been verified and in fact I've got one little bit of information about frequency, there were 3 in 2018 and 1 in 2019, clearly that's a question of repeated breaches of conditions, however, the full scale enforcement, the last measure of confiscation of furniture a full revocation of a permit has never yet been necessary because clearly there's a dialogue going on between the businesses and Council officers. So the process that is followed is, advice and education points are given to a business, then there's a verbal warning and engagement, there's a written warning and engagement then followed by a suspension of permit and further enforcement and then the removal of permit and an enforcement with the potential to confiscate furniture as mentioned there, so I hope that gives sufficient indication that there are numerous stages which can be followed through, thank you.

**Councillor
Howie**

Can I come back on that and ask for written details for the last 12 months, I appreciate that I'm not expecting Councillor Macinnes to have that to hand but if that could be provided that would be helpful, thank you.

**Councillor
Macinnes**

I'm sure that can be done.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Howie for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 15 October 2020

Question

As the Edinburgh Bike Hire scheme evolves, are there any plans for council representatives on the Transport for Edinburgh Board to discuss the introduction of adapted bikes and the inclusion of people with disabilities?

Answer

Adaptive cycles did not form part of the statement of requirement for the Edinburgh Cycle Hire Scheme upon advice from a wide Stakeholder Group and following a benchmarking exercise. Currently there are two places in Edinburgh that already offer free borrowing of adaptive cycles in the Saughton Park and Bangholm areas of the City for the inclusion of disabled people.

Benchmarking exercises and comparisons with other adaptive cycle hire schemes have taken place since the scheme was introduced but have found these to be expensive for the User.

Whilst officers were unable to identify a UK city that offered a city cycle hire scheme that provide paid access to adaptive bikes through their main cycle hire programme. They did investigate the set up in US cities and found two schemes that offered paid access through a different branch of the main hire schemes. Further information can be found using the links below:

Detroit, Michigan <https://mogodetroit.org/adaptive-mogo/>

Portland, Oregon <http://adaptivebiketown.com/>

Both these projects, whilst linked from the main City Cycle Hire Scheme website, do not utilise the same cycle hire point infrastructure as the main scheme, both MoGo and Biketown appear to use traditional docking stations. In both US cities they have identified partner providers which are bikeshops in their respective waterfront areas.

In Edinburgh adaptive cycles can be borrowed without a cost to the user, following a similar set up to the American cities where the adaptive cycles can be borrowed from different organisations/shops. This allows for face to face contact at the point of hire so that specific assistance can be given to suit an individuals needs.

If adaptive bikes were to be accessible from cycle hire points it would raise concerns such as those listed below, that we would not be able to support users adequately as there would be no face to face assistance.

The small number of adaptive bikes that the cycle hire scheme would have, means that it is likely they would be mal-located for regular use, making city centre cycling less attractive.

Cycles larger than standard cycle points would risk causing impediment to the space round them. As the micro siting of each cycle hire point has been determined utilising the Edinburgh Design Guidance, this would have a detrimental impact on pedestrians, for those on shared space and those that are in road space would be a hazard to traffic.

As a city we wish to be accessible and inclusive to all. I have instructed officers to reach out to the adaptive cycle organisations in the city, with a view to look at linking in their websites with our main cyclehire website. In addition, we will continue to monitor the scheme going forward and consider any additions we can make.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answer. I want to clarify the position here in terms of the Convener's response, as things stand with the Edinburgh Scheme it is exclusively the preserve of able-bodied people, none of the 105,000 disabled people in the city plus visitors have access to it, so will it continue, does Councillor Macinnes support the continuation of that exclusion, that exclusive preserve for able-bodied people and the continued exclusion of disabled people, saying as it would do, as it does to people with disabilities you're not welcome to participate in this scheme, you are excluded if you want to hire a bike you have to go to Saughton or Bangholm five

miles away, but if you are walking up the High Street and a family are in a group and everybody else can hire a bike from the quad well we're sorry Bangholm or Saughton for you if you want to hire a bike. So can the Convener clarify that continues to be her position or there is a way forward here, much more positive enlightened way forward, would she be prepared to adopt a more positive approach and forget the negative approach and the can't do culture in favour of a can do culture and turn Edinburgh into an example of how things can be done and really not bother about all the examples of how things can't be done, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary there was a great deal in that Councillor Howie so I will attempt to answer as clearly as I can. The written answer makes it quite clear I think that there are distinct issues, issues that have been found not only in Edinburgh but across the world in absorbing adapted bikes which of course come in many shapes and sizes to suit particular requirements for those particularly obviously with mobility or with vision issues, there is a distinct difficulty in making sure that you can service the needs of users who would want use that within an overall scheme because the simple structural of it does not allow that to happen. One of the illustrations of that is the fact that, is the fact that the bike-hire scheme works on the basis that you can hire it from any point and you can return it at any point and then it's available for the next user. The problem is if you have a number of adapted bikes which of course are lesser in number and often have got very specific aspects to them that suit particular users, there would be no way in which the Bike Hire Scheme could guarantee that the next user of that particular form of adapted bike would be able to get it where they wanted it to be, that is why there is no scheme anywhere that we've been able to identify across the world that incorporates adapted bikes without there being some limitation, the only 2 ones that we've been able to find have been in Detroit, Michigan and Portland, Oregon and particularly the one I know best is the one in Detroit, Michigan where you can hire 13 bikes that are adapted in various forms out of a total of 650, but those bikes have to be picked up from one location and returned to the same location and it's for that particular reason that we cannot

supply the right level of adaptation in bikes to make sure that they're in the right spot in a Bike Hire scheme. There are however very good facilities in this city for those who would wish to hire adapted bikes, I appreciate it's not as good as it can be in the normal bike hire scheme and that is something which I definitely regret but it's down to those practical reasons that we would not be able to service the needs of adapted bike users in a way that would be comparable to the structure of the normal bikes that that occurs. So there are two opportunities specifically at Bangholm and Saughton for people to be able to borrow bikes there's also another one at Saughton as well, and there's one in the city called Charlotte's tandems in the city where you can also pick those up. To the best of my knowledge, I hope I'm not going to be corrected here, those facilities are free of charge for people to use them, I appreciate that that does not allow the same level of freedom and mobility that it gives to somebody who is able bodied and able to go out and use the Edinburgh Bike Hire scheme but that unfortunately is down to the nature of demand and supply attached to this, I wish it were different, but I think we have made a reasonably good effort in the city to try to provide opportunities for those who would wish to have access to adapted bikes, to actually access them thank you.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Webber for answer by the
Convener of the Education, Children and
Families Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 15 October 2020**

- Question** (1) How many Computers are due to be provided to students in City of Edinburgh schools as part of the emergency response to the Coronavirus pandemic?
- Answer** (1) 2550 iPads will be provided to students funded via Scottish Government.
- Question** (2) How many students received a computer as part of this response for the start of the 2020/21 school year?
- Answer** (2) 615 CEC-purchased iPads were distributed to senior phase pupils with no home access.
- Approximately 200 CEC-purchased iPads were issued to additional students identified as requiring a device in direct response to Coronavirus pandemic.
- Question** (3) How many students have received a computer since the start of this school year, that is not attributed to the emergency response, for example through PEF funding, PC/PTA donation or other initiative?
- Answer** (3) 1950 iPads have been procured by schools since May. These have been utilised either as 1:1 devices for learners, devices for classes, replacements for outdated/damaged stock or for staff. A further 980 are on order for schools and due to arrive into CEC soon.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and thanks Convener for your answer. I suppose it'll be quite a succinct subtle supplementary. We've heard at length about the i-pad's that will be coming from the Scottish Government and I think we were all under the impression that they might all be here already and in circulation, but your answer to my question says 2,550 will be provided so I suppose my question is, what's the hold-up and why aren't they out there?
- That's 2 questions I know, I'm sorry Lord Provost.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary I think if you look at answer 3 you'll get a number there about the i-pads or devices which are on order and apparently I've been told it's a supply problem, we have issued the tender and it's taken longer than normal. What I've said to officials is that clearly that's unacceptable and they are looking at ways in which we can expedite the matter – I don't think she could hear me, could she?

**Councillor
Webber**

I could but I'm asking about the ones from the Scottish Government Councillor Perry, the 2,550 not the 980?

**Councillor
Perry**

Ah right, okay, well I don't know the answer to that so I'll have to get back to you.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 15 October 2020

As part of the Spaces for People programme covering Safe Travel to Schools, and since his previous answer to August Council, can the Convener list the schools which as part of this initiative and before the end of September have had:

Question

- (1)** Enhancements implemented and completed “on the ground”?

Answer

- (1)** As you will be aware, from the previous answer given to the member, there had been 6 measures implemented at the time of 25 August Full Council. I can advise 66 schools now have measures in place, ranging from arrows and footpath markings to full road closures. Notifications go out daily on new proposed measures.

Whilst we had hoped all interventions would be in place by Mid-September, the process has been complex as officers are also working on a range of schemes across the city. Assessments are however nearing completion for all schools so the team are working through feedback and design review at a rapid pace.

Question

- (2)** Enhancements planned and proposals shared with the relevant school’s ward Members, Parents Council and Head Teacher?

Answer

- (2)** Assessments are ongoing and plans are still being developed. These will go through the Spaces for People notification process, which includes ward members. Officers are also liaising with the head teachers on proposals and plans. Outwith Spaces for People, officers are also working on a wider review of school travel plans which will involve close dialogue with schools.

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Mowat for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 15 October 2020**

It is understood that vehicles loading or unloading goods to make deliveries for businesses located on George IV Bridge are expected to stop in the carriageway and the central setted area of the carriageway is then to be used for overtaking the vehicle which is stationary in the carriageway;

Question **(1)** Can the position of the delivery of goods in the urban transport hierarchy be confirmed?

Answer **(1)** The hierarchy is as follows:

Pedestrians and cyclists;

Public transport;

All other vehicles.

Question **(2)** Was there any communication with delivery trade bodies such as the Freight Transport Association, the Road Haulage Association prior to this arrangement being introduced? If so, can this be shared with Council.

Answer **(2)** Trade bodies such as the Freight Transport Association and the Haulage Association are not included in the agreed Notification process carried out in advance of the design being approved. These bodies are only consulted when a permanent Traffic Regulation order is being promoted.

No correspondence has been received from either Body raising any concerns with the temporary project.

Question **(3)** Was there any consultation with businesses based on George IV Bridge, or representative bodies, prior to this arrangement being introduced for deliveries? If so, can this be shared with Council.

- Answer** (3) Due to the emergency nature of the works, the approved procedure for notification of a project prior to it being delivered on site was to include the following:
- Local Councillors; Community Councils; Royal National Institute for Blind People (RNIB); Spokes; Living Streets; and the emergency services.
- Question** (4) Can links be provided to research by official bodies or organisations with professional standing on the safety of loading and unloading in the middle of the road in unmarked bays?
- Answer** (4) The areas available for loading, which are marked with double yellow lines are positioned next to the temporary kerb line which is a standard approach for all road layouts. The central reserve allows additional carriageway space for vehicles to pass if safe to do so.
- More information on design guidance can be found here:
- [Traffic Signs Manual - Chapter 5 Line markings](#)
- [Safety at Street Works Code of Practice](#)
- A safety audit is being carried out on George IV bridge as part of the review process and any issues highlighted in the report will be addressed.
- Question** (5) Were the loading arrangements in place at this location drawn to police and fire services attention and did they express views on this at the consultation stage or subsequently?
- Answer** (5) The design of the loading areas involved carrying out vehicle tracking on a 13m triple axle bus, which is larger than any of the emergency services vehicles. All emergency services were included in the notification process and no concerns were raised at that time or since the measures have been installed.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her lengthy extensive very useful answer which had a very useful appendix Safety at Street Works Code of Practice. On the first page of Safety at Street Works and Roadworks

Code of Practice it states as the very first item “ask yourself the following key questions - will someone using the road or footway from any direction understand exactly what is happening and what is expected of them”, now given that I have stood and watched with a business owner and a Council officer who we fortuitously ran into hail-fellow-well-met indeed and that we, the business owner and myself, looked in astonishment as someone was loading from the centre of the carriage way, impeding all the traffic and said this is ridiculous, and were then told, no, that's the correct way to do it, and the council officer was getting very excited because there was and there have been other examples of this, someone loading from the cycle path, because that is where they thought. Now I think, there have been a number examples of this, I think there is a problem with this because people don't understand how to use this arrangement and if you stand and watch what's happening on George IV Bridge this becomes increasingly clear. So will the Convener take some measures to communicate to businesses the correct way to use this unusual and unique arrangement and will the Convener also communicate the results of the Road Safety Audit when that has been carried out, to all ward Councillors, thank you?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Happy to say yes to both those particular questions Councillor Mowat and I think it is worthwhile though reflecting on the fact that there is inevitably pressure on road space allocation particularly within the City Centre as we know and there will have to be adjustments made in terms of how people go about doing things, there are some cities where of course loading irrespective of where a business might be specifically located would have to be done from a slightly more remote site and that's something which I think we have to ask businesses to consider to see whether or not they can absorb that into their particular business model, or if they expect to be able to continue despite changing road conditions and road space allocation which is very necessary for some of the broader aims of this city in terms of moving towards sustainability and in this particular instance temporary measures to meet the Spaces for People objectives whether or not they can actually move to help us to achieve those in how they go about receiving

deliveries. I appreciate that that can often be a contentious topic, it can often feel like a pressure on businesses, but I think we stand ready to be of assistance where we can.

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 15 October 2020**

Question **(1)** Given the introduction of travel infrastructure measures under the Spaces for People (SFP) programme, which are ‘temporary’, how much of the award of money from Sustrans is being retained from that sum to return infrastructure at the end of the TTRO period?

Answer **(1)** £277,884

Question **(2)** In respect of review of the new measures thus far implemented:

- a) what assessment of volume of footfall, wheeling and cycling is being undertaken on the roads closed as spaces for exercise and how will this be reported?
- b) what assessment in SFP schemes is being undertaken in respect of volume of cyclists where new segregated cycle lanes have been installed and how will this be reported?
- c) what assessment is being undertaken of vehicular traffic and traffic flows on the roads where SPF has been implemented and how will this be reported?

Answer **(2)** a) Regular reviews of all schemes include a site visit to take pedestrian and cyclist counts. This enables the project team to assess the usage and popularity levels of the schemes, to speak to users about their experience of using the infrastructure and to recommend any design changes. Video counts have also been collected for Cammo Walk, Leith Links and Silverknowes Road.

b) Baseline monitoring is being undertaken on the majority of Spaces for People schemes where cycle segregation is being introduced. Cyclist counts are

either being captured through the Council's existing network of cycle counters, or through video counts. These will be repeated at a future date to consider changes over time. This detailed monitoring data will form part of scheme reviews in due course.

- c) Traffic levels are currently monitored at various locations across the city. Specific additional counter equipment has and will be deployed to inform scheme reviews throughout the Programme

Question (3) Has Legal Advice been obtained by the Council regarding implementation of SFP measures in advance of road safety audits and can this be shared?

Answer (3) No Legal Advice was felt to be necessary in respect of implementing measures in advance of road safety audits. The design approach undertaken for these schemes mirrors the normal process for temporary traffic management arrangements which would be deployed by the Council.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answer. The answer to point 3 does concern me slightly in I think that there is a material difference between say the very temporary removal of a parking bay or a road closure for an event or urgent utility works compared to the significant travel infrastructure works and the risks and safety of SfP but my supplementary is actually on point 1, in Aberdeen for instance £420,000, around a quarter of its grant received is being retained to do work, significantly less has been set aside here despite a much larger grant in Edinburgh, will the Convener guarantee that other council budgets will not be impacted beyond this sum mentioned in the answer to undo spaces for people measures and that the works will not be made permanent simply on the basis there are no funds left to put back, thank you.

Supplementary Answer Thank you Councillor Rust for the question. Clearly I'm not going to guarantee anything about operational budgets because that's not a matter for me to be concerned with, that's a matter for the officers, however what I would indicate very clearly is that there will always be a gap

between temporary spaces for people pieces and any shift towards absorbing what we've learned from that, what the possibilities are that we've learned from that into any kind of permanent measure. So there would always be some degree of a break there. Any changes that might occur around Spaces for People projects that form part of the initiative will of course come back to Transport and Environment for review and agreement, and that would form part of that discussion.

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Miller for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 15 October 2020

Question

What information and evidence has been gathered from other cities in relation to design, consultation, implementation, adaptation/improvement and measurement of Low Traffic Neighbourhoods?

Answer

In preparing the proposals for Low Traffic Neighbourhoods (LTNs) research was done on LTNs, and similar type interventions, in other cities, including:

- Waltham Forrest
- Ealing
- Enfield
- Oxford
- Bristol
- Glasgow
- Copenhagen

Further to this research papers were reviewed on ways of reducing traffic levels and creating better and safer use of road space. These papers drew on evidence and research across a wide variety of projects in the UK and Europe.

In general, research and evidence suggest that the introduction of LTNs:

- Making it more attractive and safer for people to travel through the area on foot, wheeling or by bike;
- Reduced levels of traffic, especially rat running at peak times; and

Making streets more adaptable for other uses by local residents, such as for children to play and for community activities

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for the answer to my written question. I would please like to clarify the answer that she's given which is very brief for such a complex subject. She says that evidence showed that low traffic neighbourhoods reduced the levels of traffic and I would just like to double-check please that I've understood correctly, that the research and evidence that the council has used does show that overall levels of traffic are reduced and that the result of introducing a low traffic neighbourhood is not increased traffic on the arterial routes surrounding but total traffic levels in the whole area are indeed reduced?.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for the supplementary. Yes, clearly it was always going to be difficult for us to incorporate the vast array of research around low traffic neighbourhoods in a simple written answer here, and I certainly didn't want to produce a tome for you to work your way through. I think there is a general acceptance in terms of evidence what has happened around low traffic neighbourhoods that have been put in place, where we generally see in the area a reduction in traffic, it's called traffic evaporation, we accept that because people then are encouraged to make alternative choices particularly for those shorter trips, as we see in certain parts of the city, we see high level of short trips of between 1 and 3 kilometres for example which could be easily done by foot or by bike or by public transport and encourages people to make those choices rather than to automatically take their car. In Waltham Forest for example I think I'm correct in saying I can't remember the exact figure - between 15 and 17% traffic evaporation around that by area and that's a phenomenon that's been observed elsewhere. Now it doesn't happen immediately, it doesn't happen the night after you put the measures in, but it takes a little bit of time for that evidence to come forward and to be seen to have a significant impact. When you have that, you have a reduction then in terms of both congestion and the difficulties that are attached to that, in terms of lost economic value, quality of life issues etc., also plays into the air pollution discussion as well around overall areas, much of the conversation however around traffic displacement and/or evaporation tends to be zoned in on a particular road

or a particular couple of roads and it's often not very helpful to do that because what you have to do is take it outside into a slightly larger area and to understand what the overall impact is at the moment, so for example on Comiston Road at the moment where we have not put in a low traffic neighbourhood but we have put in some changes, we have seen an overall drop in that area of 35% of traffic at this point, that may of course change, it's a temporary measure at this point, so you can see that kind of thing developing elsewhere, people make different choices when they are presented with the opportunity to make more sustainable transport choices and to enjoy walking or cycling in an area where there's traffic reduction.

QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Cook for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 15 October 2020**

Question (1) Since the resumption of Pay and Display parking charges, how much Pay and Display income has the Council lost - thus far - as a result of the Spaces for People programme?

Answer (1) The table below shows the total income received for public parking in the streets where parking places have been affected by the Spaces for People programme.

	2019	2020	% change
July	£104,516.35	£76,992.00	-26.33%
August	£96,903.00	£88,779.20	-8.38%

For comparison, the table below shows the total income received for public parking across the city over the same periods:

	2019	2020	% change
July	£1,757,587.20	£1,215,270.74	-30.86%
August	£1,842,126.60	£1,531,109.11	-16.88%

Please note that the data for September is not yet available

Question (2) How much Pay and Display income is the Council is projected to lose should Spaces for People measures remain in place until expiry of the relevant traffic orders?

Answer (2) Looking forward, it is extremely difficult to predict future pay and display income when the uncertainty remains regarding the Covid-19 pandemic. However, the available data suggests that pay and display income could be down between 5 and 10% in these areas.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost. Obviously the information presented shows as much as a 31% drop in income to the authority for pay and display parking, I'm slightly troubled by your comments in terms of saying operational budgets are

not your concern Convener, I think they're of prime concern to people elected to this authority not just by officers. Given these steep declines and the uncertainty around how sustained the decline will be, will you agree to a regular business bulletin update which charts the increase possibly or the decrease in parking income being reported to the Transport and Environment Committee so Councillors can keep watch on this?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I think I'd like to clarify, so thank you for your supplementary but I think I'd like to clarify my previous comment so that it's not misconstrued, clearly of course budget issues are of importance to Conveners, Vice Conveners and indeed anybody in the Council as an elected member, what I meant was that I could not guarantee that that would not go forward because that's based on operational activity and that was the precise question I was being asked earlier on, so I was not going to give a guarantee that was not mine to give, simple as that. In terms of reporting, yes clearly these figures reflect the fact that we're in an incredibly fluid situation at the moment, this is a year like no other and we do not yet know how that is going to change and go forward, we have no real understanding, nobody has in the world of transport about exactly what will happen and when, as we go through our recovery stages and back to a more normal situation, however I'm very happy to commit to having a business bulletin which will give at least a rough overview and as informed a view as possible at each of the time to go through our transport and Environment schedule, thank you.

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Burgess for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 15 October 2020

Question

What conversations has the Convener had with the Gaelic community in the last six months about council proposals for GME at secondary level?

Answer

The Convener and Vice Convener have met with representatives of the Gaelic community on various occasions to discuss the Council proposals. There has been extensive informal discussions throughout this time as well as the following formal meetings;

- 22nd January - a meeting of officers, elected members and the parent body at Taobh na Pàirce to present options and a vision for a future GME secondary.
- 13th February - parents representatives met with the Convener and Vice-Convener to discuss a mechanism to examine the options further with outside expertise.
- 5th May – virtual meeting which involved representation from the Edinburgh Gaelic school community and the wider Gaelic community across Scotland including the Scottish Government, Bòrd na Gàidhlig and Glasgow Council to discuss co-location and standalone models.
- 22nd September - parents representatives met with the Convener and Vice-Convener to discuss a plan for, and information provided in, a pre-consultation.

Further meetings with the whole school community will take place before the end of 2020 but no specific dates have been set.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thanks Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer. I wonder if the Convener could clarify when the consultation about a Gaelic Medium secondary is likely to be made public and as requested by Gaelic school parents whether it will contain balanced information on all the options?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for the supplementary question. We discussed it with the small working group that we meet with and met with on 22 September and what we agreed is we would try as much as possible to start the informal consultation after the October break and I think we will still keep to that schedule, although we're in constant contact with them. The big problem is of course, is how you do it, you want to be able to involve all the parents in the consultation and in trying to do that and coming up with a scheme that actually makes sense is not that easy, however we've agreed that we'll make sure that if it's a virtual meeting that we have to do, and I can't see any other way of doing it, we'll have enough to allow all the parents to participate so that informal consultation is likely to last over a longer period in order to make sure all parents are allowed to participate. The other big issue is that we were conscious of is when we have to apply for Wave 4 funding, whatever happens we will need Scottish Government support for this, and we have discovered that's now flexible, so while we were trying to rush beforehand in order to meet the October timescale, although I think there's still an indication this October's where we would be going, but made that a bit more flexible so I guess that gives us a wee bit more time to actually to fit the consultation into a timescale that suits everyone.