

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 10 December 2020

Present:-

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

COUNCILLORS

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

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

1 Supporting Our City Centre - Motion by Councillor Mowat

(a) Deputation – Unite the Union Edinburgh Cab Branch

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Unite the Union Edinburgh Cab Branch.

The deputation fully supported the motion by Councillor Mowat for supporting the city centre as the pandemic and the restrictions had had a detrimental effect upon it. They indicated that although free parking may bring some more customers into the city centre, one issue this would cause would be the public parking in taxi ranks, as they already did this on a Sunday, when it was currently free parking.

The deputation also felt that it was imperative that Council protected and supported local traders, businesses and all those who relied on them so they could once again thrive and flourish when they reopened and got back to normal. They indicated that one solution to help the taxi trade would be to use taxis to transport PPE and now that the vaccine had arrived in Scotland, they felt that they were the easiest and quickest transport provider to get this around the town to clinics and care homes.

(b) Deputation – Keith Falconer and Whizz-Kidz

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Keith Falconer and Whizz Kidz.

The deputation welcomed the motion by Councillor Mowat calling for support of City Centre businesses and the appropriate measures suggested to encourage local residents to access shops safely and with proper facilities in place. They asked the Council to ensure that any measures put in place to facilitate local residents' access to shops also include those with disabilities.

The deputation asked the Council to work with disabled people to include sufficient disabled parking bays, improved dropped kerbs and access to appropriate toilet facilities and changing places in any plans to encourage local residents to access shops.

(c) Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council:

Recognises:

- a) that the Scottish Government’s Protection Levels Framework has been agreed to continue to suppress the virus, but notes that this has caused significant hardship to the businesses operating in the City Centre;
- b) that the Shop Local campaign is welcome, but the funding excludes areas with a Business Improvement District in place which means that there is no support for the Essential Edinburgh area which encompasses the major shopping streets in the City centre which are significant employers; and
- c) that whilst the city remains in Level 3 of the Strategic framework and surrounded by local authorities in differing levels, no one should be coming in to or leaving the city except for essential purposes;

Therefore calls for an urgent meeting of appropriate officers to consider immediate short term measures that could be put in place to support the message that this year Edinburgh City Centre belongs to us – the residents of Edinburgh -- and just as your local high street needs your support so does your city centre; which could include:

- re-instating any parking bays in the city centre that have been removed for any reason;
- first hour free parking – to recognise that whilst the city remains in Level 3 public transport for non-essential journeys is not encouraged or designate saving the city centre as essential;
- a communications campaign reminding people that the city centre and its shops need us as they have no one else and that the businesses and those who work in them are relying on the people of Edinburgh to get them through to the other side of the pandemic;
- whether on street stand-alone public toilets can be provided quickly so that resident who want to enjoy the city without the visitors are confident this provision is in place if they choose to venture in;

and any other ideas to encourage people to safely visit the businesses that remain open and which we wish to support.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Douglas

Amendment 1

Deletes all of the motion by Council Mowat and replace with:

Notes with concern, the serious impact which COVID19 has had, and continues to have, upon on the footfall, vibrancy, operating and trading conditions for shops, hospitality businesses, cultural attractions within Edinburgh’s City Centre, and their respective supply chain businesses.

Notes and appreciates all measures taken by Edinburgh businesses to innovate, adapt and adhere to current and changes to Scottish Government restrictions in place, ensuring their businesses are safe environments for customers and staff.

Notes that during the past 10 years, Essential Edinburgh BID levy payers have generated circa £9 million which has been invested in making improvements to, creating events, campaigns and initiatives to promote Edinburgh’s City Centre.

Notes funding of £290,000 has been allocated to support the City Centre specifically through the Towns and Business Improvement Districts Resilience and Recovery Fund, and further notes that to date in excess of £123m has been paid to support over 12000 businesses across the City, helping many City Centre businesses.

Notes that www.edinburgh.org and its associated Social Media Channels, as well as the part Council funded Forever Edinburgh campaign specifically is promoting City Centre traders and as a destination.

Notes the Council Leader and officers meet business leaders weekly, with regular check-ins from cross-industry groups including Essential Edinburgh, Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Small Business, Edinburgh Hotelier Association and other key industry reps.

Notes the Council Leader and Chief Executive meet the Scottish Government weekly and have made consistent representations to ensure Edinburgh was allocated the lowest possible level of restrictions while keeping communities safe- and have made direct representations on the make-up of Level 3 while Edinburgh was in this level to try push for changes to better support business operations while keeping communities safe.

Notes actions to support businesses have been taken up by the Council's Business Gateway service which provides 1to1 advisory support, funding guidance, webinars and online tutorials, DigitalBoost upskilling and access to market research data.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

1) To re-word point b) of the motion by Councillor Mowat as follows:

“...which means that there is no support for the Essential Edinburgh area which encompasses the major shopping streets in the City centre which are significant employers has relied on Scottish Government Business Improvement Districts COVID-19 Resilience Funds (receiving £190,000 for the period April to October 2020, and £100,000 for the period October 2020 to March 2021)”

2) To delete the following points:

“- re-instating any parking bays in the city centre that have been removed for any reason;

- first hour free parking – to recognise that whilst the city remains in Level 3 public transport for non-essential journeys is not encouraged or designate saving the city centre as essential;”

3) To replace the points deleted with:

“- Encouraging people to make use of expanded space for walking, wheeling and cycling through Spaces for People changes in the city centre, noting the higher spend from active travel customers”

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

Amendment 3

To delete all in the motion by Councillor Mowat after the words ‘support so does your city centre.’

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Osler

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), the motion was adjusted, Amendments 1 and 2 were adjusted and accepted as addendums to the motion and Amendment 3 was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mowat:

- 1) To note with concern, the serious impact which COVID19 had had, and continued to have, upon on the footfall, vibrancy, operating and trading conditions for shops, hospitality businesses, cultural attractions within Edinburgh's City Centre, and their respective supply chain businesses.
- 2) To note and appreciates all measures taken by Edinburgh businesses to innovate, adapt and adhere to current and changes to Scottish Government restrictions in place, ensuring their businesses were safe environments for customers and staff.
- 3) To note that during the past 10 years, Essential Edinburgh BID levy payers had generated circa £9 million which had been invested in making improvements to, creating events, campaigns and initiatives to promote Edinburgh's City Centre.
- 4) To note funding of £290,000 had been allocated to support the City Centre specifically through the Towns and Business Improvement Districts Resilience and Recovery Fund, and further note that to date in excess of £123m had been paid to support over 12000 businesses across the City, helping many City Centre businesses.
- 5) To note that www.edinburgh.org and its associated Social Media Channels, as well as the part Council funded Forever Edinburgh campaign specifically was promoting City Centre traders and as a destination.
- 6) To note the Council Leader and officers met business leaders weekly, with regular check-ins from cross-industry groups including Essential Edinburgh, Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce, Federation of Small Business, Edinburgh Hotelier Association and other key industry reps.
- 7) To note the Council Leader and Chief Executive met the Scottish Government weekly and had made consistent representations to ensure Edinburgh was allocated the lowest possible level of restrictions while keeping communities safe- and had made direct representations on the make-up of Level 3 while Edinburgh was in this level to try push for changes to better support business operations while keeping communities safe.
- 8) To note actions to support businesses had been taken up by the Council's Business Gateway service which provided 1to1 advisory support, funding guidance, webinars and online tutorials, DigitalBoost upskilling and access to market research data.

- 9) To encourage people to make use of expanded space for walking, wheeling and cycling through Spaces for People changes in the city centre, noting the higher spend from active travel customers.
- 10) Therefore to call for an urgent meeting of appropriate officers to consider immediate short term measures that could be put in place to support the message that this year Edinburgh City Centre belongs to us – the residents of Edinburgh -- and just as your local high street needs your support so does your city centre.

2 Public Sector Pay Freeze – Motion by Councillor McVey

(a) Deputation from the 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 welcomed the motion by Councillor McVey. They indicated that Council staff, in all services, had been providing essential, preventative and lifesaving services throughout the pandemic without a break. Many of them had worked beyond their normal hours and in difficult circumstances to continue with the provision of essential services in the communities in which they lived, worked, and served.

The deputation asked the Council to be committed to ensuring that the value of any past or future pay award was not undermined by internal processes that diminished the Pay and Benefits of the staff that they claimed to support, and that they treat any such proposals as being unfair and inappropriate and act accordingly.

(b) Motion by Councillor McVey

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

“Council condemns the UK Government is proposing a public sector pay freeze for the vast majority of employees and a below inflation rise for even the lowest paid employees as a part of the Chancellor’s Comprehensive Spending Review.

Council notes the role of public service workers has been critical in responding to and helping both Scotland and Edinburgh manage the impact of Covid-19 and considers that without the hard work of public servants, especially front line workers, such as cleaners and care assistants, we would

not have been able to protect the city and support vulnerable people to the extent that we have through this crisis.

Council recognises that the economic impact of Covid-19 goes far beyond the public sector, but agrees the specific contribution of public sector employees should be recognised and appropriately rewarded.

Requests that the Council Leader & Depute Leader write to the UK and Scottish Governments to make clear that public sector workers should be paid fairly and appropriately by fully funding any future pay increases that are agreed between employers and trade unions.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

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

- 1) To recognise the "economic emergency" caused by Covid-19 has only just begun, impacting all sectors of the UK economy, including the culture, hospitality and retail sectors in our capital city.
- 2) To salute the heroism of frontline employees, and efforts of all employees, volunteers and residents across the city during this unprecedented challenging year, including our own hardworking Council staff.
- 3) To accept that pausing headline pay awards next year for some workforces will allow the UK Government to protect public sector jobs and investment in public services to respond to spending pressures from Covid-19 and also avoid further expansion of the gap between public and private sector pay award.
- 4) To request the Leader and Depute Leader write to the Rt. Hon. Rishi Sunak MP, Chancellor of the Exchequer welcoming:
 - (a) the furlough scheme introduced and extended by the UK Government;
 - (b) the announcement by the UK Government of a 2.2% increase to the national living wage, making it one of the highest in the world;
 - (c) the UK Government's funding to aid the global search for a vaccine, funding more international research than any other country of comparable size; and

- (d) the nearly £10 billion provided by the UK Government for the Scottish Budget to tackle the pandemic.

- moved by Councillor Rust, seconded by Councillor Mitchell

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), paragraphs 1 and 2 of the amendment were accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	42 votes
For the amendment	-	18 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To condemn that the UK Government was proposing a public sector pay freeze for the vast majority of employees and a below inflation rise for even the lowest paid employees as a part of the Chancellor's Comprehensive Spending Review.
- 2) To note the role of public service workers had been critical in responding to and helping both Scotland and Edinburgh manage the impact of Covid-19 and considered that without the hard work of public servants, especially front line workers, such as cleaners and care assistants, the Council would not have been able to protect the city and support vulnerable people to the extent that it had through this crisis.
- 3) To recognise that the economic impact of Covid-19 went far beyond the public sector, but agree the specific contribution of public sector employees should be recognised and appropriately rewarded.

- 4) To recognise that the Council Leader and Depute Leader write to the UK and Scottish Governments to make clear that public sector workers should be paid fairly and appropriately by fully funding any future pay increases that were agreed between employers and trade unions.
- 5) To recognise the "economic emergency" caused by Covid-19 had only just begun, impacting all sectors of the UK economy, including the culture, hospitality and retail sectors in the capital city.
- 6) To salute the heroism of frontline employees, and efforts of all employees, volunteers and residents across the city during this unprecedented challenging year, including the Council's own hardworking staff.

3 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 19 November 2020 as a correct record.

4 Questions

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

5 Leader's Report

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

- Welcome to Councillor Ethan Young
- Thanks to those who organised the recent by-election
- Edinburgh's COVID level status
- Thanks to work of officers over the past months
- Break over the festive season

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Councillor Whyte | - | Edinburgh's COVID level status – threshold numbers |
| Councillor Staniforth | - | Pensions Committee – decision to refuse to consider divestment from investment in fossil fuel companies |

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| Councillor Aldridge | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thanks to staff for work in recent months - Thanks to Councillor McVey for circulation of letter regarding tier levels – addition of additional risks |
| Councillor Day | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congratulations to Councillors Douglas and Webber on selection as Scottish Parliament candidates - Edinburgh’s COVID level status - disappointment |
| Councillor Fullerton | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Bank branch closures in Edinburgh |
| Councillor Johnston | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hospitality in Edinburgh – Tourist tax |
| Councillor Main | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thanks to staff for commitment over recent months - 2019 suicide figures – access to mental health services |
| Councillor Louise Young | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EIS – request for distance learning for last 2 days of this school term |
| Councillor Munro | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Edinburgh’s COVID restriction level – funding from Scottish Government |
| Councillor Gardiner | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impact on economy of Brexit – moving forward as an independent Scotland |
| Councillor Webber | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accounts Commission Best Value Audit report – reconsideration of plans following objections |
| Councillor Barrie | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thanks to all staff - Accounts Commission Best Value Audit report - recommendations |
| Councillor Howie | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easing of restrictions over the festive period |
| Councillor Lang | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Economic consequences of keeping Edinburgh in Level 3 and economic consequences of leaving the EU in 3 weeks time |

6 Appointment to Committees etc

Decision

- 1) To appoint Councillor Ethan Young in place of Councillor Munn on the Planning Committee and the Development Management Sub-Committee and relevant Local Review Body.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Ethan Young in place of Councillor Fullerton on the Culture and Communities Committee.

7 Review of Political Management Arrangements December 2020

At their meeting on 25 August 2020, the Council had agreed Interim Procedural Standing Orders to allow Council business to continue to be carried out for the period 1 September 2020 to 31 December 2020.

Details were provided on the proposed political management arrangements to carry out Council business going forward.

Motion

- 1) To agree all formal meetings of the Council, including Council, executive committees and other committees should continue to take place virtually until restrictions were lessened to a degree that the Council could operate 90% attendance within the Main Council Chamber.
- 2) To note the work being progressed to improve the experience of virtual meetings for Councillors including electronic voting.
- 3) To suspend Procedural Standing Orders until 31 March 2021 and to agree the Interim Standing Orders set out in Appendix 2 to the report by the Chief Executive, to take effect from 14 December 2020, with the following additional changes:
 - a) To agree to change the order of business as set out point 9 of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 to put Council Questions as the last item of business. This is in order to maximise the front loading of decision time for Council while retaining the accountability of the administration though Leaders' questions.
 - b) To agree to add a point 22.15 of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 to read "Individual agenda items, (excluding the budget and quasi-judicial items) will be subject to a 40-minute time limit, unless

specifically agreed by committee at the order of business by a straightforward majority vote if required. This will include time for any questions to officers', proposing and seconding speeches and general debate but not including time to conduct voting. In the event of no express agreement by committee, the Convenor will have the discretion to allow proceedings to continue but should explain why they are doing so."

- c) To agree to add a sentence at the start of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 to read: "Members are responsible for acting in accordance with the Members' code of conduct at Council meetings."
 - d) To agree to amend the proportion required under standing order 31.1 of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 from "not less than one quarter" to "not less than one third".
 - e) To delegate to the Chief Executive to explore the introduction of a simpler pro-forma online process of submitting deputations to make it clearer for groups to follow and easier for committees and Council to digest the information of the deputation.
- 4) To agree that the Policy and Sustainability Committee would revert to an 8-weekly cycle.
 - 5) To agree Elected Member Champions report to their corresponding executive committee on an annual basis via the business bulletin.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

- 1) To agree all formal meetings of the Council, including Council, executive committees and other committees should continue to take place virtually until restrictions were lessened to a degree that the Council could operate 90% attendance within the Main Council Chamber.
- 2) To note the work being progressed to improve the experience of virtual meetings for Councillors including electronic voting.
- 3) To suspend Procedural Standing Orders until 31 March 2021 and to agree the Interim Standing Orders set out in Appendix 2 to the report by the Chief Executive, to take effect from 14 December 2020, subject to the following changes to the Standing Orders set out in Appendix 2, renumbering as required:
 - a) To remove clause 25 End of Session Decisions (report item 4.19.5).

- b) To add “and with a clear public audit trail from vote to Member” at the end of 24.1
- 4) To believe that these changes should help to promote brevity. Encourage all Members to consider if further training would help them become more effective at contributing or convening virtual meetings. Promote an open dialogue between Members and Officers as a way of spurring continuous improvement in that regard.
- 5) To agree that a small representative group of Member and relevant officers meet to review Standing Orders before March 2021, with the clear objective of reaching an enduring consensus, and that a super majority should be required thereafter to make any permanent changes.
- 6) To agree that the Policy and Sustainability Committee would revert to an 8-weekly cycle.
- 7) To agree Elected Member Champions report to their corresponding executive committee on an annual basis via the business bulletin.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Amendment 2

- 1) To agree all formal meetings of the Council, including Council, executive committees and other committees should continue to take place virtually until restrictions were lessened to a degree that the Council could operate 90% attendance within the Main Council Chamber.
- 2) To note the work being progressed to improve the experience of virtual meetings for Councillors including electronic voting.
- 3) To suspend Procedural Standing Orders until 31 March 2021 and to agree the Interim Standing Orders set out in Appendix 2 to the report by the Chief Executive, to take effect from 14 December 2020, with the exception of new Standing Order 25, and renumber accordingly.
- 4) To agree that the Policy and Sustainability Committee would revert to an 8-weekly cycle.
- 5) To agree Elected Member Champions report to their corresponding executive committee on an annual basis via the business bulletin.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Aldridge

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	35 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes
For Amendment 2	-	8 votes

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

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

For Amendment 2: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Ritchie, Neil Ross and Louise Young,)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To agree all formal meetings of the Council, including Council, executive committees and other committees should continue to take place virtually until restrictions were lessened to a degree that the Council could operate 90% attendance within the Main Council Chamber.
- 2) To note the work being progressed to improve the experience of virtual meetings for Councillors including electronic voting.
- 3) To suspend Procedural Standing Orders until 31 March 2021 and to agree the Interim Standing Orders set out in Appendix 2 to the report by the Chief Executive, to take effect from 14 December 2020, with the following additional changes:
 - a) To agree to change the order of business as set out point 9 of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 to put Council Questions as the last item of business. This is in order to maximise the front loading of decision time for Council while retaining the accountability of the administration though Leaders' questions.
 - b) To agree to add a point 22.15 of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 to read "Individual agenda items, (excluding the budget and quasi-judicial items) will be subject to a 40-minute time limit, unless

specifically agreed by committee at the order of business by a straightforward majority vote if required. This will include time for any questions to officers', proposing and seconding speeches and general debate but not including time to conduct voting. In the event of no express agreement by committee, the Convenor will have the discretion to allow proceedings to continue but should explain why they are doing so."

- c) To agree to add a sentence at the start of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 to read: "Members are responsible for acting in accordance with the Members' code of conduct at Council meetings."
 - d) To agree to amend the proportion required under standing order 31.1 of the interim standing orders in Appendix 2 from "not less than one quarter" to "not less than one third".
 - e) To delegate to the Chief Executive to explore the introduction of a simpler pro-forma online process of submitting deputations to make it clearer for groups to follow and easier for committees and Council to digest the information of the deputation.
 - f) To add "and with a clear public audit trail from vote to Member" at the end of 24.1
- 4) To agree that the Policy and Sustainability Committee would revert to an 8-weekly cycle.
 - 5) To agree Elected Member Champions report to their corresponding executive committee on an annual basis via the business bulletin.
 - 6) To believe that these changes should help to promote brevity. Encourage all Members to consider if further training would help them become more effective at contributing or convening virtual meetings. Promote an open dialogue between Members and Officers as a way of spurring continuous improvement in that regard.
 - 7) To agree that a small representative group of Member and relevant officers meet to review Standing Orders before March 2021, with the clear objective of reaching an enduring consensus.

(Reference – Act of Council No 5 of 25 August 2020; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

8 Treasury Management: Mid-Term Report 2020/21 – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report which provided an update on Treasury Management Activity undertaken in the first half of 2020/21, to the Council, for approval of the Treasury Management Strategy.

Decision

- 1) To approve the Treasury Management Strategy.
- 2) To refer the report to the Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee for scrutiny.

(References – Finance and Resources Committee of 3 December 2020 (item 6); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

9 Best Value Assurance Audit – referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report which detailed the findings of the City of Edinburgh Council’s Best Value Assurance Audit and set out the approach to fully review and respond with a joined up, comprehensive approach to the findings to the Council for information.

Motion

To note the report by the Chief Executive.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the findings of the Best Value Assurance Audit Report and the Accounts Commission’s Findings which highlighted a large number of significant failings including:
 - The council “does not have adequate public performance reporting arrangements”
 - The council “does not have a structured approach to continuous improvement”
 - residents’ satisfaction rates “with many services have declined”

- Progress reports to elected members on its Change Portfolio – which includes transformation projects – “do not set out details of the savings expected or achieved”
 - “it does not have a longer-term financial plan to address its significant revenue budget challenges”
 - the Council’s Workforce Plan – vital to controlling cost and prioritising staff resource in the right areas – “has become less detailed than the 2016 version”
 - “staff are not always positive about their leadership”
 - while the report suggests improving KPIs the benchmarking reported at Exhibit 6 still shows a worse position than in 2014/15 and 2015/16
 - The Edinburgh Integration Joint Board “not yet developed the detailed plans needed to address significant financial pressures”
 - The Business Plan intended to implement the Coalition’s 52 Council Commitments “does not provide a clear focus for the council”, many of commitments “are not easily measured and they are not prioritised” and the Change Strategy to implement the Business Plan “does not include the 52 commitments or set out specific actions to deliver them”.
 - “The pace of change in establishing effective community planning governance arrangements has been slow and there is limited evidence to demonstrate the impact of partnership working on outcomes.”
 - “Community empowerment is not embedded in the council’s culture.”
 - There is a “lack of involvement of some members in decision-making”
- 2) To recognise that these findings often contradicted the Council’s self-assessment which was little surprise given that it was undertaken without seeking widespread input and did not include the views of all elected members. Even overall positive statements like “The council has ambitious plans for the future of Edinburgh” were heavily caveated with “but its priorities are not clearly articulated” and exposed the Administration’s approach which relied on publishing glossy strategic documentation but routinely omitted implementation plans, performance plans and funding details.
- 3) To note that these significant failings were a direct result of political decisions taken by the current coalition Administration to reject repeated calls by the Conservative Group for an improved Council Performance Framework and a new culture of continuous improvement.

- 4) To therefore agree that, notwithstanding the Chief Executive's intention to address the improvement actions arising from the report in the refreshed Council Business Plan, these issues and the areas of Council service where performance improvement was required needed an additional and specific reporting mechanism and progress tracker.
- 5) To instruct the Chief Executive to incorporate the improvement actions into the development of a revised Council Performance Framework so that it met the aspirations in the recommendations of the Report.
- 6) To further instruct that a specific Best Value Improvement Plan be created to monitor progress on the totality of the recommendations in the report, including those to the Edinburgh Partnership

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To also note the decision of the Policy and Sustainability Committee at its meeting on 1st December 2020 and the scrutiny and consideration of the report by Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee on 8th December.
- 3) To further note:
 - a) Policy and Sustainability Committee requested 'further consideration of genuine local community empowerment'
 - b) The Audit findings concluded that Community engagement is not embedded in the council's culture; the Council and its partners have not yet established effective community planning governance arrangements.
 - c) There is concern within communities across Edinburgh and the Council that communities are not supported to engage effectively with community planning or development of Council services.
- 4) To therefore request that the 'further consideration', includes development with the community, stakeholders and members, of a community engagement and communications plan for Council and proposals for effective support for community planning arrangements.

- moved by Councillor Main, seconded by Councillor Miller

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), Paragraph 5 of Amendment 1 and the whole of Amendment 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	43 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To note the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To also note the decision of the Policy and Sustainability Committee at its meeting on 1st December 2020 and the scrutiny and consideration of the report by Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee on 8th December.
- 3) To further note:
 - a) Policy and Sustainability Committee requested 'further consideration of genuine local community empowerment'
 - b) The Audit findings concluded that Community engagement was not embedded in the council's culture; the Council and its partners had not yet established effective community planning governance arrangements.
 - c) There was concern within communities across Edinburgh and the Council that communities were not supported to engage effectively with community planning or development of Council services.
- 4) To therefore request that the 'further consideration', included development with the community, stakeholders and members, of a community engagement and communications plan for Council and proposals for effective support for community planning arrangements.

- 5) To instruct the Chief Executive to incorporate the improvement actions into the development of a revised Council Performance Framework so that it met the aspirations in the recommendations of the Report.

(References – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 1 December 2020 (item 9); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Cameron declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of EICC, EDI and CEC Holdings and a Director of the Edinburgh Community Solar Cooperative (ECSC).

Councillor Gordon declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Chair of EICC and a member of Capital City Partnership and Edinburgh Leisure.

Councillor Smith declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of EICC, Capital City Partnership and Edinburgh Leisure.

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

10 Controlled Parking Zones and Carers - Motion by Councillor Lang

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

“Council:

- 1) recognises the immense contribution of carers across Edinburgh and the particular pressures they have faced this year as a result of the spread of COVID-19.
- 2) notes the Council’s Essential User Parking Permit Scheme allows some healthcare professionals to be exempt from day-to-day charges in controlled parking zones, but is not available to carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants who provide a large proportion of social and personal care at home Edinburgh, often through the Council’s direct payments scheme.
- 3) notes that, in addition, no support arrangements are in place for unpaid carers which means these vital and dedicated individuals can incur substantial parking costs when caring for vulnerable loved ones who stay within CPZ areas.

- 4) recognises that the much needed expansion of controlled parking across the city means this issue is likely to become greater in the years ahead.
- 5) therefore seeks a report to the Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles on:
 - (a) widening the Essential User Parking Permit Scheme to cover paid carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants and
 - (b) exempting those in receipt of carer's allowance from paying pay and display parking charges within controlled parking zones when carrying out their caring responsibilities"

Motion

Council:

- 1) recognises the immense contribution of carers across Edinburgh and the particular pressures they have faced this year as a result of the spread of COVID-19.
- 2) notes the Council's Essential User Parking Permit Scheme allows some healthcare professionals to be exempt from day-to-day charges in controlled parking zones, but is not available to carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants who provide a large proportion of social and personal care at home Edinburgh, often through the Council's direct payments scheme.
- 3) notes that, unpaid carers can also incur substantial parking costs when caring for vulnerable loved ones who stay within CPZ areas.
- 4) recognises that the much needed expansion of controlled parking across the city means this issue is likely to become greater in the years ahead.
- 5) therefore seeks a report to the Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles on:
 - (a) widening the Essential User Parking Permit Scheme to cover paid carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants and
 - (b) exempting those in receipt of carer's allowance from paying pay and display parking charges within controlled parking zones when carrying out their caring responsibilities

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross

Amendment 1

- 1) To amend the first paragraph of the motion by Councillor Lang to:

Council:

- 1) recognises the immense and valued contribution of carers across Edinburgh and the particular pressures they have faced this year as a result of the spread of COVID-19.
- 2) To amend Point 2 in the motion to include:
 - 2) notes the Council's Essential User Parking Permit Scheme allows some healthcare professionals to be exempt from day-to-day charges in controlled parking zones through the purchase of exemption permits for limited use, but is not available to carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants who provide a large proportion of social and personal care at home Edinburgh, often through the Council's direct payments scheme.
- 3) To delete point 3 in the motion and replace with:
 - 3) Recognises the understandable desire expressed in the original motion to acknowledge this valued contribution to the city's well-being by carers through exemption from parking fees, similar to that currently provided to some GP staff, for example.
- 4) To retain point 4 of the motion.
- 5) To amend point 5 of the motion to include:

Therefore seeks a report to the Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles which will examine the feasibility of implementing support to carers by

- (a) widening the Essential User Parking Permit Scheme to cover paid carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants.
- (b) exempting those in receipt of carer's allowance from paying pay and display parking charges within controlled parking zones when carrying out their caring responsibilities.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 2

To add the following additional points to paragraph 5 of Councillor Lang's motion:

- (c) ensuring that paid carers and volunteers who are working for companies in partnership with Edinburgh are always reimbursed in full for travel expenses, that assessments for care include travel expenses and that carers grant funding can cover additional travel expenses if needed
- (d) exploring how the Council can best support those carers, particularly those receiving benefits including carers allowance, to ensure they are able to make best sustainable travel choices for their health and wellbeing

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Main

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an amendment to the motion and Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

- 1) To recognise the immense and valued contribution of carers across Edinburgh and the particular pressures they had faced this year as a result of the spread of COVID-19
- 2) To note the Council's Essential User Parking Permit Scheme allowed some healthcare professionals to be exempt from day-to-day charges in controlled parking zones through the purchase of exemption permits for limited use, but was not available to carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants who provided a large proportion of social and personal care at home Edinburgh, often through the Council's direct payments scheme.
- 3) To note that, unpaid carers could also incur substantial parking costs when caring for vulnerable loved ones who stayed within CPZ areas.
- 4) To recognise that the much needed expansion of controlled parking across the city meant this issue was likely to become greater in the years ahead.
- 5) To therefore seek a report to the Transport and Environment Committee within three cycles which would examine the feasibility of implementing support to carers by

- (a) widening the Essential User Parking Permit Scheme to cover paid carers registered with the Scottish Social Services Council and unregistered home care workers and personal assistants.
- (b) exempting those in receipt of carer's allowance from paying pay and display parking charges within controlled parking zones when carrying out their caring responsibilities.

11 Wardie Bay Beachwatch - Motion by Councillor Bird

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

“Council

Thanks Wardie Bay Beachwatch and all the volunteers from across the area and beyond, that have helped to maintain this invaluable local asset and monitor levels of waste and debris for the Marine Conservation Society.

Recognises the valuable ecosystem services of Wardie Bay and the important role of biodiversity at this site.

Notes that the recent application for bathing water status for Wardie Bay, based on the noticeable increase in numbers of visitors and wild swimmers (particularly since the beginning of the pandemic), was refused.

Recognises the efforts of Wardie Bay Beachwatch, alongside other stakeholders, to submit an appeal to this decision and garner public support through an online petition which is, at time of writing, at 1384 signatures -

<https://www.change.org/p/sepainclude-wardie-bay-edinburgh-in-scotland-s-list-of-designatedbathing-waters-a44504df-b0a6-4452-a6b2-2f4e3ff4c6bb?redirect=false> .

Appreciates the complexity of the mixed ownership of the beach but also recognises the opportunity for the Council to show leadership in this much loved urban blue space.

Agrees that the ‘Vision for Water Management’ and ‘Edinburgh Coastline - update’ reports to the November Transport and Environment Committee, outline some of the work that is already underway in the Council to protect and improve Edinburgh’s coastal communities.

Requests, however, that a report is brought back to Transport and Environment Committee in two cycles, outlining specific measures that the Council could consider to match the investment of the local community and support their calls for a cleaner, safer beach for the people and wildlife that benefit from it.”

- moved by Councillor Bird, seconded by Councillor Day

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Bird.

12 Edinburgh's Farmers Market Turning 20 in 2020 - Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

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

“Council notes:

In July 1999, following a request from the then Convener of the Economic Development Committee, officers commenced work on the feasibility for, and viability of establishing an Edinburgh's Farmers Market.

In February 2000, the Economic Development Committee; Environmental Services Committee; and General Purposes Committee all respectively agreed to the establishment of an Edinburgh Farmers Market, initially on a pilot basis.

The Edinburgh Farmers Market, located at Castle Terrace, quickly became, and continues to be, a busy and popular way for Edinburgh residents and visitors to buy fresh food and vegetables directly from local suppliers.

In August 2020, the Farmers Market Cooperative Committee (of market stall holders) took over the running of the weekly market from Essential Edinburgh.

Council:

Congratulates the Edinburgh Farmers Market on reaching its 20th Year Anniversary in 2020;

Welcomes the transition of the Edinburgh Farmers Market into a Cooperative Business Model;

Welcomes the role Edinburgh Farmers' Market plays in supporting the strategic aims of the Edible Edinburgh Partnership, which works to promote healthy, local, sustainable food as part of delivering economic and environmental benefits for our citizens;

and

Asks the Lord Provost to express and convey the congratulations on behalf of the Council to the Farmers Market Cooperative Committee in an appropriate and fitting manner.”

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron.

13 Former Royal High School - Motion by Councillor Corbett

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

“Council

- 1) Notes that the former Royal High School building is one of the world's most significant examples of Greek Revival neo-classical buildings in the world, but that it was vacated in 1968 when the school moved to Barnton and has lacked a permanent use since then;
- 2) Notes that the city council granted Duddingston House Properties a 125-year ground lease on the building following an open competition in 2010, but that this lease was conditional on DHP securing planning and listed building consent for their proposals;
- 3) Notes that the planning application by Duddingston House Properties and Urbanist Hotels for the former Royal High School was rejected unanimously by the council's Development Management Sub-Committee in 2017 and the appeal to Scottish Ministers was dismissed on 27 October 2020: as contrary to the Local Development Plan overall, contrary to 11 LDP policies and “that the Proposed Development would not preserve the former Royal High School listed building or its setting and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Edinburgh New Town Conservation Area;”
- 4) Notes that the Cockburn Association, Edinburgh's Civic Trust, has called on the council to sever its contractual relationship with the hotel developers to allow proposals from St Mary's Music School and the Royal High School Preservation Trust to advance;
- 5) Therefore agrees to a report to Finance and Resources Committee by the end of January 2021 outlining the contractual relationship with the current developer and setting out options for moving forward with a viable and acceptable use for the building; including ending the contractual relationship with the current developer; and alternative building uses and development pathways.
- 6) Agrees further to review options for a viable “meantime” use which could also address some of the short-term maintenance and security issues for the building.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Corbett.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment

- 1) To accept paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the motion by Councillor Corbett.
- 2) To delete paragraphs 4, 5 and 6 and replace with:
 - “4) Therefore agrees to receive a report to the January meeting of the Finance and Resources Committee that considers the options available to the Council in terms of progressing a viable future use of this important building. As part of the report consideration should be given to a) ensuring future options for the building that would allow for public access b) any short term uses of the building.”

- moved by Councillor Munn, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

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 Corbett:

- 1) To note that the former Royal High School building was one of the world's most significant examples of Greek Revival neo-classical buildings in the world, but that it was vacated in 1968 when the school moved to Barnton and had lacked a permanent use since then.
- 2) To note that the city council granted Duddingston House Properties a 125-year ground lease on the building following an open competition in 2010, but that this lease was conditional on DHP securing planning and listed building consent for their proposals.
- 3) To note that the planning application by Duddingston House Properties and Urbanist Hotels for the former Royal High School was rejected unanimously by the council's Development Management Sub-Committee in 2017 and the appeal to Scottish Ministers was dismissed on 27 October 2020: as contrary to the Local Development Plan overall, contrary to 11 LDP policies and “that the Proposed Development would not preserve the former Royal High School listed building or its setting and would neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the Edinburgh New Town Conservation Area.”.

- 4) Therefore to agree to receive a report to the January meeting of the Finance and Resources Committee that considered the options available to the Council in terms of progressing a viable future use of this important building. As part of the report consideration should be given to a) ensuring future options for the building that would allow for public access b) any short term uses of the building.

14 Great British Bake Off - Peter is our Star Baker – Motion by Councillor Webber

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

“Council

This is an iconic British programme that has brought much needed levity to our mundane lockdown lives on Tuesday evenings.

Should we ever be able to host receptions in the City Chambers then can the Lord Provost look to invite Peter and his family to celebrate in style with us.

Wishes to send a “telegram” from the Lord Provost to Mr Peter Sawkins, an Accountancy student at the University of Edinburgh, and ex-pupil and Head Boy from Currie Community High School to congratulate him on his sumptuous success at becoming, not only the youngest ever winner of the Great British Bake Off, but also the first Scottish winner.

Recognises that Peter has kept this secret for quite some time and hope his flatmates are now tucking into award winning baking.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Bruce

Amendment

To add to the motion by Councillor Webber:

“In acknowledgement of this significant achievement and with the approval of the Incorporated Trades of Edinburgh the Lord Provost further agrees to bestow the Honorary title of Burgess of the City of Edinburgh in recognition, not only of his contribution to the Baking trade, but also to the wellbeing and reputation of City.

The title of Burgess is Freedom of the City as related to the Incorporated Trades and Merchants. It is normally proposed by the Burgess Association but in exceptional cases can be awarded by the Council. This would open the door for Peter to also receive Honorary membership of the Incorporation of Baxters (Bakers) of the City of Edinburgh.”

- moved by Councillor Wilson, seconded by the Lord Provost

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 note that this was an iconic British programme that had brought much needed levity to our mundane lockdown lives on Tuesday evenings.
- 2) To agree that should we ever be able to host receptions in the City Chambers then the Lord Provost look to invite Peter and his family to celebrate in style with us.
- 3) To agree that the Council send a “telegram” from the Lord Provost to Mr Peter Sawkins, an Accountancy student at the University of Edinburgh, and ex-pupil and Head Boy from Currie Community High School to congratulate him on his sumptuous success at becoming, not only the youngest ever winner of the Great British Bake Off, but also the first Scottish winner.
- 4) To recognise that Peter had kept this secret for quite some time and hope his flatmates were now tucking into award winning baking.
- 5) In acknowledgement of this significant achievement and with the approval of the Incorporated Trades of Edinburgh the Lord Provost further agree to bestow the Honorary title of Burgess of the City of Edinburgh in recognition, not only of his contribution to the Baking trade, but also to the wellbeing and reputation of City.

The title of Burgess is Freedom of the City as related to the Incorporated Trades and Merchants. It is normally proposed by the Burgess Association but in exceptional cases can be awarded by the Council. This would open the door for Peter to also receive Honorary membership of the Incorporation of Baxters (Bakers) of the City of Edinburgh.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Arthur declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the father of the recipient was a work colleague.

15 Cardboard Recycling – Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council recognises that the instruction to work from home where possible has changed where waste is generated and that there is increased waste being produced from people’s homes which is further increased by deliveries which generate packaging that needs to be disposed of;

that many residents want to do the right thing and dispose of their packaging waste separately from general waste, which is to be applauded, however the increased volume of waste is creating problems especially in areas with communal bins where there is an insufficient supply of packaging containers, as identified in the project to review and enhance communal bin provision;

recognising that what is already a problem is likely to get worse in the coming weeks as people prepare for Christmas; and calls for an immediate cross-party meeting with officers to come up with quick, easily implemented, low-cost solutions to this problem to keep the streets clean and maximise the income the Council can make from collecting as much cardboard as possible which can then be recycled.”

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Smith

Amendment 1

To accept paragraph 1 of the motion by Councillor Mowat and replace paragraphs 2 and 3 with:

Recognises that the additional household waste and packaging materials generated by changing work patterns and the upcoming Christmas period can or are likely to cause pressures on communal bin capacity.

Welcomes efforts by residents to dispose of their waste correctly including flattening of cardboard boxes and similar packaging.

Recognises that the Waste department has anticipated this and made considerable efforts to mitigate these differences across this festive period including:

- Suspending garden waste collections to allow additional resource to be redirected to communal bin collection.
- Applying that additional resource to communal bin collection for the two weeks prior to Christmas and for some of that additional capacity to continue in the weeks post- Christmas Day.

- Applying the balance of redirected resource to Christmas tree street collections.
- Creation of a comprehensive multi-media campaign (social media, radio, outdoor and lamp wraps etc) to be launched on Monday which encourages residents to embrace ways of reducing waste and to 'go green' this Christmas.

Recognises that any other feasible option would include creating additional collection routes which would produce significant budget pressures on the Waste service.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 2

To add to the motion by Councillor Mowat:

“To note that recycling is at the lower end of the waste hierarchy and agrees that the discussions should include how best to encourage people to shop local, to support local traders and businesses, which will reduce surplus packaging, and to actively choose lower packaging options; further notes and commends many of the “Share” platforms in neighbourhoods throughout the city and applauds their role in re-using and re-purposing items, diverting them from waste streams.”

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Miller

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mowat:

- 1) To recognise that the instruction to work from home where possible had changed where waste was generated and that there was increased waste being produced from people's homes which was further increased by deliveries which generated packaging that needed to be disposed of.
- 2) To note that many residents wanted to do the right thing and dispose of their packaging waste separately from general waste, which was to be applauded, however the increased volume of waste was creating problems especially in areas with communal bins where there was an insufficient supply of packaging containers, as identified in the project to review and enhance communal bin provision.

- 3) To recognise that the additional household waste and packaging materials generated by changing work patterns and the upcoming Christmas period could or were likely to cause pressures on communal bin capacity.
- 4) To welcome efforts by residents to dispose of their waste correctly including flattening of cardboard boxes and similar packaging.
- 5) To recognise that the Waste department had anticipated this and made considerable efforts to mitigate these differences across this festive period including:
 - Suspending garden waste collections to allow additional resource to be redirected to communal bin collection.
 - Applying that additional resource to communal bin collection for the two weeks prior to Christmas and for some of that additional capacity to continue in the weeks post- Christmas Day.
 - Applying the balance of redirected resource to Christmas tree street collections.
 - Creation of a comprehensive multi-media campaign (social media, radio, outdoor and lamp wraps etc) to be launched on Monday which encourages residents to embrace ways of reducing waste and to 'go green' this Christmas.
- 6) To recognise that any other feasible option would include creating additional collection routes which would produce significant budget pressures on the Waste service.

16 Reasons for Exclusion – Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council is concerned that the forms required to be completed by schools when excluding a pupil require the use of a drop down menu provided by SEEMIS to complete the reason for the exclusion of the child and that some of the categories appear to assign criminal behaviour to the child, which will remain on the child’s record for their school career and calls for a report to the Education Children and Families Committee detailing these categories, how they are set and whether the Council has the authority to alter the reasons or whether an approach would need to be made to the Scottish Government to alter them.”

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Laidlaw

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

17 Funding of Flu Vaccine by Head Teachers for Staff– Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

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

“Council:

Notes that in previous winter terms, Headteachers were permitted to use school funds to cover winter flu jabs and a number had planned and budgeted this vaccination for staff in 2020, especially as a means to help reduce absences and co-infection with COVID; noting that supply teachers are in particularly short supply due to the pressures of the pandemic.

Notes that the private provision of flu vaccination can be done quickly and at relatively low cost (circa £12-15 per head).

Notes that a new Directive from City of Edinburgh Council advised Headteachers that they were no longer to use discretionary school funds to pay for flu vaccines for staff.

Notes that this new Directive has led some Headteachers to request that vaccination funds are covered by Parent Councils.

Notes that, given the pandemic, greater numbers of people have been offered the flu vaccine by government and all those offered the vaccine are being urged to take up the offer to protect themselves and others and help the NHS avoid additional pressure over the winter period.

Notes that ordering by private providers of flu vaccination is done many months in advance of the flu season and thus schools choosing to spend discretionary funds on flu jabs for staff will not be impacting on supplies provided to vulnerable groups free of charge.

Requests that City of Edinburgh Council rescinds the directive to headteachers asking them not to spend discretionary funds on flu vaccinations and allows them to make a decision based on their perceived need and with the goal to protect staff and prevent absences in this challenging year.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment

Council agrees to remit the motion to the Education, Children and Families Committee to allow proper investigation and discussion with officers to agree the way forward.

- moved by Councillor Perry seconded by Councillor Dickie

Decision

To remit the motion to the Education, Children and Families Committee to allow proper investigation and discussion with officers to agree the way forward.

18 Accessibility of New Buildings – Motion by Councillor Booth

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that in terms of newly built council homes, current policy is that a minimum of 10% should be fully wheelchair accessible, potentially leaving the remaining 90% inaccessible, thereby potentially excluding many disabled people, particularly wheelchair users. This can result in reduced contact and increased isolation for many disabled people since they are unable to visit the homes of family, friends and others;
- 2) Notes that many buildings can be made at least partially and more easily accessible for disabled people, including wheelchair users by, for example, alterations to the minimum standards for width/sizes of front doors as well as all ground floor room doors, thereby enabling disabled people to enter the accommodation and move around the ground floor. Being able to reach the front door of the accommodation via ramping would be a further important factor in facilitating greater access.
- 3) Recognises that investing in increased ease of access for more council homes may in some instances reduce the demand for full adaption at a later date, and thereby lead to a reduction or at least a check on the council's adaptations budget;
- 4) Requests a report to Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee within 2 cycles examining accessibility in the council's new build council homes and examining the scope to extend the 10% target and ensure that more of the council's new build homes are at least partially accessible to more people;

- 5) Requests a further report to Planning Committee within 2 cycles examining a) compliance with building regulations on accessibility, in particular on step-free access to ground floor properties, and b) examining the potential to ensure greater compliance with building regulations on accessibility and c) examining the potential to use the planning system to demand greater accessibility from developers.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Howie

Amendment 1

- 1) To delete points 1, 3, 4 and 5 of the motion by Councillor Booth and replace with:
 - ”1) Notes that for new build council homes current policy is that a minimum of 10% should be fully wheelchair accessible and that all homes are built to the Housing for Varying Need (HFVN) standard making ground floor properties accessible for wheelchair users including doorways that are wide enough to accommodate a wheel chair, level entry access, space for a wheelchair turning manoeuvre in both the kitchen and at least one bathroom and a wheel chair accessible path through property. The 10% that are fully wheelchair accessible include further specialist adaptations and where feasible plans are discussed with relevant professionals including Occupational Therapists during the design process to allow additional specialist adaptations for example lowered work surfaces, wet floor shower room or stair lifts. Further notes that a study has been commissioned into future need and demand for wheelchair accessible housing to feed into the updated Housing Needs & Demand Assessment for the city region and target setting as part of the SHIP process.
 - 3) Recognises that by building to the HVN standard and investing in increased ease of access for all ground floor new build council homes the demand for full adaption at a later date is reduced, leading to a reduction on pressure on the council's adaptations budget;
 - 4) Notes that the commitment to delivering accessible homes was increased from 3000 to 4500 and that the Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP) report, which will be at the next Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee, will contain a detailed update on the council's strategy for maximising delivery of new build accessible housing as part of the council's new build programme. Agrees that this

report should include information on the current and anticipated future demand for accessible housing and a plan for how the council will this.

- 5) Requests a report to Planning Committee on 3rd February (1 cycle) setting out how accessibility is considered through Building Standards and the planning system and how compliance with the Building Regulations is ensured.
- 2) Notes: the matter of accessibility has been the subject of a City Plan Leadership Forum meeting. This issue will be considered as part of a policy approach to the proposed City Plan 2030 and will be set within the context of the legislative powers of the planning system. This matter will be addressed, in some measure, as part of the proposed City Plan and presentation to Planning Committee on 24 February 2021 (2 cycles).

- moved by Councillor Kate Campbell, seconded by Councillor Child

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 Booth:

- 1) To note that for new build council homes current policy was that a minimum of 10% should be fully wheelchair accessible and that all homes were built to the Housing for Varying Need (HFVN) standard making ground floor properties accessible for wheelchair users including doorways that were wide enough to accommodate a wheel chair, level entry access, space for a wheelchair turning manoeuvre in both the kitchen and at least one bathroom and a wheel chair accessible path through property. The 10% that were fully wheelchair accessible included further specialist adaptations and where feasible plans were discussed with relevant professionals including Occupational Therapists during the design process to allow additional specialist adaptations for example lowered work surfaces, wet floor shower room or stair lifts. Further note that a study had been commissioned into future need and demand for wheelchair accessible housing to feed into the updated Housing Needs and Demand Assessment for the city region and target setting as part of the SHIP process.
- 2) To note that many buildings could be made at least partially and more easily accessible for disabled people, including wheelchair users by, for example, alterations to the minimum standards for width/sizes of front doors as well as all ground floor room doors, thereby enabling disabled people to enter the accommodation and move around the ground floor. Being able to reach the

front door of the accommodation via ramping would be a further important factor in facilitating greater access

- 3) To recognise that by building to the HVN standard and investing in increased ease of access for all ground floor new build council homes the demand for full adaptation at a later date was reduced, leading to a reduction on pressure on the council's adaptations budget;
- 4) To note that the commitment to delivering accessible homes was increased from 3000 to 4500 and that the Strategic Housing Investment Plan (SHIP) report, which would be at the next Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee, would contain a detailed update on the council's strategy for maximising delivery of new build accessible housing as part of the council's new build programme. To agree that this report should include information on the current and anticipated future demand for accessible housing and a plan for how the council would do this.
- 5) To request a report to the Planning Committee on 3rd February 2021 (1 cycle) setting out how accessibility was considered through Building Standards and the planning system and how compliance with the Building Regulations was ensured.
- 6) To note the matter of accessibility had been the subject of a City Plan Leadership Forum meeting. This issue would be considered as part of a policy approach to the proposed City Plan 2030 and would be set within the context of the legislative powers of the planning system. This matter would be addressed, in some measure, as part of the proposed City Plan and presentation to Planning Committee on 24 February 2021 (2 cycles).

19 Edinburgh's COVID Restriction Level - Emergency Motion by Councillor McVey

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

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

“Council commends residents and businesses (including the hospitality sector) who, through their hard work and adherence to guidance have driven Edinburgh's COVID transmission case numbers to within level 2 rates- along with all other indicators of the framework.

Council notes that the Leader and Chief Executive have met with public health officials and The Deputy First Minister weekly and have consistently made Edinburgh's case for the least restrictive level, within the context of public health's recommendations - putting the protection of residents as the first priority.

Further notes following regular engagement with businesses and trade bodies in the City, the Leader has also made the case for changes to support the specific circumstances of Edinburgh's businesses, wider society and economy.

Council seriously regrets that despite robust representations from Edinburgh Council to the Cabinet and public health advice supporting a case to reduce Edinburgh's level of restrictions to level 2, this has not happened.

Council notes a letter from the Scottish Government, requested by the Council Leader, giving an explanation of the Cabinet's decision will be published on the Council's website and emailed to members when received.

Council agrees to continue to lobby the Scottish Government and at next scheduled meeting insist the government follow scientific evidence and advice that indicates that Edinburgh have been consistently in Tier 2

Council also agrees, if the recommendation is to keep Edinburgh in level 3, approach the Scottish Government and requests they allocate an appropriate level of funding to help deal with the unique circumstances facing the Edinburgh economy which will to help protect as many jobs as possible."

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 4 of 10 December 2020)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 December 2020

- Question** (1) How many individual compensation claims were received in each of the last three years as a result of alleged personal injury or vehicle damage as a result of the condition of Council adopted roads and pavements, broken down by ward?
- Answer** (1) Table 1 below shows the number of individual compensation claims in the last three calendar years, broken down by ward.
- Question** (2) How many of these claims resulted in a financial payout by the Council, broken down by ward?
- Answer** (2) The final column of Table 1 shows the number of claims paid
- Question** (3) What was the total cost of compensation payments for successful claims in each of the last three years?
- Answer** (3) Table 2 shows the total cost of compensation claims in the last three calendar years, broken down by ward. Please note that there may be further claims for 2019 and 2020 still to be received.

Table 1 – Individual compensation claims in the last three years, by ward:

Grand Total	2018	2019	2020	Total	Claims Paid
Ward 1	81	33	37	151	24
Ward 2	77	19	47	143	42
Ward 3	21	3	4	28	3
Ward 4	21	11	3	35	2
Ward 5	21	24	11	56	7
Ward 6	18	6	4	28	10
Ward 7	23	37	41	101	20
Ward 8	9	7	10	26	6
Ward 9	7	11	10	28	5
Ward10	25	11	15	51	7
Ward11	108	61	34	203	25
Ward12	15	9	2	26	3
Ward13	22	21	16	59	14
Ward14	25	8	12	45	7
Ward15	25	21	8	54	9
Ward16	16	17	5	38	6
Ward17	19	19	5	43	4
Grand Total	533	318	264	1,115	194

Table 2 - Total cost of compensation payments, by ward:

Grand Total	2018	2019	2020	Total
Ward 1	£4,355			£4,355
Ward 2	£7,229	£359	£1,165	£8,753
Ward 3	£416		£75	£491
Ward 4	£4,405			£4,405
Ward 5	£3,569	£2,847		£6,416
Ward 6	£21,062			£21,062
Ward 7	£6,779	£715	£1,046	£8,540
Ward 8	£320	£504	£216	£1,040
Ward 9	£150	£308	£120	£578
Ward10	£9,941		£120	£10,061
Ward11	£17,007	£6,475		£23,482
Ward12	£6,717	£108		£6,825
Ward13	£1,814	£6,489	£1,539	£9,842
Ward14	£6,639			£6,639
Ward15	£14,288	£269	£301	£14,858
Ward16	£325	£645		£970
Ward17	£1,750	£1,997		£3,747
Grand Total	£106,765	£20,715	£4,583	£132,063

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 December 2020

Question

What criteria is used by the Council to determine whether new traffic lights are required to control the flow of traffic at a road junction?

Answer

The criteria for installation of traffic signals at junctions are set out by the Scottish Executive in Technical Memorandum "*SH6/73 Criteria for Traffic Light Signals at Junctions*".

Principally, these are:

- (a) traffic volumes;
- (b) pedestrian demand; and
- (c) site accident record.

The memorandum also states that "Traffic flow alone cannot be used to justify control".

If accident investigation and prevention have not identified any reason to install traffic signals on the basis of the number/severity of accidents, then traffic and pedestrian surveys would have to be commissioned to determine if either of the other two criteria have been met.

In addition, other signalised junctions can be installed for new developments as part of Section 75 agreements. These are paid for by the developer. The installation of traffic signals at junctions within new developments are subject to criteria detailed above.

The Council has approved criteria to assess whether or not the installation of a puffin/toucan crossing would be justified under the pedestrian crossing improvements programme. However, this programme is only for stand-alone crossing facilities and does not apply to providing new signals at junctions.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you to the Convener for the information that was provided, it was very helpful. Can the Convener just clarify that like pedestrian crossings and school crossings, councillors can request a formal assessment of a junction to see whether it does meet the criteria set out, that she set out in her answer?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I thank you Councillor Lang just before I get on to answering you though, I wonder if I might take a short moment, the kind of questions that I get asked at this Council reflect a lot of the core functions that are delivered by this Council and so I wanted to just take a moment as we get towards the end of this extraordinary indeed exhausting and testing year for everyone to say a thank you to those of us in the council, our colleagues in the Council who have been delivering some of those core services and to everybody who has helped us to deliver what the city needs in both normal and as we've seen increasingly abnormal circumstances. In my own area of responsibility I've witnessed staff going well beyond their normal to keep this city operating under extremely difficult circumstances and so, for example, the enormous effort, the flexibility and indeed the care that has been displayed by for example our waste and cleansing crews, road and maintenances teams and all of the officer teams who support those functions has been quite exemplary, I think it will have made an enormous difference to households and to businesses across the city. I also, as was mentioned earlier I think by Councillor Mowat if I remember correctly, I also want to thank all those at Lothian Bus and Edinburgh Tram who have worked so hard to keep public transport safe and moving in the city during these very difficult months.

To shift back now to the job that I'm supposed to be doing which is to answer Councillor Lang's request, clearly there is obviously a role for councillors to be able to request an assessment in those particular sets of circumstances, I hope that councillors would accept that we don't want to have a whole flurry of these formalised assessments coming forward for specific locations, so I hope that they would accept some degree of initial assessment of the need before

moving to any formal assessment which would then allow officers to devote their resources effectively, so in other words, it's open for raising and we can negotiate on whether or not we go to full formal assessment on some of those cases, thank you.

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Planning
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 10 December 2020**

Question

How will the '15 minute city' approach be used to inform

- a) the forthcoming City Plan, and
- b) ongoing development management?

Answer

- a) Concepts of 15-minute and 20-minute neighbourhoods are based around urban planning ideas of localism and mixed-use areas with ease of access to services. These concepts have become particularly relevant since the outbreak of COVID-19.

'Choices for City Plan 2030' Main Issues Report (MIR) consultation document on the future for the City included two key choices: *'a sustainable city which supports everyone's physical and mental wellbeing'* and *'a city where you don't need to own a car to move around'*. These support the aspiration for inclusive, walkable and active travel enabled neighbourhoods, with access to good quality homes, open space, community infrastructure, schools, employment and local shopping. Choices for City Plan 2030 articulated a preferred strategy for high-density mixed-use development on brownfield land, supporting this type of neighbourhood in Edinburgh. The city has been mapped in terms of 10-minute walk access to key services and facilities. This analysis shows that many areas currently have a high level of access. The areas where this is not the case tend to be lower density, post Victorian era suburbs. Consideration is being given to policies which would support services in these areas, where opportunities arise.

These matters will be addressed in the policy

consideration for the proposed City Plan 2030 which will be presented to Planning Committee on 24 February 2021.

- b) The Scottish Government's Programme for Government and recently published Position Statement on National Planning Framework 4 both refer to and support the 20-minute neighbourhood concept. Currently there is no adopted national, regional or local planning policy that requires the concept to be part of the design of a development.

Development Management decisions which have required mixed use development with active commercial street frontages support localities. For example, shopfront units can be occupied by a range of business users including shops, cafes, hairdressers, plumbers, electricians and digital businesses. CEC promotes active travel connectivity through planning policies, which improve connectivity within in neighbourhoods and across neighbourhoods. Development Management will continue to promote, encourage and achieve this type of development in appropriate locations.

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 December 2020

Following the recent publication of the Scottish Government's 'Private Sector Rent Statistics', which show that private sector rents in the Lothians are the most expensive in Scotland, and have risen by 45.9% for a 2-bed property in the period 2010 to 2020, while the consumer price index for the same period has risen by 21.5%, please could the Convener respond to the following questions:

Question (1) Does the Convener consider that the evidence required in order for the council to apply for a rent pressure zone is deliverable?

Answer (1) The evidence required for a Rent Pressure Zone (RPZ) application was detailed in a [report](#) to the Housing and Economy Committee on 1 November 2018. The report noted that the timescale to collect robust actual rent data, required for any RPZ application, is likely to be three to five years, once robust data collection systems and standardised reporting were in place across local authorities. The timelines are unable to be compressed because the evidence on rent increase had to be related to in-tenancy rent increase of Scottish Private Residential Tenancy that came into force on 1 December 2017.

Since the report in 2018, Council officials continue to work with other local authorities, Scottish Government and third sector partners to develop a compliant methodology for gathering robust evidence required for an RPZ application.

Question (2) Does the Convener consider that, if the council were to have the power to require landlords to declare the rents they charge at point of landlord registration and annually thereafter, this would provide sufficient evidence to allow for an RPZ to be applied for?

- Answer** (2) The guidance for RPZs states that Councils can apply to Scottish Ministers to have an area designated as an RPZ if they can prove that:
- rents payable within the proposed RPZ are rising by too much;
 - the rent rises within the proposed RPZ are causing undue hardship to tenants; and
 - the local authority within whose area the proposed zone lies is coming under increasing pressure to provide housing or subsidise the cost of housing as a consequence of the rent rises within the proposed zone.

While the collection of private rents data at point of Landlord Registration and annually thereafter would help to provide evidence for rents rising by too much, other information would be required, for example, household income is likely to be required to demonstrate tenants' undue hardship caused by rent rises.

- Question** (3) Does the Convener consider that the power to take action to address excessive rent rises should lie with local authorities, or with the Scottish Government?

- Answer** (3) While the Convener believes that local authorities are best placed to take action to address excessive rent rises in their areas, this needs to be supported by relevant legislation which must come from the Scottish Parliament. It is important to have a standardised approach to data collection and reporting across Scotland, which could be best facilitated by Scottish Government.

- Question** (4) When did the Convener last meet with Scottish Government officials or ministers to discuss action to tackle rising private sector rents, and what was the conclusion of that discussion?

Answer

- (4) At every meeting relating to housing or homelessness with either Scottish Government officials or ministers the Convener raises the issue of high private rents in Edinburgh.

The Convenor most recently met with the Head of the Homelessness Division on 16 October 2020, where the pressure on housing, both in terms of social housing stock and the cost of homes in the PRS were discussed in the context of forthcoming legislative changes to local connection and unsuitable accommodation orders.

The [Edinburgh Rapid Rehousing Transition Plan](#) (RRTP), which was submitted to the Scottish Government after it was approved by Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee on 18 September 2020 contains actions and policies the council is taking forward to tackle high private rents. These include actions to address the imbalance between supply and demand by building affordable housing and implementing new powers on short term lets as they become available.

Discussions with the Scottish Government focus on delivery and partnership working to achieve outcomes as set out in the RRTP.

Question

- (5) Would the council consider publicising the Rent Service Scotland process for challenging excessive private sector rents, to private sector tenants in Edinburgh?

Answer

- (5) Yes. A communication strategy is being developed

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost, I do have a supplementary on this one, I thank the Convener for her answer on the issue of excessive private sector rents. Can she clarify, it would appear from her answer that she accepts that the current framework for establishing a rent pressure zone is not fit for purpose since despite rent rises of over 40% in the last decade we haven't been able to install a rent pressure zone, what representations will she make to the Scottish Government to ensure that councils can take effective action to tackle these excessive rent rises?.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you and to thank Councillor Booth for his question. I don't think I said that they're not fit for purpose I think and this is something that we looked at in reports that came to Committee, the time frames are long, and part of the reason that the time frames are long is because the new Scottish Private Residential Tenancies came in which are much better tenancies but further data has to be collected on rent rises for people within those tenancies and that has created a timeframe which I think is very challenging for Edinburgh because I think we acknowledge in every aspect almost of policy that we looked at in Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work, that high private rents are absolutely at the core of so many of the challenges that we face and I do think that we need to, as a Committee, actually because I think the strongest representations that we make are the ones that we make together but I do think this is something that we need to look at as a Committee, and to bring this back. If you look at the time frames we should be coming into the third year which is when we thought that we might be able to implement, so I think it's a good time actually to bring a report back to Committee and to look at where we are and to look at how we can address this further so this is something I'm very very happy to engage with as a committee and then to engage with the Scottish Government because that is absolutely where we need changes to be made.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Burgess for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 10
December 2020**

Question (1) What actions are being taken to raise Council staff awareness of the Climate Emergency and to support staff in contributing to reducing carbon emissions?

Answer (1) New pages on sustainability have been created on the Council's staff intranet which detail Council net zero 2030 ambitions and highlight ways in which staff can contribute to sustainability targets in both their professional and personal lives. This includes links to and further information on:

- Mainstreaming sustainability within core Council business, for example through procurement and Integrated Impact Assessments
- Active and sustainable travel promotion and support, including the cycle to work scheme, bicycle mileage scheme, EV car hire scheme and encouraging use of EV fleet cars
- Promotion of Edinburgh Talks Climate, the Council-run on-line dialogue targeted to citizens and staff to help stimulate debate about climate change and encourage people to make real changes to their everyday lives

Areas being considered for development in 2021, subject to available capacity/resources include:

- Developing sustainability modules for staff training to be provided through the Council's on-line learning and development platform, CECIL
- Establishment of workplace sustainability champions within each service area

- Staff sustainability survey (to gauge and raise levels of awareness and inform future staff communication campaigns on sustainability)
- Further awareness-raising communications through a range of internal channels including the Orb, global staff newsletter, managers' newsletter, Senior Staff vlogs

Question (2) Why and when was the Council's senior staff Sustainability Programme Board suspended and when will it be re-established?

Answer (2) Sustainability Programme Board meetings were suspended following lockdown in March 2020 as part of senior staff capacity being diverted to Covid crisis response planning initially, and subsequently to adaptation and renewal (A&R) work. The A&R Programme also considers sustainability issues, particularly in relation to supporting a fair and green recovery from Covid. However, as the A&R programme bedded in, the Council also looked to re-establish the dedicated Sustainability Programme Board. It met on the 16th November 2020 and a programme of meetings is being scheduled for 2021.

Supplementary Question Thanks very much for the answer to the question on raising staff awareness on the climate emergency. I'm wondering if the leader recognises that the existing engagement with staff on the climate emergency is fairly passive in that it requires staff to be proactive in seeking out actions they can take whereas in the second part of the answer the proposed engagement for next year is far more directly engaging and therefore would he support that programme of more direct engagement being taken forward and indeed extended to councillors as well as staff where appropriate, thank you?

Supplementary Answer Can I thank Councillor Burgess for the supplementary. Absolutely, it's going to be important for all of us to embed this in our thinking as well as, and we said many times, carbon reduction and sustainability are the two lenses that we are viewing our Council services and indeed our wider city through more or more. The direct approaches to embed carbon reduction and sustainability across our Council

services and operations will ramp up and will ramp up going forward in future years, I'm expecting 2022 to have more actions than 2021, but I'm expecting 2021 to have more actions than 2020, so the nature of this will be very much a growing piece of engagement where more and more people will understand increasingly how they can take action to resolve them, so absolutely happy to support it and indeed what I've said is absolutely applicable to councillors as well and hopefully that's reflected in our policy making and decisions we're taking at every level, thank you.

QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 10 December 2020**

Using street lighting columns for electric vehicle charging was first considered by the Council in a report submitted to the Transport and Environment Committee on 5 March 2019. The report identified that non-concrete street lighting columns located at the roadside of the footpath might be suitable for vehicle charging points with, preferably, a direct power feed from Scottish Power.

Although the Council is aiming to install EV charging points at a number of locations around the city, many residents without off street parking would greatly appreciate the convenience of on street charging outside their homes.

Question (1) Given successful implementation in other cities, will further consideration be given to using street lighting columns as part of the expansion of EV infrastructure in Edinburgh?

Answer (1) As part of the city's sustainability plans, trialling street lighting columns for Electric Vehicle Charging may be included in future phases of the roll-out of EV infrastructure in the city which will require further engagement between Council officers and with the marketplace. However, the following considerations also need to be taken into account in considering the use of street lighting columns:

- Only street lighting columns located at the front of the footpath are suitable to avoid the hazards associated with trailing cables;
- Street lighting columns are traditionally located at the rear of the footpath to limit the likelihood of vehicle damage;
- Concrete columns (of which Edinburgh has over 17,000) are not suitable for vehicle charging points;
- Parking arrangements adjacent to the vehicle charging point will need to be considered, especially within the Controlled Parking Zones; and

- Where a street lighting column is fed from a Scottish Power feeder or a street lighting network, with a direct feed from Scottish Power being preferred, liaison with Scottish Power (the Council's Distribution Network Operator) will be required:
 - as there may be a need for a new power supply (depending on the capacity of the charging unit); and
 - under the specification for public lighting supplies there can be no more than a 3% drop in voltage, which may limit the number of charging units in a street.

Question (2) If so, when are proposals expected to be brought forward?

Answer (2) The earliest officers expect to bring forward any proposals on this will be quarter three of 2021.

Supplementary Question Thanks Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answers. I must say I'm pleased to hear that proposals for EV charging from street lighting columns might come forward in August or thereby next year but given the council's commitment to achieving net zero by 2030 and that other councils are I think rolling out this technology, can the Convener please explain why after almost two years Edinburgh appears to have made no progress with this?

Supplementary Answer Thank you Councillor Ross. I should just clarify that what will come forward will be consideration of the issue about brown street lighting, it is by no means a tried and tested method for every city, a lot depends on the street design that we have, the particular features of our environment that would allow it to be effective or not, and it's also got significant implications for our electricity supply, and so all of these facts are noted in the final part of the written answer and it's for those reasons alone that we have to be very careful about how we go forward with it. I also have some not inconsiderable concerns about the risks attached to both accessibility and safety issues to having trailing connections a present on on-street parking and the issue around street lighting, particularly the location of the street lights, the

columns themselves and how drivers would then relate to them is a situation I would not want to have developed without some forethought in an attempt to contain it. As you know the whole issue around the electric vehicle infrastructure that we're looking at has taken some time to move forward, we've got as is noted in a later answer, we've got some extension of funding processes from the Scottish Government for some of the other work that we're doing around this area and that's reflective of the fact that this is untested ground for us and we're attempting to make the right move in the right way to provide the right infrastructure that's why it's taking some period of time to bring this forward, thank you.

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 December 2020

Spaces for People: Continuous Improvement

For existing schemes up to and including those agreed at Full Council on 19th November 2020, following implementation date, can the Convener provide further detail regarding:

Question (1) The feedback and number of complaints received relating to each scheme?

Answer (1) There has been significant correspondence received on the Spaces for People programme since its inception. This means that the feedback has been considered as part of the initial implementation plans or in the review of each scheme (in a similar way to responses received for Traffic Regulation orders).

In two instances, formal complaints have been received and investigated through the Council's complaints process.

Complaints received related to the closure of Braid Road and access to Cockburn Street during periods of the part-time closure. Both complaints have been completed under the first stage of the procedure.

Question (2) A list of modifications that have been made or a scheduled to be made and why for each scheme and provide the cost of doing so?

Answer (2) Each scheme formally reviewed every two months. The outcome of these reviews and any proposed changes are reported to the Transport and Environment Committee (the last report was on [12 November 2020](#)). All modifications are contained in the scheme budget.

Question (3) What measures are in place to keep the segregated lanes safe for all?

Answer (3) Following installation, measures are inspected to ensure that they are in accordance with the plan and that there are no immediate safety concerns.

A schedule of weekly road asset inspections has been introduced to ensure that the schemes are appropriately maintained. Any damage, missing infrastructure or other defects are then followed up with the appropriate contractor for repair.

Question (4) How often are lanes inspected?

Answer (4) Following installation, a schedule of weekly inspections is carried out.

Question (5) Any logistical issues with maintaining the integrity, quality and safety of each scheme (eg missing bollards and length of time to replace them) and the cost of doing so for each scheme?

Answer (5) There are no logistical issues with maintaining the integrity, quality and safety of each scheme.

However, the programme has stock of replacement cycle lane defenders (CLD) and bollards that can be used to replace any missing or damaged assets.

The cost of inspection, maintenance cleansing and removal has been reserved within the £5.25m Spaces for People budget (Each individual project has a nominal 7.5% install cost reserve for maintenance during the period of the project).

Supplementary Question Thank you Convener for your answers. I suppose I'm going to ask a bit of a question regarding your answer to my second question because I am aware of that report that was presented at Transport and Environment Committee and maybe I need to make my question a bit more specific, I was looking for specifics in terms of the modifications and changes that weren't in that report. I suppose for example, the removal of the disabled parking bay that was so contentious on Comiston Road, that's the sort of thing, so I'm wondering would it be possible to have something so I could see that level of detail, to see the modifications that have taken place, thank you?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Some of that level of detail is most easily accessible for any councillor by direct contact with the spaces for people team, there is a continuing programme of reviews coming forward every two months and it's in those that we're looking at as a Committee, we're scrutinising what's coming forward and it's there that is probably the best arena for discussion around some of the specifics attached to this. I'm sure that officers will be able to give you more background on that specific case that you've highlighted there without any great difficulty, thank you.

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 December 2020

Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Network

In CEC was awarded almost £2.5m in 2018 to complete their network of chargers by December 2020:

<https://www.transport.gov.scot/our-approach/environment/carbon-reduction-on-roads/switched-on-towns-and-cities-challenge-fund/winners-201819-switched-on-towns-and-cities-challenge-fund/>

The press release stated that the project will have an installation period running from January 2020 to December 2020, representing phase I of the City Council’s EV charge point deployment.

Question (1) Can the Convener please provide a detailed update on progress and map of the 134 electric vehicle (EV) charging bays located within the 14 hubs across the city?

Answer (1) City of Edinburgh Council was awarded £2.2m from Transport Scotland through the “Switched on Towns and Cities Fund”. Due to the impact of COVID-19, the funding period has been extended to April 2022.

A procurement plan has been developed, for engagement with the market in early 2021. A communications strategy has also been developed for implementation from early 2021. The implementation of Phase 1 of this programme is expected to be completed by 31 March 2022.

The table and map below show the implementation plan for Phase 1.

Implementation	kW and time	Location	Primary Users	Implementation Time
25 slow chargers	7kW 6-8 hours	Ingliston and Hermiston Park and Ride sites	Visitors and commuters	Stage 1 26 weeks delivery

				NB: Ingliston will include three rapid chargers and both sites require the construction of electrical substations.
9 rapid chargers	50kW 25 minutes	Various Sites	Taxi/Private Hire and general use	Stage 2 8 weeks delivery
32 fast chargers	22kW 2-4 hours	Various Sites	Residents	Stage 3 8 weeks delivery

These are broken down by site below:

Location	Infrastructure Planned	Number of Charging Points	Primary Users	Electrical Connection Cost
India Street / Circus Gardens	Rapid 50kW	2 (4 charging bays)	Taxi and general use	£50,000
Fettes Avenue	Rapid 50kW	2 (4 charging bays)	Taxi and general use	£28,000
East London Street	Rapid 50kW	2 (4 charging bays)	Taxi and general use	£18,000
Ingliston Park and Ride	Rapid 50kW	3 (6 charging bays)	Taxi and general use	£50,000
Heriot Row	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£32,000
Kings Road	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£35,000
Sheriff Brae	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£15,000
Comely Bank Avenue	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£17,000
Montgomery Street	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£18,000
Thirlestane Road	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£50,000

Stewart Terrace	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£18,000
Maxwell Street	Fast 22kW AC/DC mix	4 (8 charging bays)	Residents	£18,000
Ingliston P&R	Slow 7kW AC	15 (30 charging bays)	Visitors and commuters	£50,000
Hermiston P&R	Slow 7kW AC	10 (20 charging bays)	Visitors and commuters	£25,000



Question (2) Can the Convener provide a detailed breakdown of the cost per installation/hub and detail the budget that is still to be allocated, and confirm to which installation this is linked?

Answer (2) The cost of the electrical connection work will be £424,000 (excluding VAT). This includes the construction of the two electrical substations required at the Park and Ride sites.

The electrical connection costs are shown above.

It is not possible to provide a breakdown of the cost per installation/hub until the procurement process has been completed.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and yes I do have a supplementary on this and it's a bit of a lesson for me today I suppose on how you frame a question to get more of what you're looking for. When it says information in time in my answer one where I've asked for that, I wasn't looking for 26 weeks delivery for example, I was looking for when can we expect it to be delivered, a date in time, so I suppose if I drill down on that one around the nine rapid charges which are so key to us in terms of that electric vehicle infrastructure, it says eight weeks delivery, from when until when can we expect that to be completed?

Supplementary Answer

Those are specific dates which I cannot give you today because I don't have all of them to hand you'll see the several categories here and different stages but I'll ensure the officers give you a more detailed response to your particular question emerged today, thank you.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Leader of the Council at a meeting of
the Council on 10 December 2020**

Question (1) What engagement has there been over 2019/2020 with The Edinburgh Tram Inquiry led by Lord Hardie:

(a) By the CEC team responsible for the tram extension?

(b) By the Leader, Transport and Environment Convener or other members of his Administration?

Answer (1) The project team have not engaged with The Edinburgh Tram Inquiry. The Inquiry relates to the first phase of tram construction and the project does not fall within the Inquiry's Terms of Reference. The project team have reviewed evidence given to the Inquiry to inform the lessons learned summarised at paragraphs 2.23 to 2.25 of the Final Business Case. In addition, the project team engaged with Professor Bent Flyvbjerg of the Said Business School at the University of Oxford to inform its assessment of Optimism Bias in the Final Business Case, having taken account of expert evidence given by him to The Edinburgh Tram Inquiry.

To my knowledge, I do not believe that there has been any direct engagement with the Tram inquiry by the Administration.

Question (2) When was the last update received from the Inquiry by the Leader in terms of its progress and when it would publicly report?

Answer (2) No update has been received from the Inquiry on progress or on when it will publicly report. The Inquiry was commissioned by the Scottish Government and it is they who would receive any such progress updates.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Council Leader for his answer. I'm aware as the Council Leader states, that the tram report was commissioned by the Scottish Government but that with Council support and of course the subject of the inquiry was a Council led project, so my supplementary is, given the inquiry to establish why the Edinburgh Tram project incurred delays, cost more than originally budgeted and through reductions and scope delivered significantly less than projected and given it's been running for a good number of years and apparently it cost around £12m, will he as Council Leader contact, be it Scottish Government or the inquiry Lord Hardie himself, to ask what time scale we are looking at for publication of the report, completion of the inquiry and I'm well aware I could write myself but I think as council leader it would have rather more weight and given the public furore and the amount of taxpayers' cash expended I think a degree of interest in our part would be appreciated by residents, thank you.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Can I thank Councillor Rust for the supplementary question and can I just say I entirely agree, a timeline would be incredibly helpful. It's worth saying there have been some more informal approaches to the inquiry and from a conversation I had with a previous Transport Minister there have been more formal requests as well and they have not been met, I think it would be fair to say with an answer which would give any indication of what was being asked, the answer seems to follow the tone of, it will be ready when it's ready rather than anything more substantive. I'm happy to try and do anything else but I would say I'm a little bit sceptical based on previous responses that I know have been made that will get much further forward, but happy to do so.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 December 2020

Nurseries

Question (1) The addendum to Item 7.6 passed by the Education Children & Families Committee on 4 March 2020 stated, “Committee requests to know the amount allocated to each child (on an hourly basis) in Local Authority nurseries”. This information has not been presented to date. Please can it now be presented.

Answer (1) The budget for LA settings is not allocated on an hourly basis. For funded only settings the budget is allocated based on the registered capacity.

Question (2) The addendum welcomed the “independent review” of rates of Partner providers anticipated to start in August 2020. This review has commenced, and CEC has commissioned Scotland Excel to undertake the project – Scotland Excel is funded by Scotland’s 32 local authorities. Please advise how this constitutes an independent review.

Answer (2) Scotland Excel is the Centre of Procurement Expertise for the local government sector. They are a not for profit organisation and were commissioned by the Scottish Government to develop a suite of supporting operational guidance and information for the early years expansion, including setting sustainable rates for the delivery of funded early learning and childcare.

The organisation has significant experience in developing sustainable rate processes through our work on the National Care Home Calculator. Scotland Excel are not directly involved in procuring local Early Learning and Childcare services, therefore there is a degree of autonomy to the process and outcome; and

Scotland Excel understands how the sustainable rate process can be developed and managed appropriately, and compliantly, in line with procurement or contract requirements.

- Question** (3) The current approach will involve over 100 Partner providers providing a large amount of detailed and confidential information. Is CEC concerned that this complicated approach runs the risk of Scotland Excel receiving very low engagement and responses which when aggregated will not produce a proper outcome?
- Answer** (3) The Scottish Government Guidance on setting sustainable rates for funded providers includes a survey of costs as an approach to gather information to establish a sustainable rate. Information gathered by Scotland Excel in the survey of costs will not be seen by CEC.
- Question** (4) Has any consideration been given by CEC to the formation of an internal working group with representatives from each sector (large & small Partner Providers, Independent schools, Childminders, Charities, Playgroups) working with Scotland Excel?
- Answer** (4) This was considered along with other process outlined in the Scottish Government guidance on setting a sustainable rate for funded hours. However, only the survey of costs or survey of prices approaches allow all our partners to contribute to the process if they wish to do so.
- Question** (5) Partner Providers have been advised by Scotland Excel that CEC will not allow them to discuss their recommendations/report with Partner Providers before (or after) submission to CEC. Is there not a case for having the results of the exercise transparent and shared with the Partner Providers prior to submission to CEC?
- Answer** (5) We have a contractual agreement with Scotland Excel to carry out the survey of costs on behalf of CEC. Once we receive the outcome, the findings will be shared with the Education, Children and Families Committee for consideration and be available to the public.
- Question** (6) Why have Partner Providers been advised by CEC that the recommendations of Scotland Excel will not be shared with them at any stage of the process and that they can access some information via FOI requests?

Answer (6) See answer to question 5. We have not advised partners that they will need to access information via FOI requests. There was some concern from partners that rival businesses could access the information they share with Scot Excel through the FOI process. This is not the case.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answer. I understand from partner providers that the response to question six is erroneous as the FOI point was stated at partner meeting but I can follow that up with the Convener separately along with various other issues in connection with Scotland Excel but my supplementary relates to the answer to question one which seems to be I think a little bit about a play on words, the question was not about on what basis the budget is allocated it was a request for the actual hourly cost in local authority settings, however as it's been confirmed in the answer that the budget per setting on a registered capacity basis is available or known it should be relatively straightforward for the council to convert that to a budgeted hourly rate which is what has been asked for, so on the basis that the actual costs are known, recorded, maintained for each setting, an actual cost hourly rate should also be available. Could this please be supplied as requested both through the addendum in March and through the written question, thank you.

Supplementary Answer There's a lot of detail in that question thanks to Jason, so I'll need to look into that and if it's possible it will be done.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 December 2020

Question (1) Given the need for Edinburgh to substantially increase its provision of on-street electric vehicle charging – in light of both rising consumer demand and the recent announcement by the U.K. Government that the ban on conventional petrol and diesel engine cars will be moved forward from 2040 to 2030 – can the Convener confirm if Edinburgh has applied for grant funding from the Energy Saving Trust’s On-street Residential Chargepoint Scheme?

Answer (1) The Council has not applied for grant funding from the Energy Saving Trust’s On-street Residential Chargepoint Scheme.

Question (2) If so, can she provide details of what has been applied for?

Answer (2) N/A

Question (3) If not, can she explain the reasons why not?

Answer (3) The Energy Savings Trust ‘On-street Residential ChargePoint Scheme’ funding is only available in the current financial year (2020/21) and must be fully utilised to pay for installation of chargers only.

The Council’s focus is currently on developing the Electric Vehicle (EV) network in the city for delivery of Phase One of the EV On Street Charger Project. As the necessary electrical infrastructure, supporting civil engineering and Traffic Regulation Order work is not at the delivery stage it was not appropriate for the Council to apply for and install the necessary new chargers in the current financial year.

The work which is being progressed to improve the electrical network will enable the Council to apply for similar funding should this become available in future years.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for the answer. Given the news that conventional engine cars will be phased out 10 years ahead of the previous schedule by the UK Government, does the Convener feel there is a need to accelerate the easy charging infrastructure project in Edinburgh to meet the likely increase in demand or face Edinburgh being left behind, particularly as it seems that the one referred to in my answer that grant funding is being accessed by other cities in Scotland like Stirling and indeed East Lothian, thank you?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you for your supplementary Councillor Laidlaw. I certainly believe that there is a need for fast movement towards this particular area but I also think that the answer provided gives a really useful reason as to why that particular funding has not yet applied for and I hope that will be read in detail. In terms of the broader point that you are making about whether or not we risk being left behind, I think it's worthwhile making what is I think is a relevant point for a City of this nature, which is that electric vehicles are an incredibly useful technological step forward that helps us meet those targets that we're aiming for but it's particularly helpful in terms of for example gaining of fleets, whether you're talking about the CEC fleet, Lothian Bus, taxi fleets, any number of business oriented fleets, in other words the vehicles that are doing the high mileage. I'm less convinced of the need to completely push everybody who is currently using a car on to electric cars, I can see that there is absolute validity and it's important we get that infrastructure in place, but I don't want it to become a substitute for also looking at ways to reduce the amount of car use inside Edinburgh, a city of this size is drowning in cars and we need to find a way to prevent that wholesale shift from petrol and diesel simply being replicated in the number of electric vehicles that we've got on the road and so I think that's a useful bit of background piece because it does not help us to address the issues around congestion, there are also issues around emissions attached to electric vehicles which are only just beginning to be explored and understood and so while I absolutely support the development of EB infrastructure in this city for both fleet and private use, I don't

want it to become a substitute for us failing as a city to address the issue of over use of cars inside the city and a lack of movement towards more sustainable transport methods ie public transport and walking, cycling and wheeling. So I believe that what we're doing is correct, we're moving in the right direction on it, I'd like a bit more speed in certain parts of it but I believe that all of the efforts we're putting right now will help us meet those targets.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Howie for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 10
December 2020**

Question

Bearing in mind there is council involvement in all care home admissions, how many Edinburgh citizens/patients have been transferred from hospital to a care home without the individual's consent, legal authority or family support (such as a Power of Attorney or Guardianship Order) for each calendar month over the past twelve months?

Answer

There are no records of any individuals transferred from hospital to a care home without the individual's consent, legal authority or family support over twelve months.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you and thank you to the Council Leader for his answer. I wonder if I can seek clarification, the Council Leader refers in his response to nothing having appeared in the records, but nothing would appear in the records on this matter since if this sort of thing was going on it would not be recorded. It was certainly happening elsewhere within Lothian Health Board area, in fact there's reports in Midlothian, also in Glasgow and Clyde I'm aware there's an investigation by EHRC over the past while to include this year and previous times. So I wonder if the Council Leader can clarify the response he has given, thank you?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Yes I'm happy to do so Lord Provost and thanks Councillor Howie for the question. The Health and Social Care officials were very very definitive in their answer and I'm afraid the wording was my choice because I wasn't, having not been hugely close to the detail perhaps Councillor Henderson may have given a more definitive position, I was a little bit uneasy about giving the answer as definitively as it was reported to me but it was reported to me very very clearly from the officers that this has not happened in Edinburgh it was incredibly clear and incredibly definitive, the wording that appears in the answer is my choice based on that information but also of course based on a slight caveat in that I'm not as close to the details as the officers but if

Councillor Howie writes to the relevant Director I'm sure she'll be able to give a very very definitive answer just as she gave me.

QUESTION NO 13

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Convener of the Education,
Children and Families Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 10
December 2020**

The following questions concerning the council's current consultation on Gaelic Medium Education at secondary level are all supplementary to my questions on the same topic asked at the November meeting of council.

- Question** **(1)** Further to the answer to question 1, what proportion of the current school roll at Taobh na Pairce live within 3 miles of each of the four options for GME secondary as well as Darroch and JGHS, broken down by school year?
- Answer** **(1)** This question requires a considerable amount of analysis to be undertaken and will be answered in the GME informal consultation outcomes report which is expected to be complete in January 2021.
- Question** **(2)** Further to the answer to question 2, what proportion of the current Sgoil-araich and P1-4 at Taobh na Pairce currently live within a) 15 minutes' walk; b) 15 minutes' cycle of each of the four options, plus Darroch and JGHS?
- Answer** **(2)** This question requires a considerable amount of analysis to be undertaken and will be answered (as much as is possible with the data available to officers) in the GME informal consultation outcomes report which is expected to be complete in January 2021.
- Question** **(3)** Further to the answer to questions 3 and 4, how were these answers calculated, and did it assume travel at rush hour or outside of rush hour, in pre-covid or post-covid travel conditions?
- Answer** **(3)** This question will be answered in the GME informal consultation outcomes report which is expected to be complete in January 2021.

- Question** (4) Further to the answer to question 5, please can you supply this information broken down by school year?
- Answer** (4) This question will be answered in the GME informal consultation outcomes report which is expected to be complete in January 2021.
- Question** (5) Further to the answer to question 6, parts a) and b), please can you clarify that the intention is to withdraw curriculum support from JGHS as soon as Darroch opens in 2022? Why is that?
- Answer** (5) See answer at the end of questions.
- Question** (6) Further to the answer to question 6, parts a) and b), please can you clarify which subjects will be taught using curriculum support outside Darroch; when this will start, and which school years this will affect, and how many school pupils might be expected to attend curriculum support outside Darroch in a week? Will this be all subjects which cannot be taught in Gaelic, or is some other criteria used, and if so, what criteria? How is it expected that educational outcomes for GME pupils will be improved by this arrangement?
- Answer** (6) See answer at the end of questions.
- Question** (7) Further to the answer to question 6, parts a) and b), please can you outline what mode of travel is assumed for pupils travelling to a) Tynecastle, b) Boroughmuir, c) St Thomas' and d) JGHS for curriculum support, and in each case please give the estimated travel time;
- Answer** (7) See answer at the end of questions.
- Question** (8) Further to the answer to question 6, parts a) and b), when will the council publish, as referenced in the approved Gaelic Language Plan 2018 -2022, the long-term plan to ensure the quality and sustainable expansion of secondary GME which will support the increasing numbers of pupils from Taobh Na Pàirce and any future GME primary school, as they move into S1 and beyond, which was due for completion in 2020?

- Answer** (8) See answer at the end of questions.
- Question** (9) Further to the answer to question 6, part b), please can you clarify how many pupils in each of the city's secondary schools currently receive curriculum support in another school, and in each case identify what proportion of the school roll that represents?
- Answer** (9) See answer at the end of questions.
- Question** (10) Further to the answer to question 6, part b), please can you clarify what the mode of travel and travel time is for each secondary school which currently sends pupils to other secondary schools for curriculum support?
- Answer** (10) See answer at the end of questions.
- Question** (11) Further to the answer to question 6, parts c) and d), please can you clarify why a different answer was given to these questions at the parent consultation event on Wednesday 25 November? Which answer is correct?
- Answer** (11) Support from other schools refers to mechanisms already embedded in practice in Edinburgh secondary schools to provide consortia models, which allow pupils to access the broadest possible curriculum choice, usually in the senior phase. Where a school is unable, due to staffing or low demand from pupils, to offer exam courses in a particular subject, pupils can opt to join classes at another neighbourhood school, through planned collaborative agreements. Coordinated space is built into city-wide timetabling to accommodate this, usually on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons. Pupils are provided with travel support when this is necessary to ensure they can travel to the alternative school within the timeslots for travel that are made available. Pupils are also able to access courses offered by Edinburgh College in the same way. Increasingly sophisticated and strengthened digital practice will allow for further broadening of the curriculum for our learners.
- Which subjects are involved and the amount of time pupils spend in other schools will depend on pupils' subject choice and staffing levels. At present in GME, we are able to offer

Gaelic up to Advanced Higher. History is offered up to N5, with the final exam in English, with the hope being to transition History fully to Gaelic by the time the move to Darroch is made. Modern Studies at N5 will be offered as a course choice this year, following the same model as history, with teaching in Gaelic and final exam in English, with a view to full transition to Gaelic by the time pupils move to Darroch. The GME CL is looking at development of additional curricular areas. We would seek to maximise access to any additional GME teaching our own team are not able to offer, and to minimise disruption, through use of digital resource such as Esgoil.

Supplementary Question

Thank you Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for his answers and although for the second month running he hasn't answered the majority of my questions I am grateful for his commitment to ensure that they are answered within the next month, I would ask that these are please circulated by e-mail and also published on the Council website. I am seeking clarification on the point about the move to Darroch, many Gaelic parents have asked this question and despite it being raised at both consultation events has still not been answered, please can the Convener clarify when the Gaelic Medium Education cohort moves to Darroch where will the non-Gaelic Medium Education classes be taught?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you very much for your supplementary question and I will ensure that the answers to the questions we haven't answered will be circulated and will go on the website, most of these questions were raised at the meeting and there's over 100 questions that we're trying to answer and that's caused the delay. When Darroch is opened it will be part of James Gillespie's Annexe so it will still be part of James Gillespie's and the subjects will therefore be taught in James Gillespie's. The reason for putting in the question about the other surrounding schools was in answer to a question I'd received which said roughly ,what happens if James Gillespie's curriculum classes are full as the roll in James Gillespie's increases before we open the new school in Liberton, and I said in answer to that question, if there was

no space in Gillespie's there is space in other schools surrounding there where pupils could get the subjects that they requested. I don't envisage that happening because I think there'll still be spaces with James Gillespie's curriculum in the site at James Gillespie's but as a comfort I suppose what I said was if that couldn't happen there are other schools which could provide the subjects.