

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 29 April 2021

Present:-

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Frank Ross

COUNCILLORS

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

Andrew Johnston
David Key
Callum Laidlaw
Kevin Lang
Lesley Macinnes
Melanie Main
John McLellan
Amy McNeese-Mechan
Adam McVey
Claire Miller
Max Mitchell
Joanna Mowat
Rob Munn
Gordon J Munro
Hal Osler
Ian Perry
Susan Rae
Alasdair Rankin
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 Declaration of Interests

Decision

- a) To note that Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron had declared an interest as a member of EICC, EDI, CEC Holdings, Edinburgh Leisure, RSNO, and a Director of the Edinburgh Community Solar Cooperative (ECSC).
- b) To note that Councillor Gordon had declared an interest as Chair of EICC.

2 Future Provision of Public Conveniences – referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

a) Deputation – Colinton Community Council

The deputation expressed concern at a number of issues raised in the report referred to the Council from the Transport and Environment Committee, particularly in relation to existing public toilets. They felt that the policy with which the public toilets in Colinton had been aligned had not been properly validated due to a failure of the Council to engage with the Community Council.

The deputation indicated that they felt that reports and representations to Committee had been deeply misleading in regard to the public toilets at Colinton. They also stressed that the older toilets situated within an out building in Spylaw Park were not generally available for use by members of the public.

The Deputation indicated that they could not see any other viable use for the public toilet building in Colinton.

b) Deputation – Colinton Amenity Association

The deputation indicated that they were in the process of launching their initiative “Discover Colinton” in an attempt to attract more visitors in and around the Colinton area. They had received funding in the form of a Community Grant for publicising this initiative and felt it was of great importance to be able to provide public toilet facilities to those visitors. They urged the Council to support the continued provision of the public toilets in Colinton.

c) Deputation – The Colinton Tunnel

The deputation indicated that they had been working since 2016 to encourage visitors to Colinton with the aim of helping to maintain the few remaining

businesses and encourage the establishment of new ones. They stressed that footfall numbers in the Colinton area had increased greatly and the need for the public toilets was essential.

The deputation indicated that the public toilets were only 10 years old, had had no problems with vandalism or anti-social behaviour, were DDA compliant and served a genuine and growing need in the community. They urged the Council to support Colinton in their future plans for the re-opening and continuation of Colinton Public Toilets.

d) Deputations – Colinton Village Enterprise SCIO

The deputation indicated that they had recently used Community Asset Transfer legislation in respect of an outbuilding in Spylaw Park and stressed that the toilets within the building were not in the public realm. The toilets within the outbuilding dated back to the 1970's or earlier and had only been used during the Enterprise's occasional outdoor community events. The deputation stressed that while it was their aim to completely refurbish and develop the building into a community hub, work was not likely to start on the project for some time and therefore, fit-for-purpose toilet facilities would not exist for several years and even then, would be subject to the Hub's opening hours.

The deputation urged the Council to re-open the existing public toilets in Colinton.

e) Referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

The Transport and Environment committee had referred a report setting out plans for future provision of public conveniences in Edinburgh and seeking approval to progress with focusing on ensuring there were appropriate facilities in premier parks in the first instance to the Council for approval of an additional £450,000 of additional resources from COVID funds for additional temporary public toilets.

f) Question by Councillor Rust – Submitted in terms of Standing Order 15.2

The following Question, together with the answer, and supplementary question and answer, had been submitted by Councillor Rust in terms of Standing Order 15.2:

Question

At 4.20 of the report it states: “*The analysis of existing provision shows that the public convenience at Colinton sits outside the terms of the proposed plans.*” and in Appendix 1 it is the sole convenience listed as, “*Toilet locations which do not align with proposed plans for future provision.*”

Please can you specifically set out the basis for Colinton Public Convenience sitting outside the terms of the Council’s proposed plans in terms of the report.

Answer

Transport and Environment Committee approved the approach set out in the Committee report on the future provision of public conveniences. This approach focuses provision:

- In premier parks;
- At locations which are promoted as places for a higher number of visitors (e.g. Portobello beach or the Pentland Hills Regional Park);
- In each of Edinburgh’s official town centres; and
- In travel centres where people arrive after journeys on which facilities are typically limited.

On the basis of this approach, Colinton Public Convenience sits outside the terms of this approach.

Supplementary Question

Thank you very much Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answer. The Convener references the Committee report and again gives the same headings in the answer, so just to clarify is the publicly accessible strategy document lying behind this with current information so I’m thinking for example it mentions Premier Parks, these defined, it talks about visitor number promotion in the answer, so is there a strategy document lying behind this?

Supplementary Answer

The key content was held in the Transport and Environment Committee papers, I will ask senior officers to return to you with a more specific answer to that particular supplementary question, thank you Councillor Rust.

**Comments by
the Lord
Provost**

Councillor Macinnes if we can just make sure that that supplementary answer is circulated to all elected members please.

**Comments by
Councillor
Macinnes**

Indeed thank you

Motion

To agree an additional £450,000 of additional resources from COVID funds for additional temporary public toilets.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment

- 1) To agree an additional £450k of additional resources from COVID funds for additional temporary public toilets; the monies could also be used to re-open public toilets currently closed in order to provide adequate public toilet provision in the City.
- 2) To note the estimated investment required to create new or refurbish public conveniences; and accelerate exploration of commercial partnerships to deliver facilities based on a concessions model, reporting back to Committee within two cycles (noting this approach had already been taken for a combined café and public conveniences at Joppa)
- 3) When the public toilets were closed at Haymarket to facilitate the delivery of the Haymarket development the sale was conditional on re-provisioning these facilities within the development and were detailed on the original planning permission; to note that the current planning permission did not show public toilets provided and instruct officers to investigate whether this burden was not transferred in subsequent sales and report back to Committee with their findings.
- 4) To reject paragraph 4.20 of the report by the Executive Director of Place and call for Colinton Public Convenience to be retained and maintained as part of the Council's strategy going ahead.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Rust

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted)	-	45 votes
For the amendment	-	17 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgmn, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, 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, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To agree an additional £450,000 of additional resources from COVID funds for additional temporary public toilets; the monies could also be used to re-open public toilets currently closed in order to provide adequate public toilet provision in the City;
- 2) To note the estimated investment required to create new or refurbish public conveniences; and accelerate exploration of commercial and community partnerships to deliver facilities based on a concessions model, reporting back to Committee within two cycles (noting this approach had already been taken for a combined café and public conveniences at Joppa)
- 3) When the public toilets were closed at Haymarket to facilitate the delivery of the Haymarket development the sale was conditional on re-provisioning these facilities within the development and were detailed on the original planning permission; to note that the current planning permission did not show public toilets provided and instruct officers to investigate whether this burden was not transferred in subsequent sales and report back to Committee with their findings.

(References: Transport and Environment Committee of 22 April 2021; referral from the Transport and Environment Committee)

3 Motion by Councillor Webber - Public Confidence

a) Deputation – South West Edinburgh in Motion

The deputation felt that the schemes being introduced during the pandemic were highly devisive, discriminatory and potentially unlawful, with schemes having no specific or measurable goals had been installed in the face of clear community opposition. They were of the view that community views had been ignored, goal posts constantly shifted and they were concerned about how the results from the street schemes survey would be used as they felt there was no clarity on how responses would determine policy.

The deputation believed that it would not be appropriate for this consultation to report back in two months' time to the Transport and Environment Committee to inform decision making at the June meeting. If it did report back, they felt it would severely undermine the visible commitment to the Council's approved policy for consultations and the repercussions would impact other Council business and the ability for the Council to be effective or offer best value in the longer term.

b) Deputation – Newington Hotels Group

The deputation expressed concern with the conduct and competency of the Council particularly in regard to the spaces for people schemes installed throughout Edinburgh's conservation areas. They indicated that they were supportive of active travel and accepted the need to mitigate the risk of transmission of COVID 19 through the use of emergency Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTRO). They stressed that their main concern lay specifically with the construction, appearance and placement of the segregated units within Edinburgh's protected historic environment.

The deputation indicated that they had been advised by council officers that the cycle segregates did not fall under emergency COVID TTROs and traffic legislation but had been installed under class 30 permitted development under planning legislation, the same planning laws under which local authorities had a statutory duty to preserve conservation areas.

The deputation urged the Council to remove the segregation units from Edinburgh's conservation areas.

c) Deputation – Silverknowes Community Group

The deputation felt that public confidence in the Council was extremely low and that they were not being listened to regarding active travel initiatives city-wide. They believed that the recent consultation for retaining spaces for people breached acceptable quality standards to be able to fulfil its purpose, did not even reflect the

Council's own consultation framework and that fundamentally the approach fell drastically short of the Council Directive.

The deputation urged the Council to make a visible commitment to the approved policy for consultation, a fresh approach to consulting around retaining Spaces for People measures be embraced, with respectful community engagement seen as a priority. They stressed that such dialogue would build trust by ensuring all Quality Standards were adhered to.

d) Deputation – Get Edinburgh Moving

The deputations indicated that they felt that the spaces for people schemes had impacted negatively on disabled people, on public transport, on the ability of emergency services to respond and the impact and on 99% of journeys that were not cycled. They felt that the Council's permanency plans were deeply flawed as they were connected to adverts showing how good spaces for people was rather than a balanced survey introduction and they followed responses so that they predicated on change being good and necessary.

The deputation asked the Council for collaboration, transparency, openness and above all for the deputation's views to not just be listened to but to be heard. The deputation believed that the motion submitted by Councillor Webber was a constructive and an appropriate start.

e) Motion by Councillor Webber

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

"Council:

Welcomes the substantial response to the recent Street Scheme Survey promoted on the Consultation Hub.

Subject to below, welcomes the opportunity to review and the full, complete feedback from those residents that chose to take part.

Notes with concern significant public disquiet with this exercise, not least given a strategic piece of work which impacts on wards across the entire city and with potentially permanent outcomes where there continues to be:

- a) Public opposition of many Community Councils and Local Residents Associations.
- b) Extensive negative coverage in local and national media.

- c) Significant concerns raised by consultative bodies representing less able citizens and users of public transport.
- d) Significant concerns raised by public transport bodies.
- e) The apparent failure of Council Officers to always give full and complete answers in public meetings.
- f) A disputed legal basis for the lawful promotion of some schemes.
- g) The leading nature of the attempted consultation.
- h) An absence of valid information to permit informed feedback.
- i) Absence of timely consistent data from the Cities network of cycle counters.
- j) A shortened timescale notwithstanding it being extended which still fell short of other less complex single-issue consultations.

In order to address any bureaucratic overreach and in an attempt to restore public confidence in the Council, The Executive Director is instructed to:

- 1) Arrange round table workshops with himself, his senior team leading on Spaces for People, any elected Member with an interest, and the Edinburgh Access Panel, Public transport providers, emergency services, businesses and local groups formed to represent residents.
- 2) Structure his forthcoming report to the Transport and Environment Committee on 17th June 2021 to include the output of point 1 (above) and to arrange all the SfP schemes into discrete contiguous routes for separate consideration and discussion, in each case detailing the feedback received from people residing on the streets, local businesses, etc, and including discrete Integrated Impact Assessments and legal justification to ensure fastidious application of the following applicable policies all approved at Policy and Sustainability Committee on 20th April 2021:
 - i) Equality and Diversity Framework 2021-2025 P & S Committee Report 20.4.21
 - ii) COVID19 engagement and consultation approach from 1st July 2021.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Webber.

- moved by Councillor Webber, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment 1

To welcome the substantial response to the recent Street Scheme Survey promoted on the Consultation Hub.

To note that extensive consultation and constructive engagement were in process, as agreed by the Transport and Environment Committee.

To welcome constructive dialogue with outside organisations, interest groups, consultative and representative groups, thanks all organisations and groups for their work and for issues they had identified and raised in consultation.

To note that a wide and detailed range of views had been expressed via the consultation and in public discourse, ranging from strategic city-wide issues to highly specific local details, and recognised the complexity of interpreting and reporting such findings.

To note the report scheduled for June to the Transport and Environment Committee on the results of the online consultation, the concurrent market research, the detailed internal project review and the recommendations against a background of the strategic transport policy framework, as well as Scottish government guidance, and ask that the report:

- be structured to allow members to amend both city-wide strategic decisions and/or street schemes as necessary, in order to take account of representations made before the meeting,
- comprehensively review the issues raised by equalities impact assessments and the options to address these,
- include references or appendices of additional information that has been unavailable so far, such as cycle counter data and answers to public questions, and
- include legal opinion on the dispute which had been raised

To note that a full detailed discussion would take place before a decision by elected members.

To note that extensive discussion, and subsequent requested changes to schemes, had already taken place with senior officers, elected members, specialist stakeholder groups, public transport providers, emergency services, businesses and local

resident groups throughout the development and implementation of the Spaces for People project to date.

To welcome the opportunity to examine the role of improved active travel infrastructure in meeting our sustainable transport aspirations and net zero carbon ambitions for Edinburgh.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 2

To add to paragraph 1) of the motion by Councillor Webber:

- a) after “workshops”, insert “by locality”.
- b) after “any elected member”, insert “representing a ward within that locality”.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Louise Young

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	25 votes
For Amendment 1	-	37 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Macinnes.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Arthur declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a work colleague was a member of one of the deputations.

4 Minutes

Decision

- a) To approve the minute of the Council of 11 March 2021 as a correct record.
- b) To approve the minute of the Council of 16 April 2021 as a correct record.

5 Leader's Report

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

- Welcome results of survey done into Council services
- Edinburgh by Numbers report
- Scottish Parliamentary elections – number of registered voters
- Safe opening of businesses in Edinburgh

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|
| Councillor Whyte | - | Opening up of Edinburgh – increase in congestion – use of public transport |
| Councillor Staniforth | - | Support for traveller communities |
| Councillor Aldridge | - | Libraries re-opening – crucial core resource |
| Councillor Day | - | Black Lives Matter – update on work of independent review group |
| Councillor Macinnes | - | Increase in volume of traffic – road conditions |
| Councillor Johnson | - | Spaces for People programme – public transport congestion - review |
| Councillor Main | - | Accommodation for homeless people - future |
| Councillor Osler | - | Pedestrian Crossing – East Fettes Avenue |
| Councillor Munro | - | Financial settlement |
| Councillor Gordon | - | Food Growing Strategy |
| Councillor Jim Campbell | - | Withdrawal of hot food in schools |
| Councillor Burgess | - | Glasgow City Council Pension Fund – Fossil fuel investment |

- Councillor Kate Campbell - Thanks to Council officers for help in providing outdoor space for businesses
- Councillor Booth - Pledge for stand alone GME secondary school in Edinburgh
- Councillor Fullerton - International Workers Memorial Day – Lothian Buses – Zero Tolerance at work
- Councillor Cameron - Edinburgh Eye Pavilion - update
- Councillor Mary Campbell - Petition for Pledge – P&S
- Councillor Gardiner - Festivals in the City – work of planning officers
- Councillor Doggart - Tourist Bodies – practical steps to encourage tourists to visit Edinburgh

6 Appointments to Outside Organisations – Edinburgh International Conference Centre (EICC)

On 29 June 2017 the Council had appointed members to outside bodies for 2017-22. Councillor Smith had tendered her resignation as a member of the Edinburgh International Conference Centre (EICC), and the Council was asked to appoint a member in her place.

Decision

To appoint Councillor Whyte as a member of the Edinburgh International Conference Centre in place of Councillor Smith.

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

7 Child Protection – Response to Motion

In response to a motion by Councilor Dickie, details were provided of the Edinburgh Child Protection Committee Annual Report 2019/20 which included detail and context around a number of topics including; child protection referrals, interagency training, public information campaigns and matters in relation to whistleblowing.

Decision

- 1) To note the the report by the Chief Executive.

- 2) To note the positive contribution of services across the City in keeping children safe.
- 3) To note the plan for an Internal Audit regarding whistleblowing outcomes, including those relating to child protection issues.
- 4) To note that this report had already been presented to the Education, Children and Families Committee on 2 March 2021 and that no changes were required.

(References – Education Children and Families Committee of 2 March 2021 (item 9); report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

8 Women’s Safety in Public Places – Motion by Councillor Watt

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

“Council deeply regrets that it has taken the murder of Sarah Everard, Bennylyn Burke & Wenjing Lin to bring women’s safety in public spaces to mainstream attention across the country.

Council notes the need for structural change across society and its institutions ought not to be used as a reason for doing nothing in response to this problem.

Council agrees to bring a report to Policy & Sustainability within two cycles, detailing any actions to improve women’s safety, including embedding considerations within risk assessments, placemaking and any other organisational changes to positively impact safety of women in Edinburgh.

This report should identify options for a consultation around the public places and spaces in Edinburgh where women feel safe, where they feel less safe and what can be done to improve their safety. With actions being reported back to the appropriate committee.”

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Watt.

9 Garden Waste Collection - Motion by Councillor Rust

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that the Garden waste collection service operates using fixed registration windows and once the registration closes the Council is not able to accept additional registrations.
- 2) Understands that in the absence of registration the lawful options are essentially (a) to compost the garden waste; (b) to take it to the nearest recycling centre; or (c) to arrange for private collection.
- 3) Recognises that circumstances can arise where a householder omits to register within the registration period because for example, they (a) die, or become incapacitated or unwell and otherwise unable to deal with certain matters timeously; (b) move from a property outwith Edinburgh or move from a property without garden; or (c) through family bereavement or other pressures, not least during the pandemic genuinely forget.
- 4) Appreciates that the other options above are in many cases not practical for householders affected or in the case of the deceased for their estate.
- 5) Therefore, calls for a report in two cycles which:
 - (a) details the number of requests made to the Council outwith the registration windows since the system was launched and where recorded the reasons given for the failure to register to better understand the extent of this issue;
 - (b) considers the potential for extended registration periods and “manual” registration and “stickers” in exceptional circumstances which can be reconciled at year end;
 - (c) further explores the issue of support and system development for registration outwith the fixed periods with the IT provider;
 - (d) better informs regarding how the weight of garden waste impacts through small changes to household registrations and what level of built-in flexibility there is in collection routes; and
 - (e) generally advises as to any ways in which the process can be made more flexible for residents with minimum impact on the service being delivered.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rust.

- moved by Councillor Rust, seconded by Councillor Bruce.

Amendment 1

- 1) To accept paragraphs 1-4 of the motion by Councillor Rust.
- 2) To replace paragraph 5 of the motion with:

Notes that officers are already working on changes to the registration window and process to allow customers who are forced into registering outside of the current windows to join the scheme within four weeks of application.

Notes the impact on complex collection route building requirements of absorbing requests outside of the current window.

Welcomes the remarkable success of the implementation of the garden waste scheme where, within a few short years of its introduction, 66% of eligible households are now participating in the scheme. Notes that this participation rate is considerably higher than the original anticipated levels of 46%.

Notes that the revenue budget report agreed by Council on 18 February 2021 provided detail on the £35 charge for the garden waste service. This includes the following information as one of the outcomes that will be delivered through the service charge.

Investment in administration support and system development to allow the mid-year sign up window to be greatly expanded addressing the high levels of complaints from residents and councillors on the restriction of the current window timescales and the inability to join these if missed.

Notes that there is a report scheduled for June's Transport and Environment Committee which will detail these proposals and that the committee will be asked to decide whether to proceed with these new arrangements which are designed to meet some of the concerns outlined above.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 2

To add at paragraph (5) of the motion by Councillor Rust a further requirement for the requested report:

- (f) to include options for how an automatic renewal process could be available (either by opt in or opt out) to avoid residents accidental missed renewals.

- moved by Councillor Louise Young, seconded by Councillor Osler

Amendment 3

- 1) To accept paragraphs 1-4 of the motion by Councillor Rust.
- 2) To replace paragraph 5 of the motion with:

Notes that officers are already working on changes to the registration window and process to allow customers who are forced into registering outside of the current windows to join the scheme within four weeks of application.

Notes the impact on complex collection route building requirements of absorbing requests outside of the current window.

Notes that the revenue budget report agreed by Council on 18 February 2021 provided detail on the £35 charge for the garden waste service. This includes the following information as one of the outcomes that will be delivered through the service charge.

Investment in administration support and system development to allow the mid-year sign up window to be greatly expanded addressing the high levels of complaints from residents and councillors on the restriction of the current window timescales and the inability to join these if missed.

Notes that there is a report scheduled for June's Transport and Environment Committee which will detail these proposals and that the committee will be asked to decide whether to proceed with these new arrangements which are designed to meet some of the concerns outlined above.

- 3) adds a further requirement for the report to the Transport and Environment Committee in June:

“to include options for how an automatic renewal process could be available (either by opt in or opt out) to avoid residents accidental missed renewals”.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Osler

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	55 votes
For Amendment 3	-	6 votes

(For the motion (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Burgess, Cameron, Jim Campbell, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Cook, Corbett, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Duggart, Doran, Douglas, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Hutchison, Johnston, Key, Laidlaw, Macinnes, Main, McLellan, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rose, Rust, Smith, Staniforth, Watt, Webber, Whyte, Wilson, Work and Ethan Young.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Rust:

- 1) To note that the Garden waste collection service operated using fixed registration windows and once the registration closed the Council was not able to accept additional registrations.
- 2) To understand that in the absence of registration the lawful options were essentially (a) to compost the garden waste; (b) to take it to the nearest recycling centre; or (c) to arrange for private collection.
- 3) To recognise that circumstances could arise where a householder omitted to register within the registration period because for example, they (a) died, or became incapacitated or unwell and otherwise unable to deal with certain matters timeously; (b) moved from a property outwith Edinburgh or moved from a property without garden; or (c) through family bereavement or other pressures, not least during the pandemic genuinely forgot.
- 4) To appreciate that the other options above were in many cases not practical for householders affected or in the case of the deceased for their estate.
- 5) To note that officers were already working on changes to the registration window and process to allow customers who were forced into registering outside of the current windows to join the scheme within four weeks of application.

- 6) To note the impact on complex collection route building requirements of absorbing requests outside of the current window.
- 7) To welcome the remarkable success of the implementation of the garden waste scheme where, within a few short years of its introduction, 66% of eligible households were now participating in the scheme. To note that this participation rate was considerably higher than the original anticipated levels of 46%.
- 8) To note that the revenue budget report agreed by Council on 18 February 2021 provided detail on the £35 charge for the garden waste service. This included the following information as one of the outcomes that would be delivered through the service charge:

Investment in administration support and system development to allow the mid-year sign up window to be greatly expanded addressing the high levels of complaints from residents and councillors on the restriction of the current window timescales and the inability to join these if missed.

- 9) To note that there was a report scheduled for June's Transport and Environment Committee which would detail these proposals and that the committee would be asked to decide whether to proceed with these new arrangements which were designed to meet some of the concerns outlined above.
- 10) To add a further requirement for the report to the Transport and Environment Committee in June:

"to include options for how an automatic renewal process could be available (either by opt in or opt out) to avoid residents accidental missed renewals".

10 City Parks – Motion by Councillor Osler

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

"Council thanks and appreciates the dedication of many Council staff in their efforts in trying to keep the City's many parks to an acceptable standard during the last year. The easing of lockdown will bring the much anticipated re-opening of outdoor hospitality and the resumption of the sale of alcohol from licensed premises until 10pm. If similar circumstances to those in Summer 2020 are repeated, open spaces in the city may experience increased massing of groups, as well as anti-social behaviour resulting from a lack of available public conveniences.

Council calls for a report to Policy and Sustainability within one cycle, indicating with costings what additional waste clearing and environmental resources, including

public conveniences in respect of Parks, will be necessary and should be provided, to address the consequences of increased massing and anti-social behaviour, for:

- Council Parks
- Local Town centres and
- the City Centre.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Osler.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross

Amendment

To delete the second paragraph of the motion by Councillor Osler and replace with;

Notes that the provision of additional accessible temporary public conveniences was approved at Transport and Environment Committee last week and referred to Full Council today for the approval of funding.

Notes that a robust process is in place to allocate additional funding for Covid-related expenditure and the city's recovery plan, and notes that this will be the case for any additional pressures incurred in managing additional footfall in our local high streets and parks and greenspaces.

Notes that longer term implications for parks and greenspaces and waste and cleansing should be considered as part of our on-going budget strategy and any continued Covid restrictions.

Notes the budget passed in February allocated additional investment of around £4m to help support upgrades and improvements in our parks.

Agrees that officers continue to analyse use of public space against deployment of waste resources to ensure issues are minimised and that information on any additional pressures on waste and environment services resulting from intensive use of public space will be included in the next Adaptation and Renewal report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee.

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

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 Osler:

- 1) To thank and appreciate the dedication of many Council staff in their efforts in trying to keep the City's many parks to an acceptable standard during the last year. The easing of lockdown would bring the much anticipated re-opening of outdoor hospitality and the resumption of the sale of alcohol from licensed premises until 10pm. If similar circumstances to those in Summer 2020 were repeated, open spaces in the city might experience increased massing of groups, as well as anti-social behaviour resulting from a lack of available public conveniences.
- 2) To note that the provision of additional accessible temporary public conveniences was approved at Transport and Environment Committee last week and referred to Full Council today for the approval of funding.
- 3) To note that a robust process was in place to allocate additional funding for Covid-related expenditure and the city's recovery plan, and note that this will be the case for any additional pressures incurred in managing additional footfall in the local high streets and parks and greenspaces.
- 4) To note that longer term implications for parks and greenspaces and waste and cleansing should be considered as part of the on-going budget strategy and any continued Covid restrictions.
- 5) To note the budget passed in February allocated additional investment of around £4m to help support upgrades and improvements in the parks.
- 6) To agree that officers continue to analyse use of public space against deployment of waste resources to ensure issues were minimised and that information on any additional pressures on waste and environment services resulting from intensive use of public space would be included in the next Adaptation and Renewal report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee.

11 Local Member Oversight – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

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

“Council:

Warmly notes the evolution of “Click to Report” on the Council website, which has proved to be an invaluable way for service users to inform us of issues that require Council action during the pandemic. Understand the attraction of this web-based solution available via many, many, devices, and which including mapping, location,

image and reporting options for residents. Further notes the efficient solution this should offer, with reports logged through the Verint platform, passing automatically to Services back-office management systems.

Requests a report within 2 cycles to the Policy and Sustainability Committee setting out proposals for “Click to Report” so that Members and Officers supporting Members can lodge reports on behalf of constituents, view the details of reports made by constituents directly and gain real time performance reporting by Ward.”

Motion

Council:

Warmly notes the evolution of “Click to Report” on the Council website, which has proved to be an invaluable way for service users to inform us of issues that require Council action during the pandemic. Understand the attraction of this web-based solution available via many, many, devices, and which including mapping, location, image and reporting options for residents. Further notes the efficient solution this should offer, with reports logged through the Verint platform, passing automatically to Services back-office management systems.

Requests a written update within 2 cycles to the Policy and Sustainability Committee setting out proposals for “Click to Report” so that Members and Officers supporting Members can lodge reports on behalf of constituents, view the details of reports made by constituents directly and gain real time performance reporting by Ward.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Jim Campbell.

12 Scottish Youth Parliament Election – Motion by Councillor Bird

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

“Council:

Warmly welcomes the role of the Scottish Youth Parliament (SYP) in platforming the voices of Scotland’s young people, championing youth led community engagement, and empowering young people to express their views freely and have their opinions listened to in all matters affecting them, in line with Article 12 of the UNCRC.

Notes that the next SYP election will take place in November 2021 and that nominations for expressions of interest to be a candidate are now open until June 30th.

Recognises SYP's commitment to be truly inclusive and ensure diversity across its membership and the need for wide participation to achieve that aim.

Acknowledges the responsibility of elected members from across the political spectrum to promote and support the SYP election and its place in our city's democratic calendar by, for example, sharing information on social media and with youth and community organisations in their local area.

Recognises the work of previous and existing MSYPs in championing the issues that are most important to young people and campaigning to affect the change they want to see. Encourages Edinburgh's young people aged between 14 and 25 to visit SYP's social media platforms to find out more about the upcoming election and to consider standing to hold local and national government to account on the policies they care about most."

- moved by Councillor Bird, seconded by Councillor Perry

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Bird.

13 Sewage Discharges into the River Almond – Motion by Councillor Hutchison

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

"Council:

- 1) Notes great concern at reports that Scottish Water plants discharged raw sewage into the River Almond over 500 times in 2019.
- 2) Joins West Lothian Council in calling on Scottish Water to urgently bring forward an action plan to end such discharges.
- 3) Notes that in addition to having a potentially negative impact on local wildlife this also affects the quality of life of residents and the attractiveness of hospitality businesses operating along the river, including those within the City of Edinburgh Council area.
- 4) Understands that landowners have a responsibility to maintain the cleanliness of any watercourses running through their land. Further understands that the

Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA), as the regulator of Scottish Water, is responsible for investigating any unlicensed discharges of sewage, and requests that members of the public report any such discharges via the SEPA website without delay.

- 5) Instructs the Council Leader to write to the relevant Scottish Minister when a new Scottish Government is formed, requesting an acceleration in the capital programme to mitigate risks of unlicensed discharges into the River Almond, and all other waterways that flow with the City of Edinburgh, with the aim of completing this programme by the original deadline or sooner.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Hutchison.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Smith

Amendment

- 1) Notes with great concern that FOI data secured by the River Almond Action group has identified 501 instances of sewage being released into the River Almond in 2019 from Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) operated by Veolia on behalf of Scottish Water.
- 2) Thanks groups like the River Almond Action Group and the Forth Rivers Trust for their continuing work towards clean, healthy river environments and calls on Scottish Water to address the concerns they have raised as a matter of urgency.
- 3) Notes the source of discharges are Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) which, at times of peak flow, permit sewage and sanitary waste to be discharged into waterways but that their use can be minimised by sufficient investment in drainage capacity and adequate maintenance.
- 4) Notes, with concern, that CSO releases include the discharge of human waste and physical debris such as wet wipes, condoms and sanitary products, threatening the marine environment and harming aquatic life, potentially impacting the health of river users and adding plastic pollution to the river and the Firth of Forth;
- 5) Recognises that the climate emergency will intensify pressure on drainage systems and require further investment on drainage capacity as part of a city region climate adaptation strategy.
- 6) Recognises that the four WWTWs from which discharges were made lie within the West Lothian area but that these inevitably impact on the river ecosystem

as a whole and its amenity for people within the City of Edinburgh area, given that river from Newbridge to the sea at Cramond lies wholly within Edinburgh's boundary.

- 7) Notes that CSOs which are discharging during dry weather can be reported to Scottish Water on 08000 778778 or online at scottishwater.co.uk, and also to SEPA on 0800 807060 or online at sepa.org.uk; but also believes that public bodies should pro-actively inform the public when CSOs are discharging.
- 8) Notes that in September 2020 the council approved a set of actions in relation to CSOs on the Water of Leith which included dialogue with partner authorities and Scottish Water within the Edinburgh and Lothian Strategic Drainage Partnership to draw up a fully-costed plan to prevent future discharges of sewage into CSOs more widely and therefore seeks an update to the next Transport and Environment Committee on progress with that.
- 9) Agrees to work with partner authorities to present that costed plan to the relevant minister within the new Scottish Government to seek an accelerated capital programme to address CSO discharges into the River Almond, the Water of Leith and other waterways within the Edinburgh area.
- 10) Welcomes opportunities to strengthen environmental governance in Scotland, including a review of SEPA's role; establishing an environmental court, and enshrining the right to a healthy and safe environment within a Human Rights (Scotland) Act.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Booth

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 Hutchison:

- 1) To note great concern at reports that Scottish Water plants discharged raw sewage into the River Almond over 500 times in 2019.
- 2) To join West Lothian Council in calling on Scottish Water to urgently bring forward an action plan to end such discharges.
- 3) To note that in addition to having a potentially negative impact on local wildlife this also affected the quality of life of residents and the attractiveness of hospitality businesses operating along the river, including those within the City of Edinburgh Council area.

- 4) To understand that landowners had a responsibility to maintain the cleanliness of any watercourses running through their land. To further understand that the Scottish Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA), as the regulator of Scottish Water, was responsible for investigating any unlicensed discharges of sewage, and request that members of the public report any such discharges via the SEPA website without delay.
- 5) To instruct the Council Leader to write to the relevant Scottish Minister when a new Scottish Government was formed, requesting an acceleration in the capital programme to mitigate risks of unlicensed discharges into the River Almond, and all other waterways that flowed with the City of Edinburgh, with the aim of completing this programme by the original deadline or sooner.
- 6) To note with great concern that FOI data secured by the River Almond Action group had identified 501 instances of sewage being released into the River Almond in 2019 from Wastewater Treatment Works (WWTW) operated by Veolia on behalf of Scottish Water.
- 7) To thank groups like the River Almond Action Group and the Forth Rivers Trust for their continuing work towards clean, healthy river environments and call on Scottish Water to address the concerns they had raised as a matter of urgency.
- 8) To note the source of discharges were Combined Sewer Overflows (CSOs) which, at times of peak flow, permitted sewage and sanitary waste to be discharged into waterways but that their use could be minimised by sufficient investment in drainage capacity and adequate maintenance.
- 9) To note, with concern, that CSO releases included the discharge of human waste and physical debris such as wet wipes, condoms and sanitary products, threatening the marine environment and harming aquatic life, potentially impacting the health of river users and adding plastic pollution to the river and the Firth of Forth;
- 10) To recognise that the climate emergency would intensify pressure on drainage systems and required further investment on drainage capacity as part of a city region climate adaptation strategy.
- 11) To recognise that the four WWTWs from which discharges were made lay within the West Lothian area but that these inevitably impacted on the river ecosystem as a whole and its amenity for people within the City of Edinburgh area, given that river from Newbridge to the sea at Cramond lay wholly within Edinburgh's boundary.
- 12) To note that CSOs which were discharging during dry weather could be reported to Scottish Water on 08000 778778 or online at scottishwater.co.uk,

and also to SEPA on 0800 807060 or online at sepa.org.uk; but also believe that public bodies should pro-actively inform the public when CSOs were discharging.

- 13) To note that in September 2020 the council approved a set of actions in relation to CSOs on the Water of Leith which included dialogue with partner authorities and Scottish Water within the Edinburgh and Lothian Strategic Drainage Partnership to draw up a fully-costed plan to prevent future discharges of sewage into CSOs more widely and therefore seek an update to the next Transport and Environment Committee on progress with that.
- 14) To agree to work with partner authorities to present that costed plan to the relevant minister within the new Scottish Government to seek an accelerated capital programme to address CSO discharges into the River Almond, the Water of Leith and other waterways within the Edinburgh area.
- 15) To welcome opportunities to strengthen environmental governance in Scotland, including a review of SEPA's role; establishing an environmental court, and enshrining the right to a healthy and safe environment within a Human Rights (Scotland) Act.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Arthur declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a former student of his was a member of the River Almond Action Group.

14 Commemorate Joan Davidson of the Edinburgh Science Festival– Motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan

The following motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17:

“The City of Edinburgh recently lost a true champion of science and education in Joan Davidson, who was Head of Learning at Edinburgh Science, the charitable organisation behind the annual Edinburgh Science Festival. Joan was a dedicated figure who devoted her career to inspiring young people to explore, study and develop a lifelong love of science and technology. She was instrumental in organising events and experiences which reached more than half a million young people.

A dedicated champion of environmental causes in her youth, Joan was a science educator who came to the Edinburgh International Science Festival in 2008, where her first role was that of Generation Science manager, running a touring programme of educational science workshops in primary schools across Scotland. She oversaw

its expansion to the point at which it was reaching 60,000 pupils a year, as the largest sciencebased touring programme of its kind in the UK.

Joan was also instrumental in developing the Careers Hive, offering workshops and advice from industry professionals on studying for and entering STEM (science, technology, engineering and maths) careers.

Joan was a highly motivated, respected and well-loved educator with ambitious ideas, who inspired so many to make their own ideas happen through the example of her own drive and determination.

Her family and friends have set up a page with links to two charities which Joan had supported and which are true to her values and principles of equality for all when it comes to young people and science. Donations will be distributed to [EQUATE Scotland](#) and [ScienceGrrl](#).

EQUATE Scotland is the national expert in gender equality throughout STEM sectors, making tangible and sustainable change, enabling women studying and working in these key sectors to develop by supporting their recruitment, retention and progression.

[ScienceGrrl Glasgow](#) is a grassroots organisation, led by volunteers from an amalgamation of backgrounds with a vested interest in science. Their mission is to increase equality in STEM and show that science is truly for everybody.

<https://www.peoplesfundraising.com/donation/Honouring-Joan-Davidson> .”

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan.

15 International Care Experienced Day of Remembrance – Motion by Councillor Dickie

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

“Council:

Welcomes, the first ever International Care Experienced Day of Remembrance on 30th April as part of this Care Experienced History Month where people and organisations are encouraged to link in a call for a global recognition of care experienced history using the hashtags #CareExperiencedHistoryMonth and #CEHM2021.

Recognises and celebrates the contributions of care experienced people from our planet's history including figures such as Sir Issac Newton and his advancement of humanity, Nelson Mandela the revolutionary, and Eleanor Roosevelt – but that many stories remain untold.

Recognises the systemic barriers that have existed for care experienced people and the need for all care experienced children to be remembered - and their legacy honoured.

Celebrates, in particular, the fantastic care experienced people of Edinburgh, past and present, and their valuable contributions to the life of our city.

And further recognises the work of Edinburgh's Champions' Board, who ensure the voice of care experienced young people is heard and drives the much needed change, working together with Corporate Parents to deliver our Corporate Parenting Action Plan and embed The Promise across all practice and decisions.

Council requests:

The Council observe International Care Experienced Day of Remembrance.

The Lord Provost celebrates care experienced people in Edinburgh in an appropriate way on April 30th.

That officers work with schools to share and develop educational resources on care experienced history to bridge the divide in understanding the history, and present day stories, of care experienced people.”

- moved by Councillor Dickie, seconded by Councillor Perry

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Dickie.

16 Protect Transport for Edinburgh – Motion by Councillor Whyte

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

“Council:

Deplores the recent attacks on Lothian Buses. Is gravely concerned by the risks such attacks pose to the safety of bus drivers and passengers. Notes Edinburgh Trams have also been subject to attack. Further notes the unsustainable level of damage to Edinburgh Cycle Hire (branded “Just Eat Cycles”) and docking stations. Regrets the enormous inconvenience that has been imposed on Transport for Edinburgh (TfE) service users as a result.

Observes that the spatial pattern of these attacks is not random and seems linked to social media activities of certain groups of anti-social individuals.

Condemns all such dangerous, illegal and anti-social behaviour unreservedly and trusts that the individuals responsible will find their way into our justice system in due course. Is grateful for all the work of local Police Scotland officers in support of TfE to date.

Nonetheless, notes with concern that Police Officer numbers have dropped over the last year, and each Edinburgh local Police Officer is now statistically split between protecting 460 citizens: 124 more citizens than the equivalent figure for Greater Glasgow. Regrets the lack of progress in Edinburgh receiving a fair settlement in terms of Local Police numbers. Calls on Police Scotland to do more to protect the customers, employees and assets of TfE and to return to a locally based problem-solving approach based on an ethos of prevention.

Calls on the Chief Executive to provide an urgent report indicating actions that can be taken to:

- lobby Police Scotland and the Scottish Government to address the low number of local Police officers in our Capital and the ensure Edinburgh gets its fair share of policing resources;
- ensure that those officers are fully accountable through local mechanisms so that we can return to the partnership and prevention approach that was highly successful under the former Lothian and Borders Police;
- and to consider what actions the Council could take to contribute to that partnership approach to support and inspire young people who might be at risk of following a misguided path towards anti-social behaviour, risk assessing such positive outcomes against any coronavirus restrictions.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Whyte.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment 1

To delete paragraph 4 onwards in the motion by Councillor Whyte and replace with:

Also notes the completely unacceptable disturbances in Portobello on Friday night and previous disturbances at the Meadows and recognises that we must take action to prevent further incidents.

Recognises the enormous changes to the lives of young people, and the sacrifices they have made over the last year to help reduce the spread of the virus, while many youth services have been closed and young people left without all of the activities, and support, that would normally be available to them.

Notes the ongoing work, including 6VT and LAYC alongside police, in response to the incidents at the Meadows.

Notes the easing of restrictions and the good weather means that large numbers of people of all ages are congregating in areas where there are open spaces.

Recognises that Lothian Buses have expressed gratitude to local Police Scotland officers for their efforts in partnership in helping address the antisocial behaviour and notes the ongoing Council efforts to lobby Police Scotland and Government for additional police resources in the Capital.

Therefore requests the report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee within three cycles to include information on how the Council is facilitating partnership between Community Police and with our excellent third sector organisations across the city who already deliver detached, or street-based, youth work.

Also includes consideration of place plans, shaped by participation of young people, to help the city further develop a preventative approach to antisocial behaviour while supporting and encouraging our young people and keeping them, and our wider communities, safe.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

To delete all after paragraph 1 of the motion by Councillor Whyte and replace with:

Recognises that anti-social behaviour is caused by a number of factors including but not limited to the alienation of young people, poverty, a chaotic home life and lack of agency in other aspects of life.

Recognises that local Police Scotland officers should be thanked for their work in support of TfE to date, the root causes of anti-social behaviour cannot be successfully addressed by additional police resource.

Recognises that some of the people engaged in antisocial behaviour are visitors to the city who are resident to nearby local authorities such as Fife and East Lothian.

Therefore calls on the Chief Executive to provide an urgent report indicating actions that can be taken to consult with young people and affected communities on ways to mitigate the causes of anti-social behaviour including the lack of facilities across the city for people between the ages of 12 and 17 (inclusive). Asks that this report also

considers how Edinburgh can work with other local authorities to alleviate anti-social behaviour across the region.

That the process of such a consultation and its results should be shared with the Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership to ensure partnership work can be engaged in to prevent anti-social behaviour in the future.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Millerr

In accordance with Standing Order 22(12), Paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Motion and the whole of Amendment 2 were accepted as addendums to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

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

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

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To deplore the recent attacks on Lothian Buses. Was gravely concerned by the risks such attacks posed to the safety of bus drivers and passengers. To note Edinburgh Trams had also been subject to attack. To further note the unsustainable level of damage to Edinburgh Cycle Hire (branded "Just Eat Cycles") and docking stations. To regret the enormous inconvenience that had been imposed on Transport for Edinburgh (TfE) service users as a result.
- 2) To observe that the spatial pattern of these attacks was not random and seemed linked to social media activities of certain groups of anti-social individuals.
- 3) To condemn all such dangerous, illegal and anti-social behaviour unreservedly and trust that the individuals responsible would find their way

into the justice system in due course. Was grateful for all the work of local Police Scotland officers in support of TfE to date.

- 4) To also note the completely unacceptable disturbances in Portobello on Friday night and previous disturbances at the Meadows and recognise that we must take action to prevent further incidents.
- 5) To recognise the enormous changes to the lives of young people, and the sacrifices they had made over the last year to help reduce the spread of the virus, while many youth services had been closed and young people left without all of the activities, and support, that would normally be available to them.
- 6) To note the ongoing work, including 6VT and LAYC alongside police, in response to the incidents at the Meadows.
- 7) To note the easing of restrictions and the good weather meant that large numbers of people of all ages were congregating in areas where there were open spaces.
- 8) To recognise that Lothian Buses had expressed gratitude to local Police Scotland officers for their efforts in partnership in helping address the antisocial behaviour and note the ongoing Council efforts to lobby Police Scotland and Government for additional police resources in the Capital.
- 9) To therefore request the report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee within three cycles to include information on how the Council was facilitating partnership between Community Police and with the excellent third sector organisations across the city who already delivered detached, or street-based, youth work.
- 10) To also include consideration of place plans, shaped by participation of young people, to help the city further develop a preventative approach to antisocial behaviour while supporting and encouraging our young people and keeping them, and the wider communities, safe.
- 11) To recognise that anti-social behaviour was caused by a number of factors including but not limited to the alienation of young people, poverty, a chaotic home life and lack of agency in other aspects of life.
- 12) To recognise that local Police Scotland officers should be thanked for their work in support of TfE to date, the root causes of anti-social behaviour could be successfully addressed by additional police resource.

- 13) To recognise that some of the people engaged in antisocial behaviour were visitors to the city who were resident to nearby local authorities such as Fife and East Lothian.
- 14) To therefore call on the Chief Executive to provide an urgent report indicating actions that could be taken to consult with young people and affected communities on ways to mitigate the causes of anti-social behaviour including the lack of facilities across the city for people between the ages of 12 and 17 (inclusive). To ask that this report also consider how Edinburgh could work with other local authorities to alleviate anti-social behaviour across the region.
- 15) That the process of such a consultation and its results should be shared with the Edinburgh Community Safety Partnership to ensure partnership work could be engaged in to prevent anti-social behaviour in the future.

Declaration of Interest

Councillor Bruce declared a financial interest as an employee of Police Scotland and left the meeting during the Council's consideration of the above item.

Councillor Macinnes declared a non-financial interest in the above item as Chair of Transport for Edinburgh.

Councillors Doran, Laidlaw and Miller declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of Transport for Edinburgh.

17 World Summit Awards 2021 WelcoMe by Neatebox – Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

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

“Council notes:

The World Summit Awards (www.wsa-global.org) provides an international platform for cutting edge examples of how technology companies are impacting society in a positive way through local digital innovation; and contributes to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals agenda.

At the WSA Global Congress 2021, “Connect4Impact – Digital Solutions for the UN Sustainability Development Goals”, 9 social technology start-ups, whose solutions not only drive the achievement of UN SDGs, but demonstrate how digital creativity is making a positive impact on society, were awarded the title of WSA Global Champion.

Council congratulates Neatebox, an Edinburgh based company on being one of the 9 companies, from 600 applications worldwide, to be awarded the title of WSA Global Champion, in recognition of its development of WelcoMe, a low-cost web-based service which enables any person with a disability to forewarn participating businesses of their visit and special needs, ensuring awareness, ease of customer experience, meaningful inclusion and citizen empowerment.

Council asks the Lord Provost to convey its congratulations to the Neatebox team on this success.”

- moved by The Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron.

18 Debora Kayembe – Rector of the University of Edinburgh – Motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

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

“Welcomes and congratulates Ms Debora Kayembe on her recent election as Rector of the University of Edinburgh. Ms Kayembe is the third woman to be elected as Rector.

Recognises the wealth of experience Debora Kayembe has including at the Congolese Bar Association, the language services of the office of the prosecutor at the International Criminal Court and the International Criminal Court Bar Association (ICCBA), as a Board Member of the Scottish Refugee Council, the Royal Society of Edinburgh/Young Academy of Scotland representing refugee minorities and is an expert lawyer to the RSE Working Group for Africa.

Further recognises Debora’s ongoing work with Full Options, a charity which tackles social isolation, campaigns for human rights, conflict resolution or reconciliation; promotes religious and racial harmony; works towards the relief of poverty and the advancement of health and education for all, the Freedom Walk campaign – a civil rights movement which campaigns on behalf of citizens by promoting social reforms, racial justice and community harmony and work promoting and anti-racist approach to education in Scotland.

Council welcomes Ms Kayembe to the role of Rector of the University of Edinburgh and wishes her every success during her tenure.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron.

Declaration of Interests

The Lord Provost declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of the Edinburgh University Court.

19 North Edinburgh Covid 19 Respond and Recovery Group– Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council congratulates the North Edinburgh Covid 19 Respond and Recovery Group on their recent award for Inspiring Partnership Award from Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce 2021 Awards.

“The partnership between, FreshStart, Spartans, NEA, PCHP, Scran Academy, LIFT, Granton Community Gardener’s, Granton Information Centre, Community Renewal – supported by local activists, local Councillors and the MP and MSP has shown how the our amazing local projects can pull together, create innovation and deliver immediate support to those that need it most in times of crisis.”

The pandemic response demonstrated the speed and agility that third sector organisations can bring to a crisis response at a community level. It highlighted the impact which can be made on the ground when statutory services work closely with third sector partners to tap into and harness that local understanding, commitment and experience and use existing channels to ensure support is responsive to local needs.

Council requests the Lord Provost celebrates this great achievement in an appropriate manner.”

- moved by Councillor the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron.

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Bird, Brown and Gordon declared a non-financial interest in the above item as members of the board of Spartans Football Academy.

20 Questions

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

Declaration of Interests – Question Number 8

Councillor Webber declared a non-financial interest in the above item (Question 8) as a board member of an organisation which had purchased a public convenience building from the Council.

21 Condolences - Former Mayor Dave Cull of Dunedin, New Zealand

To note the passing of former Mayor Dave Cull of Dunedin, New Zealand and that condolences be sent to the City.

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 20 of 29 April 2021)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

In the CEC news release of 22nd February for the recent consultation around retaining Spaces for People measures, the Transport and Environment Convener said: "*We've had encouragement from the Scottish Government to consider turning the most useful of these schemes into permanent infrastructure to help further support walking, wheeling and cycling.*"

Question

- (1) In what ways and to what extent has the Scottish Government directly encouraged CEC to retain the Spaces for People measures in the way they have been implemented in Edinburgh?

Answer

- (1) Early in the Spaces for People rollout it became clear that new active travel infrastructure delivered through SfP could potentially benefit the longer term achievement of sustainable transport and net zero carbon goals, shared by many local authorities across Scotland.

In July 2020 the Cabinet Secretary for Transport, Infrastructure and Connectivity said: "The steps local authorities have taken in our towns and cities have been ambitious and widely welcomed – and I'm confident will re-energise demand for permanent active travel infrastructure as we think collectively about Scotland's green recovery. To support this, we will continue to provide funding through our Places for Everyone initiative for high quality permanent infrastructure and place-making".

Retention of such schemes is reflected in the Scottish Government's Strategic Transport Projects Review 2, which states that making successful Spaces for People schemes permanent is the next key step in creating a change to the way road space is allocated and supporting active travel.

Question (2) How is the Scottish Government defining what should be classed as a successful or useful scheme and therefore potentially eligible for funding for permanency?

Answer (2) In the Route Map to Permanence, published as a guide to local authorities who have implemented SfP, there are several points suggested on what would make a temporary scheme suitable for retention. These include the impact, positive or negative, on walking, wheeling, cycling, business, public transport, disabled persons; the evidence base; levels of public and political support; the related TRO and funding positions; and does it form part of a coherent and/or strategic network to support walking, wheeling and cycling.

There is a report scheduled for the June Transport and Environment Committee which will provide a detailed response on these and other considerations, before any decision is made about retention of temporary schemes.

Officers will work with the Places for Everyone funding requirements, where required.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and thanks to the Convener for her answer. In answer 2 Convener it says there is a report scheduled for the June Transport Committee which will provide a detailed response on these – so that’s obviously referring to what’s above - and other considerations, before any decision is made about retention of temporary schemes.

In this context what is meant by other considerations please?

Supplementary Answer Thank you Councillor Rust for your supplementary. Clearly we have to look at this in the case of our own particular set of circumstances. There are several things which are feeding into that June report, one being obviously the online consultation report, the analysis really of the results and how we can work with that but there's also some independent market research which has been done as an extensive internal review by officers with obviously their specialist knowledge, and there’s also an assessment, really of how well that will work, how well the officer proposals will work

within our general strategic direction, particularly in relation to our climate change goals and the health of the city in general terms, in terms of green recovery, so that's what was meant by that particular catch all phrase, thank you.

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021**

- Question** **(1)** In Financial year 2019/20:
- (a) What income came into CEC via or from Sustrans and what was that for?
- (b) What was the total CEC paid to Sustrans and what services was that for? eg design of schemes, Commonplace tool, procurement support, research, infrastructure etc?

- Answer** **(1)** (a) 2019/20 Sustrans Income by Project

A8 Glasgow Road - Proposed 40mph speed limit	122,576
Arboretum Place	15,696
Calton Road	11,992
CCWEL	308,476
Davidson Mains Park - Walking and Cycling Improvements	157,108
Dropped kerb programme and active travel crossing improvements	11,258
Edinburgh City Centre Transformation	1,079,057
Edinburgh Street Design Guidance	45,368
Edinburgh SUDS Design Guidance	53,000
Leith Walk to Ocean Terminal	31,753
Maybury Road and junctions Feasibility Study	15,000
Meadows to Canal	53,496
Meadows to George Street	241,704
Newcraighall/QMU Lighting Project	3,000
Niddrie Burn Footbridge and Cycle Path Construction	86,474
Online active travel cycle/pedestrian data counter database and analysis tool	26,090
Quiet Route 13 - Lower Granton Road Shared Path	645,246
Quiet Route 5 - Holyrood Park	4,014
Quiet Route 61 - Niddrie to Gilmerton	7,751

Quiet Route 8 - Balgreen Crossing improvements and path upgrades	19,500
Quiet Route 8 - Balgreen Road, Roseburn Park and Stenhouse Drive	67,620
Quiet Route 9 - Corstorphine to The Gyle	7,115
Ratho Canal Bridge Project	119,580
Roseburn to Union Canal cycle and walking Link	60,655
Saughton Park - Installation of people and bike counters	18,902
St Leonards to Holyrood Drive and Canongate	15,321
The West Edinburgh Active Travel Network	236,012
Quiet Route 6	9,673
On-Street Secure Cycle Parking, Storage and Racks	57,640
Total	3,531,077

(b) Total Paid to Sustrans 2019/20

Project	Amount
Bike Life 2019	15,000
Equipment - (inc. Bikes and Trailers Support to Businesses)	508
Staff Costs	47,470
Grand Total	62,978

Question

(2) In Financial year 2020/21:

- (a) What income came into CEC via or from Sustrans and what was that for?
- (b) What was the total CEC paid to Sustrans and what services was that for? eg design of schemes, Commonplace tool procurement support, research, infrastructure etc?
- (c) Specifically, how much was Sustrans paid to design
 - i) the scheme for Slateford, Longstone, Murrayburn and Lanark Roads and
 - ii) The proposal for Braid Road?

Answer

(2) (a) 2020/21 Sustrans Income by Project

Project	Total
CCWEL	818,407
Creating Safe Walking and Cycling Spaces in Edinburgh	822,170
Davidson Mains Park - Walking and Cycling Improvements	48,135
Dropped kerb programme and active travel crossing improvements	30,096
Edinburgh City Centre Transformation	396,384
Edinburgh Street Design Guidance	49,024
Follow On From Braidburn Terrace	32,740
Follow On From Dundee Street / Fountainbridge	8,804
Follow On From Gogarstone Road to Middle Norton	17,580
Follow On From Innocent Path Lighting	562
Follow On From Maybury Road and junctions Feasibility Study	44,725
Follow On From Morrison Street	43,082
Follow On From one way streets, exemptions for cyclists	31,228
Follow On From Pennywell and Muirhouse Regeneration Key Cycle Link	48,229
Follow On From St Leonards to Holyrood Drive and Canongate	43,616
George Street & First New Town and Leith Connections	106,249
Meadows to Canal	80,151
Meadows to George Street	680,614
Niddrie Burn Footbridge and Cycle Path Construction	29,623
Open Streets Edinburgh (Follow on from Edinburgh City Centre Transformation)	170,694
Powderhall Railway Line	3,405
Quiet Route 13 - Lower Granton Road Shared Path	28,429
Quiet Route 30 -Follow On From Holyrood Park Road to Ratcliffe Terrace	30,100
Quiet Route 5 - Holyrood Park	34,128
Quiet Route 61 - Niddrie to Gilmerton	64,843
Quiet Route 8 - Balgreen Road, Roseburn Park and Stenhouse Drive	38,105
Quiet Route 8 - Follow On From Cultins Road Cycleway	142
Quiet Route 9 - Follow On From Corstorphine to The Gyle	56,631
Ratho Canal Bridge Project	49,970
Roseburn to Union Canal cycle and walking Link	464,195
The West Edinburgh Active Travel Network	388,454
Edinburgh City Centre Transformation	84,111
Davidsons Mains Park - Walking and Cycling Improvements Phase 2	42,592
Quiet Route 6	83,407
On-Street Secure Cycle Parking, Storage and Racks	312,422
Grand Total	5,183,047

In addition to the above, a further £2.688m for Spaces for People and £3.524m for Places for Everyone Active Travel projects accrued in 2020/21 Accounts, with funding anticipated by June 2021.

(b)

Project	Amount
Cycling Initiatives in Schools	21,000
Equipment - (inc. Bikes and Trailers Support to Businesses)	10,205
Staff Costs (for 2019/20)	53,980
Officers time on route signage	7,500
Grand Total	£92,685

(c) (i) £nil paid to Sustrans for this work

(ii) £nil paid to Sustrans for this work

Question

(3) In Financial year 2021/2022:

(a) What is the projected income for CEC via or from Sustrans?

(b) What is the projected expenditure by CEC to Sustrans, including detail of any contracted projects?

Answer (3) (a) 2021/22 Projected Income (including 20/21 accruals)

Project	Projected Claim
City Centre West to East Link	£5,961,004
West Edinburgh Link	£1,180,048
Roseburn Path – Union Canal	£108,000
Meadows to George Street	£508,452
Rest of Active Travel Investment Programme	£4,879,454
Spaces for People	£2,688,638
Total Income	£15,325,596

At present we expect the cost of two embedded officers and 60 days of signage support costing £59,500 to CEC in 2021/22, although this is subject to final confirmation.

Supplementary Question

Thanks Lord Provost, thanks again to the Convener for his answer. In Question 2, part 2(c)(i) and (ii), it states that Sustrans designed the schemes for Lanark Road, Longstone, Slateford and Braids but no payment was made to Sustrans for this work. Who did pay Sustrans for this work?

Supplementary Answer

Thank you for that question, I don't have the answer to that but I will get that answer and circulate it to members.

QUESTION NO 3

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Across the city temporary measures to aid social distancing in response to the public health emergency were installed without substantive consultation resulting in poor awareness until there local installation.

Question (1) Which schemes have subsequently had retrospective safety audits completed?

Answer (1) Table 1 provides a summary of Roads Safety Audits - completed, in progress and planned for Spaces for People schemes.

Table 2 provides details of the position for each scheme. There are four recorded as Not Applicable (N/A) - these relate to schemes which are road closures and therefore a Road Safety Audit is not required.

Question (2) Where can the public access these reports?

Answer (2) Individual Road Safety Audits are not currently publicly available. Due to limited resource availability and project pace limited technical documents are due to be made publicly available (completion drawings in progress).

Question (3) Who was contracted to carry out the Safety Audits?

Answer (3) To date Aecom Ltd have undertaken most of the Road Safety Audits.

Table 1

	City Centre	Town Centre	Travelling Safely	Spaces for Exercise	Common place	Schools	Total
Completed	7	7	11	5	0	7	37
In Progress	0	0	6	1	2	0	9
Planned	0	1	6	2	0	0	9

Table 2

Scheme Name	Roads Safety Audits
CITY CENTRE (CC)	
Cockburn Street	Completed by Aecom
Forest Road	Completed by Aecom
George IV Bridge	Completed by Aecom
The Mound	Completed by Aecom
Princes Street East End	Completed by Aecom
Victoria Street	Completed by Aecom
Waverley Bridge	Completed by Aecom
TOWN CENTRES (TC)	
Bruntsfield	Completed by Aecom
Corstorphine	Completed by Aecom
Gorgie / Dalry Road	Completed by Aecom
Morningside	Completed by Aecom
Portobello	Completed by Aecom
Queensferry High Street	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits
Stockbridge	Completed by Aecom
Tollcross	Completed by Aecom
TRAVELLING SAFELY (TS)	
A1 Corridor	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits
A90 Queensferry Road	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits
Buccleuch St	Completed by Aecom
Causewayside	Completed by Aecom
Comiston Road	Completed by Aecom
Corstorphine High Street	Road Safety Audit in progress
Craigmillar Park corridor	Road Safety Audit in progress
Crewe Road South (Initial)	Completed by Council Officers
Crewe Road South (revised scheme with segregation units)	Completed by Aecom
Drum Brae and Craigs Road	Road Safety Audit in progress
Duddingston Road	Completed by Aecom
Ferry Road	Road Safety Audit in progress
Fountainbridge Dundee St	Completed by Aecom
Gilmerton Road	Completed by Aecom
Lanark/Inglis Green /Longstone Road	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits
Mayfield Road	Road Safety Audit in progress
Meadowplace Road	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits
Old Dalkeith Road (Initial)	Completed by Council officers

Old Dalkeith Road (revised scheme with segregation units)	Completed by Aecom
Comely Bank Roundabout	Road Safety Audit in progress
Pennywell Road & Silverknowes Parkway	Completed by Aecom
Quiet Corridor - Meadows / Greenbank	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits
Slateford Road (A70)	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits
SPACES FOR EXERCISE (SfE)	
Arboretum Place	Completed by Aecom
Braidburn Terrace	N/A – Road Closure
Braid Road	Road Safety Audit in progress
Cammo Walk	N/A – Road Closure
Kings Place	Completed by Aecom
Links Gardens	N/A – Road Closure
Maybury Road	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits (Revision planned following engagement from Police Scotland)
Seafield Street	Completed by Aecom
Silverknowes Road (North section)	Completed by Aecom
Silverknowes Road (South section)	Completed by Aecom
Stanley Street/ Hope Lane	N/A
West Shore Road	Will be carried out in next phase of Road Safety Audits by Sweco
Public Proposals – Commonplace (CP)	
Broughton Street	Road Safety Audit in progress
Duddingston Road West	Road Safety Audit in progress
Fillyside Road	Not installed yet
Restalrig Road South (Smoky Brae)	Scheme on hold
Starbank Road	Not installed yet
Schools (Schs)	
Preston Street Primary	Completed by Aecom
Prestonfield Primary	Completed by Aecom
Victoria Primary	Completed by Aecom
South Morningside Primary	Completed by Aecom
Corstorphine Primary	Completed by Aecom
Craiglockhart Primary	Completed by Aecom
Murrayburn Primary	Completed by Aecom

**Supplementary
Question**

Thanks Lord Provost and thanks to the Convener for her answer. We note that there's a number of the safety audits that have been carried out by the same organisations that designed them, so I'm looking for, it this standard practice and indeed best practice to ensure that audits are independent. I'm just thinking and concerned that some of the other ones, Old Dalkeith Road and Pennywell Road were designed and audited by Aecom and so I'm just looking just for a bit of clarification around best practice on that, thanks.

**Supplementary
Answer**

My understanding is that it is because it's a particularly specialist function, this is not something which you can hand over to somebody with a generalised safety approach, it is very much in relation to the road engineering, so my understanding is that that is the case. I somewhat regret the fact that some of the presence of consultancy work around spaces for people has become the subject of speculation and indeed incorrect information around who we should be using, what we're using them for and some sort of nefarious reasoning for using them. Aecom is a respected company, it sits on our procurement framework, and to the best of my knowledge, although I will ask for confirmation from officers, this is absolutely standard practice.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Webber for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021**

Question (1) Since the installation of the various temporary Spaces for People schemes across the city intended to aid with social distancing during the Covid 19 Pandemic how many personal injury or accident claims have been made against the Council?

- a) In total.
- b) By scheme.

Answer (1) a) There have been five claims in total
b) There has been one each from the following schemes:
Dalry Road, Buckstone Terrace, Princes Street,
Morningside Road and Pennywell Road.

Question (2) What has been the outcome of these claims?

- a) Number of successful claims.
- b) Total Payments / Compensation if applicable.

Answer (2) All of the claims are still open at present.

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question

The Convener will be aware of the significant issues many residents face with regard to the lack of provision of public toilet facilities in some of our most popular parks and green spaces, including, but not limited to, Leith Links, Inverleith Park and the Meadows. Already, as Covid restrictions ease, these areas have seen large numbers of people gathering to eat and drink outdoors and this is likely to increase as we enter the summer months.

Given the Council does not have the resources to construct and open public toilets in these areas would the Convener consider putting out to tender the license of the commercial provision on temporary toilet facilities, operating on a commercial basis, in these most popular and thus problematic, outdoor areas?

Answer

As agreed at the Transport and Environment Committee on 22 April, an additional £450,000 will be allocated, subject to approval by Full Council or by the Chief Executive under urgency powers, towards providing additional toilets in key locations this summer. The Council will seek to hire additional facilities where required.

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question

Elected members face questions from constituents about *Spaces for People* schemes in respect of their own wards, but also other parts of the city in which constituents work or visit. There are around 120 schemes presenting a burden on both council officers and councillors in responding to individual queries. While some information is currently available on the Council website, can the Convener commit to investigating the provision of additional information for each *Spaces for People* scheme including all key documents, for example:

- final plans,
- integrated impact assessments,
- design risk assessments,
- completed safety audit

in order to allow easy access by councillors, their support staff and members of the public with a view to improving transparency, increasing efficiency and reducing workloads for all?

Answer

Due to the urgent and temporary nature of the current Spaces for People Programme it has not been possible to create a public facing data platform which includes all of the requested information. The Spaces for People section of the Council Website includes a number of published scheme plans and others will be added when available. Individual technical documents can also be provided if requested.

The overall Programme Integrated Impact Assessment is currently on the Council [website](#).

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost and thanks to the Convener. Can any commitment be given to provide requested documents within three working days if they're not going to be provided centrally?

**Councillor
Macinnes**

I'm sorry Councillor Rust I missed part of that, can I ask you to repeat it.

**Councillor
Rust**

Can any commitment be given to provide requested documents within 3 working days if they're not going to be provided centrally?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I'll pick up with officers in particular because clearly this is a very operational matter in terms of how the technical information is developed and used within each project and indeed in terms of the consultation process. I think the answer that I have given in writing gives some understanding in the context of that and given the scale of what we can do across spaces for people it has put the team under enormous strain to try to provide incredibly detailed bits of information, but we will come back to you on that specific, thank you.

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021**

The Council is responsible for maintaining thousands of gullies across the city. In March this year the Council had only two gulley cleaning vehicles with three new vehicles on order.

Question (1) How many gully issues are currently shown as outstanding on the Council's online reporting system per ward?

Answer (1) These figures are provided in Table 1 below, which clearly indicate that only 3% of the almost 60,000 gullies in Edinburgh are currently the subject of outstanding enquiries.

As is also made clear in the notes to the table there may be some instances of double counting when reports are not specific to an individual gully.

Question (2) How many of those gully issues have been outstanding for more than one month, more than three months and more than six months analysed per ward?

Answer (2) Table 1 provides this information.

Question (3) When might it be reasonable to expect that the backlog will be eliminated and all the outstanding issues identified at 2) above cleared?

Answer (3) The lifecycle of a gully issue can vary greatly in terms of complexity and timescale and depends on the cause of the issue. There is no standard time to fix an enquiry - some can be fixed in a day and some can take months to resolve. It should also be noted that on some occasions it is not the responsibility of the Council to do so, depending on the nature of the problem.

The Road Operations team prioritise gully issues which are affecting property and/or creating road safety issues first.

They also attempt to co-ordinate these enquiries with our cyclical maintenance programme.

There will always be work in progress because as current enquiries are completed new ones arise and the overall figure fluctuates in line with the weather and available resources. It is therefore not realistic to reference 'eliminating a backlog' but recognition is necessary of the ongoing nature of this work and Council responsibility.

For reference, on average in the seven months prior to the onset of the severe winter weather (Jun 2020 – Dec 2020 inclusive), 762 enquiries per month were closed.

Question (4) What are the operational performance targets for gully cleaning?

Answer (4) The operational target is to undertake a fully cyclical maintenance of the city's gullies on a two-year cycle.

Supplementary Question Thank you Lord Provost and thank you to the Convener for her answer. It would seem from the figures provided that Ward 10, my ward, has by far the highest number of all outstanding gully enquiries, I don't expect the Convener to know why that is, but would she be willing to help me find out and take appropriate action?

Supplementary Answer Of course I'd be delighted to help. I'm hoping that you've maybe gone directly to officers to ask those specific questions already, but what I can do today though is perhaps give some degree of context attached to this. The question of gullies is not a simple one, it is actually incredibly complex and so there may be a lot of reasons as to why your particular ward has a high number of outstanding enquiries, or indeed when any other ward has, and one of the reasons for that is the nature of the problem around gullies, because there is no one simple reason for issues around gullies nor is there any simple solution often to them, it can often be several different stages of investigation, sometimes it's a problem that's actually sitting with the sewer, in which case it's the responsibility of Scottish Water, sometimes it is not obvious as to why something is blocked, there are also occasionally times

when people will make reports of blocked gullies when in actual fact after rainfall it is natural and right that the gully pots are sitting at three quarter level full even though they may appear to be blocked to people, they're actually not and sometimes the problem does not actually lie at the gully it lies further back in the drainage system, as it reaches the sewer, in which case that requires an enormous amount of additional work either the jetting crew to clear them out which has to come back in as a second piece of work, or alternatively to actually have them dug out and that's often where we're combining with Scottish Water on that. So depending on the nature of the problem, and obviously there'll be issues around old sewer works etc. in different parts of the city, that may explain why there's a particular concentration in one ward over another and also it helps to explain some of the delays in getting enquiries resolved when they turn out to be more complex than first appears, thank you.

Table 1 – Outstanding Gully Enquiries

Ward	Less than 1 month	1month - 3month	3 month - 6 month	> 6month	Total No. Enquiries Outstanding	% of total gullies
Ward 1	31	64	45	24	164	0.28%
Ward 2	10	32	19	31	92	0.15%
Ward 3	11	23	41	15	90	0.15%
Ward 4	6	13	23	14	56	0.09%
Ward 5	18	32	39	30	119	0.20%
Ward 6	5	42	33	32	112	0.19%
Ward 7	7	41	30	13	91	0.15%
Ward 8	11	24	13	15	63	0.11%
Ward 9	13	37	22	31	103	0.17%
Ward 10	25	103	95	79	302	0.51%
Ward 11	24	25	37	15	101	0.17%
Ward 12	4	24	15	28	71	0.12%
Ward 13	5	33	22	15	75	0.13%
Ward 14	10	13	33	14	70	0.12%
Ward 15	21	67	66	36	190	0.32%
Ward 16	10	69	45	14	138	0.23%
Ward 17	7	26	30	12	75	0.13%
Total					1,912	
Total Gullies in Edinburgh					59,413	
% of Total					3%	

Please note – the actual numbers are expected to be less than noted above. This is because there will be instances of double counting where customers have not selected specific gullies to report against. It is not possible to automatically identify the number which are double counted as the customer has not specified an asset that the system can identify as unique.

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Neil Ross for answer
by the Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021**

- Question** (1) How much has the Council received, net of costs, from the sale of public conveniences over the past ten years?
- Answer** (1) Total net receipts are £1,334,717
- Question** (2) How much has the Council spent on the modernisation or refurbishment of public conveniences over the past ten years?
- Answer** (2) £678,242
- Question** (3) How much does the Council intend to spend in total on the modernisation or refurbishment of public conveniences over the current year 2021/22 and, in particular, on the facilities at Bruntsfield Links, Meadows (East) and Middle Meadow Walk?
- Answer** (3) There are currently no funded plans to refurbish these toilets. However, the [Future Provision of Public Conveniences](#) was considered at 22 April 2021 Transport and Environment Committee

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

On Friday 9th April the guardrails at the Blackhall Dip were removed with no warning, this was not part of the consulted A90 Spaces for People scheme but done by the team charged with “decluttering”.

Question (1) If the guardrail needed to be removed why was their removal not considered as part of the original scheme and removed instead with no consultation?

Answer (1) The Spaces for People programme includes a workstream dedicated to the removal of street clutter which is being progressed in consultation with Living Streets. Due to the urgent nature of the programme full consideration to the removal of street clutter could not always be provided. However, the programme has enabled a review of measures to improve pedestrian movement in line with the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance.

Question (2) In many schemes guardrail removal was considered as part of the Spaces for People Schemes. Who decides on whether this is considered or not?

Answer (2) The lead officer for the measures should consider street clutter removal as part of the process but as mentioned above, this was not always possible.

Question (3) How is such a decision made?

Answer (3) The process follows the protocol adopted in 2012 and is in line with the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance. As part of guidance, the decluttering of streets should be considered when carrying out work on the network.

QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Education, Children and Families
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 29 April 2021**

Question (1) Are holders of an NHS Scotland Face Coverings Exemption card exempt from wearing face coverings in all Council settings?

Answer (1) Schools and Lifelong Learning follow Scottish Government and Health Protection advice. In-line with this, all holders of an NHS Scotland Face Coverings Exemption card would be exempt from wearing face coverings in all Council settings.

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-public-use-of-face-coverings/pages/face-covering-exemptions/>

Question (2) Following an enquiry from a constituent in early March, I understand the Children and Families were reminded that if a student is exempt then they need not wear a mask. Would the Convener agree?

Answer (2) Schools and Lifelong Learning follow Scottish Government and Health Protection advice with regards to the response to managing Covid-19 in schools.

Where required face coverings should be worn, if staff or pupils are exempt, they do not need to wear a face covering.

The link to guidance is provided below.

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance-on-reducing-the-risks-in-schools/>

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/coronavirus-covid-19-public-use-of-face-coverings/pages/face-covering-exemptions/>

- Question** (3) Despite this, a story appeared in Scotland on Sunday on 3 April alleging several exempt students had been excluded from a City of Edinburgh school classroom for failing to wear a face covering. Can the Convener comment on the accuracy of this media report? If true, has an apology been given to any students wrongly excluded from class?
- Answer** (3) Parents, pupils and Head Teachers have resolved this.
- Questions** (4) Has it been made clear to all Head Teachers that students exempt from wearing face coverings must not be discriminated against?
- Answer** (4) Head Teachers were made aware of this on 08.03.2021 and 29.03.2021. A Bite size training was also provided to all staff on face masks / face coverings.

QUESTION NO 11

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 29 April 2021**

Question (1) What are the normal office locations of those responsible for designing Edinburgh Spaces for People schemes?

Answer (1) The lead officers for all of the Spaces for People schemes are based in Edinburgh. All except three schemes were designed in Edinburgh.

Question (2) Are press reports accurate that some schemes were designed by London based individuals?

Answer (2) All the Spaces for People measures have a Council officer with responsibility for developing schemes in line with agreed objectives, providing a design brief to the designers so plans can be produced using computer-aided design and drafting software (AutoCAD). Only three schemes out of 54 had plans produced on AutoCAD by London based designers. These designs were then subject to detailed consideration by Council officers.

Question (3) Did any individuals involved in designing an Edinburgh Spaces for People schemes that were not based within this Council boundary, make site visits to the scheme they were responsible for designing? Please list these schemes.

Answer (3) The designers for the three schemes who are not based in Edinburgh were provided with a design brief including concept design and purpose and did not make site visits to the scheme. However, the lead officer for each scheme is based in Edinburgh and therefore could and did make site visits and remained in constant communication with the designer. The three schemes were: Slateford Road, Greenbank to Meadows and Lanark Road/Inglis Green Road and Longstone Road.

- Questions** (4) Which Spaces for People schemes were designed without the designers making any site visits?
- Answer** (4) See answer 3. However, it is important to stress that the lead officer for the scheme and other officers know these sites well, visited them on many occasions and liaised closely with the designers.
- Supplementary Question** Thank you Lord Provost, I thank the Convener for her answer. Does the Convener think it's coincidence that the three schemes that seem to have raised the greatest level of public anxiety were all schemes designed outside Scotland?
- Supplementary Answer** I'm really dismayed by that question Councillor Campbell. This is attempting to stir a pot which does not need stirred. As I give you the answer in the written answer, in part three of your question, it is quite clear that both the briefing has been given by local officers and others who have detailed local knowledge, it goes in then in the case of 3 out of the 54 schemes that we've done so far of this nature, only 3 have gone out to specialist capacity to reflect the fact that our officers didn't have the capacity to put in these number of schemes properly at this point because of the sheer number of schemes going through. They then came back in and they went through a very careful review process, I'm sorry, you're shaking your head but I presume that means you don't believe me, in which case I'll come back to you writing on it. I really do have some concerns about the way in which our officers work is being portrayed around spaces for people, it came back in, it went through very careful internal review with again localised knowledge being applied to that. This is an entirely normal process when you've got capacity issues, to employ specialist outside help to be getting anywhere in any part of a system in a council where that was required and quite why it's being questioned in the way it is and the way that's been put forward in the public arena in this way I cannot fathom, unless it is just mischief making.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 29 April 2021**

Question (1) What percentage of Edinburgh's public path network has path lighting?

Answer (1) Within the Council's GIS System, the footpath network is measured in kilometres and the street lights are recorded as data points. It is therefore not possible to identify the length of footpath that is lit, without individually checking each section of footpath, which would take some time and would be highly resource intensive.

Question (2) What plans exist to increase this percentage?

Answer (2) Under Section 35 of the Roads (Scotland) Act 1984, a local roads authority shall provide and maintain lighting for roads, or proposed roads, which are, or will be, maintainable by them and which in their opinion ought to be lit. This includes the provision and maintenance of lighting on footpaths.

There are no plans to increase the existing lighting coverage by installing street lighting on roads that are currently adopted by the Council and are unlit. This is in line with one of the three priorities in the Council's Business Plan "becoming sustainable and net zero city".

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

On Thursday 11th March a question was submitted about the feedback and responses from residents and stakeholders to the Queensferry Road/A90 scheme.

The response to part four of the question said “It is hoped that the summary of feedback will [be] circulated by the end of the week.”

Over five weeks later, and having enquired about this with the Convener and officials on 29th March, could the Convener please confirm:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Question | (1) Why this information has not yet been forthcoming? |
| Answer | (1) Due to competing priorities there has been a delay in finalising the assessment feedback form. |
| Question | (2) When the feedback on the scheme will be circulated to councillors, transport spokespeople, and stakeholders? |
| Answer | (2) Officers have committed that the Assessment Feedback Form will be circulated ahead of Full Council on 29 April 2021. |

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Louise Young for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 29 April 2021**

With regard to the number of registrations for a garden waste permit can the following numbers be provided for the last 3 registration periods:

Question (1) What quantity and % of eligible households have registered for a garden waste permit?

Answer (1) At the introduction of the charge in 2018, the garden waste service opened to all residents within Edinburgh. However, before the charge was introduced approximately 124,000 households received a garden waste collection service.

The business case for the introduction of the charge predicted that 46% of these 124,000 households (with an assumption of 1 bin each) would opt-in to the chargeable service.

In 2018/19 (year 1) there were 68,841 households registered for 74,879 bins (60% of original bins).

In 2019/20 (year 2) this rose to 72,133 households registered for 79,496 bins (64% of original bins; and 6% increase from previous year).

In 2020/21 (year 3) this increased further to 74,539 households registered for 82,355 bins (66% of original bins; and 4% increase from previous year).

Question (2) Of that total registrations, how many were renewals and how many were new households?

Answer (2) Of the properties registered for the garden waste service since the charge was introduced:

4% were for year 1 only

3% were for year 2 only

9% were for year 3 only

5% were for year 1 and 2 but not year 3

6% were for year 1 and 3 but not year 2

9% were for year 2 and 3 but not year 1

65% were for all years - 1, 2 and 3

In total, this means around 89% of properties that have registered for the service since the charge was introduced are current year 3 customers.

These figures relate to the property that was registered and not the person registering as it could be a different person in the household (or friend/family member) doing this each year. This means that these figures will not factor in where someone has registered for multiple years but moved to a new house; these would appear as two separate properties.

Question (3) How many / what % of permit holders did not renew?

Answer (3) See response to question 2. On this basis, around 11-12% of properties that have registered for the service since the charge was introduced are not currently registered for the service in year 3.

Question (4) How many complaints have been received from residents who had a permit but missed the renewal period and are now not covered by the service?

Answer (4) Unfortunately, due to processes and the way in which enquiries, requests and complaints are categorised, it is not possible to provide this information.

If a customer has an enquiry that the Council's Contact Centre is able to answer at the first contact, this is done without the enquiry being logged and sent to the service.

When an enquiry or complaint is logged, those relating to enquiries or complaints about missing a registration window; wanting to join the service outside of the registration window (for example, recently moved into Edinburgh); issues with registering; questions about registering/the service; changes to contact details etc are categorised together on the system.

Questions (5) Of those complaints, how many / what % are from senior residents aged 65 or over (or if DOB data not known, but other data available which would indicate senior age)?

Answer (5) The Council does not capture or have access to any data that would indicate someone's age other than if this is stated within the customer's enquiry therefore it is not possible to provide this information.

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question (1) Given we have an SNP led Council Administration can the Convener confirm what plans have been progressed for a standalone GME secondary school in central Edinburgh?

Answer (1) Given we are in the middle of an election we are not in position to clarify if there has been a change in the national strategy. When a new administration is formed in Holyrood we will clarify if there is likely to be a change in the national plan to develop Gaelic which will affect the council's proposal.

Question (2) Does the Convener agree that a central location is necessary?

Answer (2) It should be acknowledged that presently pupils from Taobh na Pairce attend James Gillespies High school which could not be considered to be in 'central Edinburgh'. To my knowledge this has not been seen as a barrier for parents sending their children to Taobh na Pairce. It should also be noted there is a section in the report that outlines how a sustainable travel strategy can be achieved using the Liberton site.

Question (3) Is the Convener aware of the new national strategic approach?

Answer (3) Discussions on the proposed site have taken place over a two-year period. The Scottish Government has been closely involved in these discussions and at no time have they indicated that the plan to site a new dedicated Gaelic secondary school on a shared learning campus at Liberton was against the national strategy for the expansion of Gaelic in Scotland.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thanks Lord Provost, thanks Convener for his answer. In Answer 2 the Convener acknowledged that “presently pupils attend James Gillespie’s High School which could not be considered to be in ‘central Edinburgh’,” yet the Education, Children and Families Committee papers of 24 May 2016 item 7.8 gave the location of James Gillespie’s High School as “central”. What has changed since 2016?

**Supplementary
Answer**

I think my reference to central Edinburgh in Answer 2 was in reference to the manifesto commitment of the SNP and that clearly had central in a much more tight area because they talked about it serving the whole of Lothians therefore if you’re talking about the railway station, the bus station, that type of thing, that’s what I think they meant.

The central bit is not an issue for me because if it's a question of the transport links into a school, and as I say in Answer 2, it's not been a barrier for the present parents to get to Liberton because of the sustainable transport we’ve got, so central for me is not an issue.

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Question

Could the Leader detail what meetings have been had with members of the Hospitality and Retail industries in the city to develop a plan for their recovery and when any plan developed will be shared with Committees and Councillors?

Answer

There have been extensive meetings and discussions with representatives from the Hospitality and Retail sectors in the city, including Business Improvement Districts (BIDs), Traders Associations (old and new), Scottish Hospitality Group and individual businesses. These discussions have been through the Economic Advisory Panel, ETAG's Strategic Implementation Group (both of which cover representatives across FSB, Chamber of Commerce, Essential Edinburgh and other members from the retail sector) and a host of other direct meetings between local businesses and officers as well as myself as Council Leader, The Deputy Leader and Convenor and Vice Convenor of the Housing Homelessness and Fair Work Committee and others. Discussions have been focused on the support available from the Council and some of the actions already implemented include the commitment to simplify the planning application process for outdoor structures and to suspend charges for tables and chairs as well as forward planning with a specific focus on the City Centre.

Some output has already been to Councillors for approval, information and scrutiny, such as the Council's continuing support for the Forever Edinburgh campaign, which is focused on supporting retail and hospitality as well as tourism. The campaign is encouraging all businesses to sign up and become part of 'team Forever Edinburgh'. A business briefing was well-received on 21 April ahead of the relaunch of the campaign which took place on 22 April.

This engagement has been extremely useful and I'm very grateful to businesses for their engagement.

I note Cllr Mowat still refuses to accept that she made comments at October's Council meeting which falsely attributed comments to me in relation to these meetings. As the convener of the committee responsible for Governance within the Council, and as a longstanding councillor who is well aware of the importance of upholding standards of conduct in public office, it is particularly disappointing that Cllr Mowat is yet to withdraw this false and unsubstantiated allegation or to apologise for making the accusation. I would, again, ask Councillor Mowat to withdraw and apologise.

In addition to meetings with businesses as Council leader I also sit on the Scottish Government's National City Centre Task Force along with other City leaders and the Cabinet Secretary to establish a coordinated approach to support the City centre. This is now actively working across 4 cross-cutting themes to support our City centre and major city centres across Scotland. Actions requiring Council approval from that work will come back to Council/Committee, actions under delegated authority will be progressed with urgency.

The revised Economy Strategy, taking account of the engagement and feedback from businesses and business representatives will go to Policy and Sustainability Committee in June.

**Supplementary
Question**

Thank you Lord Provost, I wish there was no supplementary to this and had Councillor McVey responded without paragraph 3 of his answer I would be happy to welcome his answer and thank him for the reassurances he's given which will be very welcome to the businesses that have come to me. However, as he has chosen to raise the issue of October's Council meeting, perhaps he could acknowledge that we did have extensive correspondence post that Council meeting where I explained my unwillingness to name the person who had made the comment at a semi-public meeting because I was concerned that they were extremely upset by the issues, by the state of business in

the city centre and also drew his attention to a press article in the Scotsman of 1 October 2020 and I only have to quote one sentence, “an official announcement from the local authority said it had become clear that the best place to experience Edinburgh's Christmas and Hogmanay will be from home”, which is what I had asked Councillor McVey about whether he said that, the article goes on to quote Councillor McVey extensively so I presume given it was an official statement it had his blessing and he had approved it, so perhaps Councillor McVey can tell me when he will reply to my last correspondence with him on this matter of 17 October 2020 which is outstanding, thank you Lord Provost.

**Supplementary
Answer**

Thank you Lord Provost, obviously didn't say that, obviously didn't say that at a meeting, Councillor Mowat has failed to present any evidence whatsoever that I did, the last correspondence from her was not what I've asked for which is for her to withdraw the false remark and apologise and I think what Councillor Mowat has just displayed is the modus operandi of accountability from the Conservative party, which is none.

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor Mowat for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

The West End of the City Centre has seen two significant interventions on the road network – the introduction of the tram which led to the closure of Shandwick Place and the current proposals for the introduction of the City Centre West to East Link a significant new cycle route across the City Centre. Promised assessments on changes in traffic routes and volumes have not been carried out, nor has the third tram TRO been brought forward which was to have addressed changes in vehicular traffic patterns caused by changes to the road network. With another change to the road network in this area residents are concerned about further impacts which may displace additional traffic onto streets which are almost exclusively residential, and indeed are becoming more so as more properties are converted from business use into residential use.

Question (1) Could the Convener confirm what work was carried out as part of planning for CCWEL on traffic diversions and displacement.

Answer (1) As noted in the Council’s submission to the Public Hearing on the legal orders for the West End section of CCWEL, extensive traffic modelling of the proposed route has been undertaken. The modelling concluded that “a ‘QuietRoutes’ compatible cycle route can be created through the city centre with only minor impacts on buses, trams and general traffic”.

Question (2) What traffic counts have been carried out to enable comparisons to be carried out pre and post CCWEL construction.

Answer

- (2) A number of counts have been carried out to date as part of a package of before and after monitoring looking at a range of impacts of CCWEL. Two separate runs of counts were carried out in 2018. The first focussing on 'The Crescents' between Haymarket Terrace and Palmerston Place at the following junctions:

Magdala Crescent/ Haymarket Terrace
Coates Gardens/ Haymarket Terrace
Roseberry Crescent/ Haymarket Terrace
Grosvenor St/ Haymarket Terrace
Douglas Crescent/ Palmerston Place
Glencairn Crescent/ Palmerston Place
Grosvenor Crescent/ Palmerston Place

The second in order to inform our detailed traffic signals designs at the following locations:

Roseburn Terrace/Russell Road
Haymarket Terrace/Haymarket Yards
Shandwick Place/ Canning St/ Coates Crescent (Atholl Crescent/ Stafford St)
Queensferry Street/ Randolph Place
Charlotte Square/ Rose Street
Charlotte Square/ George Street
Charlotte Square/ Young Street
St Andrew Square/ George Street
Queen Street/ North St David Street
York Place/ North St Andrew Street
St Andrew Square / North St Andrew Street

Finally, in 2020 early autumn counts were carried out at the following locations:

Streets

Ellersley Road
Murrayfield Road
Corstorphine Road
Roseburn Terrace
Coltbridge Terrace
Henderland Road
Roseburn Place
Chester Street

Junctions

Roseburn Street / Russell Road
Magdala Crescent / Haymarket Terrace
Randolph Place / Queensferry Street / Melville Street

Junctions with queue lengths

Murrayfield Avenue / Roseburn Terrace / Corstorphine Road

Roseburn Terrace / Roseburn Street

Haymarket Junction

Charlotte Square / George Street

St Andrew Square / George Street

Question (3) Whether monitoring of traffic displacement has been carried out as part of the planning work.

Answer (3) The counts and modelling that have been carried out will enable an assessment to be made of traffic displacement.

Question (4) Are there plans in place to review the cumulative effects of post tram traffic displacement and CCWEL construction so as to protect the residential environment of the West End – to be taken as the area bounded by Magdala and Douglas Crescent's in the west, Haymarket Terrace to West Maitland Street and Shandwick Place to the south, Queensferry Street to the east and Belford Road from its junction with Douglas Gardens to the north?

Answer (4) During construction of CCWEL there will be a need for localised traffic diversions that may have temporary impacts on residential amenity. As with other construction projects, consideration will be given to any interactions between CCWEL construction and other projects including tram with a view to avoiding excessive impacts.

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Barrie for answer by the Convener of the Regulatory Committee at a meeting of the Council on 29 April 2021

Council notes the recent announcement that permit fees are being waved for outdoor bars in Edinburgh

<https://www.edinburgh.gov.uk/news/article/13144/helping-restaurants-and-cafes-make-the-most-of-outdoor-space-safely-when-restrictions-ease>

Council further notes that Walking Tours are low carbon when compared to motorised sightseeing in the city, are low impact sustainable experiences boosting the wellbeing of visitors, staff teams and residents. Often run by local family business, some are Living Wage employers and CEC rate payers. Council also notes that responsible Walking Tour companies mirror CEC Green City and Fair Work objectives and that their businesses have been just as heavily hit by COVID restrictions as Licensed Premises.

Question (1) What support is being made available by CEC to walking tours to 'get businesses back on their feet' and will their licensing fees be similarly waived or discounted?

Answer (1) The majority of walking tours do not require a licence under the current provisions of the relevant licensing legislation, as either payment is made on-line or the tour is free of charge and relies on tips.

Walking tours are encouraged to engage with and participate in the Forever Edinburgh recovery campaign. They have also had access to similar financial support as other businesses, in particular the discretionary fund in the event that they were ineligible for the Visit Scotland tour guide fund.

If walking tours can evidence income drop as an eligible business, they would also have been eligible for discretionary support funding. We are aware some walking tour guide guides qualified for the tour guide support, which was administered by Visit Scotland, businesses which received this funding would have been ineligible for additional payments through the discretionary support.

Question (2) Will Council consider favourably allowing walking tours to apply for Outdoor Area Occupation Permits to allow them on street visibility to aid their business recovery?

Answer (2) While the Council is taking all possible means to support business recovery, Outdoor Area Occupation Permits are specifically for businesses who want to provide tables and chairs on the pavement and therefore could not be used for the purpose of increasing on-street visibility.

Supplementary Question I thank the Lord Provost and I thank the Convener for her answer. In Answer 2 it states that the Council are taking all possible means to support business recovery, if this is the case, why are some businesses especially those who already paid licencing fees to the council, not being considered for support as part of all possible means where others eg hospitality, are getting support?

Supplementary Answer Thanks Councillor Barrie. As you know the Council's ability to manage this activity is very problematic, but Question 2 that you're referring to lies with the roads department and so I'm happy to pass that on and get the information you want, there's not much more I can add to that to be honest.

Comments by the Lord Provost If that information from the Roads Department can be circulated to all elected members that would be helpful.

Comments by Councillor Fullerton Of course.