

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 26 August 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
Graham J Hutchison

Andrew Johnston
David Key
Callum Laidlaw
Kevin Lang
Lesley Macinnes
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
Lewis Ritchie
Cameron Rose
Neil Ross
Jason Rust
Stephanie Smith
Alex Staniforth
Mandy Watt
Susan Webber
Iain Whyte
Donald Wilson
Norman J Work
Ethan Young
Louise Young

1 Motion by Councillor Osler – Action on Flooding

a) Deputation – Easter Drylaw Drive Residents Group

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Easter Drylaw Residents Group.

The deputation was concerned at the damage the flooding had brought to their properties inside and out which had a major impact on their lives and mental well being. They indicated that in regard to flash flooding it seemed that climate change was also an issue.

The deputation noted that major works had commenced within the Craigleith area due to residents being subjected to similar problems and asked if provision could be made within the Council budget to help in their area which was of a smaller scale than Craigleith.

b) Deputation – EH4 Residents Association

The deputation expressed concern at the summers storms which caused sewage surcharges into their properties and with the high water pressure during those times the water was unable to go back down the drainage pipes. They stressed that water was being forced through manholes in the street and into into internal sinks.

The deputation felt powerless to stop the water from infiltrating their properties and urged the Council to work with Scottish Water to find a solution to the problem which could include soak away tanks.

c) Deputation – Owners and Residents of Queens Court, Blackhall

The deputation indicated that Queens Court had been the subject of immense flooding in recent years following exceptionally heavy rain and thunder showers in the area. These occurrences had happened in recent times in June 2019, August 2020 and more recently in July 2021. On each of these recent occasions the drainage system flowing under the development grounds had been under immense pressure of water, resulting in the drains situated within the development having their lids blown off with the overflow of water and sewerage saturating the grounds and entering the apartments situated on the lower (garden) level and communal areas (ie Residents Lounge and Guest Suite) also sited on that level. The level of resulting contamination from these floods had been significant and caused potential extreme health hazards, requiring action by Scottish Water to decontaminate the grounds on several occasions.

The deputation felt that the Council needed to take full responsibility to ensure that measures were put in place urgently to improve the drainage system flowing through the grounds of Queen's Court to prevent further flooding in the area, and to endorse Councillor Osler's motion regarding action on flooding.

d) Deputation – Eildon Street Residents Association

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Eildon Street Residents Association.

The deputation indicated that they had recently suffered several basement property flooding incidents which had caused severe emotional and financial harm to an increasing number of residents. They felt that in view of the likelihood of more flooding incidents in years to come, the support and involvement of the Council in finding a solution to this traumatic situation would be welcomed.

e) Deputation – Craigleith Flooding

The deputation indicated that in August 2020 three homes had been very badly flooded with water coming in through doors and walls at the front and backs of the houses and in through airbricks and up through the floors. There had been dirty water sitting above skirting board height across the whole ground floor of each of the houses.

The deputation stressed that the impact that this event has had on all three households involved was hard to set out and that the initial shock of seeing the water in their homes, being powerless to do anything to stop or alleviate the damage and not knowing what the ultimate consequences would be, had been distressing.

The deputation felt that their situation justified public investment and assistance.

f) Deputation – Craigleith/Blackhall Community Council

The deputation indicated that the significant amount of rain falling in a short period which had occurred annually over the last 3 years - 2019, 2020, 2021 had led to major disruption, roads impassible for a period, debris left on the road and pavements. For some unfortunate residents their properties were affected. Queensferry Road/Hillhouse Road flooded wall to wall during the recent floods in July 2021 and some residents had been affected by not only rainfall, but also foul sewage mixed with the floodwater

The deputation felt that the Council needed to be more pro-active giving greater priority to maintaining existing infrastructure such as gully drains,

roads and pavements and that it was unrealistic to expect residents to report all blocked gully drains.

They urged the Council to identify problem areas where early action to upgrade the drainage system was required to accommodate increased rainfall and that a more pro-active approach was essential, equal to the priority being given to other Council policies.

g) Deputation – Residents of Egypt Mews

The deputation expressed concern at the number of flooding incidents they had suffered over the last 30 years and particularly on 11/12 August 2020 when floodwater entered homes, caused a car to be written off, and seriously damaged driveways.

The deputation strongly supported the motion asking for adequate funding to support the transition from risk assessment to implementation of risk management for Edinburgh.

The deputation was particularly concerned at the ability of the capacity of existing drainage infrastructure to cope with any additional water load resulting from future developments on the Astley Ainslie Hospital site. While this was a very local issue, they believed similar concerns would apply to other areas in Edinburgh vulnerable to flooding.

h) Deputation – Polwarth Local Residents

A written deputation was presented on behalf of Polwarth Local Residents.

The deputation indicated that there had been repeated flooding to properties in Polwarth Grove for the last 12 years, however, on 11 August 2020 they had suffered the worst flooding so far. Seven properties in Polwarth Grove had been impacted with thousands of pounds of damage to buildings and gardens. Luckily no one was killed or injured.

The deputation indicated that the flooding re-occurred in early July 2021 and felt that the disaster and damage to their houses could have been avoided if the council had properly addressed their repeated requests over recent years to address the underlying problem of insufficient and non-working drains to manage surface water.

The deputation asked the Council for a co-ordinated city-wide approach by the Council, Scottish Water and SEPA via the Edinburgh and Lothians Strategic Drainage Partnership to implement the objectives of the Water Management plan.

i) Deputation – Greenhill Place Residents

The deputation indicated that following the flooding in August, Scottish Water had carried out a survey in their area but the residents were still unaware of the details of the outcome. Nothing had been heard from the City of Edinburgh Council addressing the problem of flooding which they felt had been exacerbated by the gross failure of the Council for a considerable period of time to clear the roadway and gutters of leaves, mud and debris.

The deputation urged the Council to allocate the necessary funds to ensure necessary improvements were made for protection against flooding and there was an appropriate maintenance schedule in place to ensure gutters and drains were kept clear. They asked the Council to liaise with Scottish Water on steps to be taken concerning the sewers to avoid a repeat of flooding which was becoming more frequent.

j) Motion by Councillor Osler

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

“Council notes:

- 1) Notes the torrential rainfall witnessed in July 2021 which resulted in serious localised flooding including areas of Blackhall, Comely Bank, Craigleith, Drylaw, Inverleith, Stockbridge and Warriston.
- 2) Thanks the efforts of Council officers, the emergency services and local residents who worked to support local communities which were affected.
- 3) Notes the Vision for Water Management as approved Transport and Environment Committee in November 2020 which recognised how occurrences of extreme rainfall events will rise as a result of climate change, and that a progress report on the Vision is due later this year.
- 4) Notes the collaborative work with Scottish Water and SEPA to address the complex interaction between surface and wastewater and to develop surface water management plans which identify the most critical areas in this city for flooding.
- 5) Remains concerned that continued pressure on local government funding will mean the Council is unable to make the critical improvements which will be necessary to protect communities from future flooding.

- 6) Therefore agrees that the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee writes to both Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Economy and the Minister for Net Zero, Energy and Transport in order to seek sufficient increased funding to enable the necessary improvements to be made.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Osler.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Lang

Amendment

To add to the motion by Councillor Osler:

- 1) Notes the work between the council, Scottish Water and Scottish Canals in Glasgow to develop a “Smart Canal” partnership to tackle surface water distribution and therefore, in the progress report on the Vision for Water Management, seeks an update from officers on the scope for an analogous partnership with reference to the Union Canal.
- 2) Notes that the arrangements for regional strategic drainage partnership need to be matched by improved partnership arrangements at an operational level so that multi-faceted flooding problems at hotspots can be tackled across a range of public bodies as appropriate, and so seeks an update on work to enable that to happen.

- moved by Councillor Corbett, seconded by Councillor Miller

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Osler:

- 1) To note the torrential rainfall witnessed in July 2021 which resulted in serious localised flooding including areas of Blackhall, Comely Bank, Craigleith, Drylaw, Inverleith, Stockbridge and Warriston.
- 2) To thank the efforts of Council officers, the emergency services and local residents who worked to support local communities which were affected.
- 3) To note the Vision for Water Management as approved Transport and Environment Committee in November 2020 which recognised how

occurrences of extreme rainfall events would rise as a result of climate change, and that a progress report on the Vision was due later this year.

- 4) To note the collaborative work with Scottish Water and SEPA to address the complex interaction between surface and wastewater and to develop surface water management plans which identify the most critical areas in this city for flooding.
- 5) To remain concerned that continued pressure on local government funding would mean the Council was unable to make the critical improvements which would be necessary to protect communities from future flooding.
- 6) To therefore agree that the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee writes to both Cabinet Secretary for Finance and Economy and the Minister for Net Zero, Energy and Transport in order to seek sufficient increased funding to enable the necessary improvements to be made.
- 7) To note the work between the council, Scottish Water and Scottish Canals in Glasgow to develop a “Smart Canal” partnership to tackle surface water distribution and therefore, in the progress report on the Vision for Water Management, seek an update from officers on the scope for an analogous partnership with reference to the Union Canal.
- 8) To note that the arrangements for regional strategic drainage partnership needed to be matched by improved partnership arrangements at an operational level so that multi-faceted flooding problems at hotspots could be tackled across a range of public bodies as appropriate, and so seek an update on work to enable that to happen.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Corbett declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the Council's Canal Champion.

3 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minute of the Council of 24 June 2021 as a correct record.

4 Leader's Report

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

- Updated Covid status – increase in numbers
- Situation in Afghanistan – accommodation for refugees

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | | |
|-------------------------|----|--|
| Councillor Whyte | - | 2022 Controlled parking zones in the City – Consultation outcomes |
| Councillor Miller | -- | Afghanistan refugees – Funding resources for 3 rd sector organisations |
| Councillor Aldridge | - | Afghanistan refugees |
| | -- | Joseph Rowntree report – UK Government cut of Universal Credit |
| Councillor Day | - | Edinburgh welcoming refugees |
| | - | Senior Officer Appointments and appointment of Sharon Graham as Unite leader |
| Councillor Bird | - | 76 expressions of interest for young people to stand in the election for the Scottish Youth Parliament |
| Councillor Webber | - | Wester Hailes Regeneration – pilot programme costs |
| Councillor Burgess | - | Rrecent report on Climate Change – Council led approach |
| Councillor Louise Young | - | Flooding - communications |
| Councillor Cameron | - | Dame Elizabeth Violet Blackadder - condolences |
| Councillor Gordon | - | Climate declaration before COP |
| Councillor Laidlaw | - | Re-branded Spaces for People programme – creation of driveways |
| Councillor Barrie | - | Afghanistan refugees |
| | - | Affordable housing within the city |
| Councillor Booth | - | Short term lets/holiday lets – planning policy on loss of housing |

- Councillor Bruce - School closures – home schooling P1 – P3 – what additional support will be provided to enable pupils to catch up
- Councillor Fullerton - Government decision to cut Universal Credit uplift
- Councillor Munro - UK Government funding for refugees
- Scottish Government funding

5 Elected Member Champion – Older People

The Council had appointed elected member champions for a number of roles but currently there was no champion for older people. The Council had been approached by the national charity Age Scotland and the Scottish Older People’s Assembly (SOPA) to establish an Older People’s Champion.

Motion

- a) To appoint Councillor Fullerton as Older People’s Champion.
- b) To note a review of the role of elected member champions would be carried out with findings and recommendations presented to Council, following the local government elections in 2022.

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

Amendment

To note that a review of the role of elected member champions would be carried out following the local government elections in 2022 and presented to Council with findings and recommendation and agree that Council should consider whether to appoint an elected member champion for older people at that time.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Voting

The voting was as follows:

- For the motion - 42 votes
- For the amendment - 17 votes

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

Henderson, Key, Macinnes, 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 motion by Councillor Fullerton.

(References – Act of Council No 8 of 29 June 2017; report by the Executive Director of Corporate Service, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Corbett declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the Council's Canal Champion

6 Review of Political Management Arrangements

In response to the Covid-19 emergency; specifically, to establish quick and agile decision making, manage the pressure on staff, and prioritise frontline services; interim political management arrangements had been implemented. Arrangements had been reviewed at regular and appropriate points during this period.

Details were provided on proposed meeting arrangements to carry out Council and Committee business going forward.

Motion

- 1) To note that physical meetings of executive committees would re-commence with the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 5 October 2021.
- 2) To agree that meetings of the City of Edinburgh Council would continue to be virtual until the Council removed the physical distancing requirement in its buildings.
- 3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with relevant Conveners and Vice-Conveners, to agree an appropriate time to reinstate physical Other Committees and Sub-Committees (as set out in the Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions) including quasi-judicial meetings, following the successful implementation of physical executive committees.

- 4) To delegate authority to the Proper Officer, in consultation with the relevant Convener, to determine whether a hybrid meeting should revert to being remote only in situations where the numbers of members attending virtually meant that it was impractical to run and support the meeting effectively.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

- 1) To note that physical meetings of executive committees would re-commence with the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 5 October 2021.
- 2) To agree that meetings of the City of Edinburgh Council would continue to be virtual until the Council removed the physical distancing requirement in its buildings.
- 3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with relevant Conveners and Vice-Conveners, to agree an appropriate time to reinstate physical Other Committees and Sub-Committees (as set out in the Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions) including quasi-judicial meetings, following the successful implementation of physical executive committees.
- 4) To delegate authority to the Proper Officer, in consultation with the relevant Convener, to determine whether a hybrid meeting should revert to being remote only in situations where the numbers of members attending virtually meant that it was impractical to run and support the meeting effectively.
- 5) To develop guidance on when hybrid meetings should revert to being remote to ensure consistency in how meetings were held across the Council.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment 2

To ensure that all political parties were represented in discussions on the return of physical meetings, to insert, at paragraph 3 of the motion by Councillor McVey;

“and Group leaders” after “Vice-Conveners”.

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the motion

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor McVey:

- 1) To note that physical meetings of executive committees would re-commence with the Policy and Sustainability Committee on 5 October 2021.
- 2) To agree that meetings of the City of Edinburgh Council would continue to be virtual until the Council removed the physical distancing requirement in its buildings.
- 3) To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with relevant Conveners, Vice-Conveners and Group Leaders, to agree an appropriate time to reinstate physical Other Committees and Sub-Committees (as set out in the Committee Terms of Reference and Delegated Functions) including quasi-judicial meetings, following the successful implementation of physical executive committees.
- 4) To delegate authority to the Proper Officer, in consultation with the relevant Convener, to determine whether a hybrid meeting should revert to being remote only in situations where the numbers of members attending virtually meant that it was impractical to run and support the meeting effectively.
- 5) To develop guidance on when hybrid meetings should revert to being remote to ensure consistency in how meetings were held across the Council.

(Reference – report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, submitted.)

7 The Scheme of Delegation

Details were provided on proposed amendments to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers in relation to the delegated powers to proper officers

Decision

- 1) To repeal the Scheme of Delegation to Officers and approve in its place Appendix one to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, such repeal and approval to take place from 27 August 2021.
- 2) To designate the proper officer functions noted in paragraph 4.3 of the report currently appointed to the Chief Executive to the Service Director, Legal and Assurance from 27 August 2021.

(Reference - report by the Executive Director of Corporate Service, submitted.)

8 Consultation Response to Ethical Standards Commissioner – Strategic Plan 2021-24

Details were provided on the Council's proposed draft response to the Ethical Standards Commissioner's consultation on the Strategic Plan 2021-24.

Decision

- 1) To note an extension period had been agreed with the Acting Ethical Standards Commissioner to allow consideration of the consultation at Council.
- 2) To agree the proposed Council response to the consultation at Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 3) To add to Edinburgh's consultation response:
 - a) To note to date, a perceived failure in the office to effectively and quickly deal with minor complaints and effectively and meaningfully deal with the most serious complaints relating to violence and sexual misconduct have led to a low in confidence in the office and very much hope through reform this can be improved.
 - b) While acknowledging the aspiration to improve effectiveness of the office, notes that these are only set out a fairly high level in the proposed plan. Welcomes further engagement with Council, formally through consultation and directly through continuous engagement, to ensure that confidence can be restored in the operations of the office to ensure that the public, Councillors and their families can be effectively protected.

(Reference: report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, submitted.)

9 Rolling Actions Log

Details were provided on the outstanding actions arising from decisions taken by the Council from May 2015 to June 2021.

Decision

- 1) To agree to close the following Actions:
 - Action 3** - Climate Change Impact and Management - Motion by Councillor Macinnes
 - Action 4** - 1140 Hours Provision of Early Learning and Childcare – Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

Action 5 - Community Councils - Motion by Councillor Rae

Action 7 - Year of Childhood – Motion by Councillor Dickie

Action 8 - CEC Legal Challenge – Motion by Councillor Rose

2) To otherwise note the Rolling Actions Log.

(Reference – Rolling Actions Log, submitted)

10 Report in Relation to a Legal Case

Order of Business - Resolution to consider in private

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

“Council notes that Item 7.5 has been circulated to members with a related confidential Annex with the intention that it be considered as private business.

Council further notes that part of the Annex is the Court Judgement in the case and Court judgements are published as public documents by the Court Service so there is no reason why this should not be published under the ‘A agenda’; Council therefore agrees to do so.

Council also notes that the remainder of the report circulated under a ‘B agenda’ as private relates to potential legal arguments which the Council did not use in the case. As the case has been lost, the Court has ordered release of the document to the Whistleblower and this has been complied with, there is no further value in this legal argument and no reason why the remainder of the report should not be made public.

Council therefore agrees to publish the remainder of the report on the ‘A agenda’ and to consider the matter in public.”

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Decision

To continue consideration of the matter to the next meeting of the Council for further clarification on the private elements of the report at b) on the agenda.

(References – Act of Council No 14 of 24 June 2021: reports (2) by the Service Director: Legal and Assurance and Council Monitoring Officer, submitted.)

11 Treasury Management - Annual Report 2020/21 – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on Treasury Management activity in 2020/21 to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval.

Decision

To approve the Annual Report on Treasury Management for 2020/21.

(References - Finance and Resources Committee of 12 August 2021 (item 11); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

12 Revenue Monitoring 2020/21 – Outturn Report – referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on Revenue Monitoring 2020/21 – outturn report to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of a contribution of up to £21,660 to support the Edinburgh Boundaries Extension and Tramways Act 1920 Centennial commemorations.

Decision

To approve of a contribution of up to £21,660 to support the Edinburgh Boundaries Extension and Tramways Act 1920 Centennial commemorations:

(References – Finance and Resources Committee of 12 August 2021 (item 7); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

13 Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update– referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report on the Strategic Review of Parking – Results of Phase 2 Consultation and General Update to the Council for consideration

Motion

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the report formed the second part of a city-wide strategic review of parking being conducted in 4 different stages and previously approved in 2018.

- 3) To note the degree of consultation and engagement which had taken place and the consultation results for the Phase 2 schemes.
- 4) To request officers undertake further engagement with resident's groups and other local stakeholders, such as community Councils, on the final designs for Phase 2.
- 5) To request an additional report in Autumn 2022 at the latest (including feedback on the implementation on phase 1) to allow Committee to review the designs for the TRO process for Phase 2 schemes following the engagement set out in 4) above and prior to a traffic order being issued. These designs should be consistent with the implementation of the pavement parking ban.
- 6) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 7) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report.
- 8) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report, which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.
- 9) To agree that high quality public engagement during the roll-out of these proposals would be crucial to its success, and therefore call for a comprehensive public engagement programme to be brought forward, in particular focusing on the policy justifications for the extension of the CPZ and the likely knock-on effect of adjacent zones coming into operation.
- 10) To further agree that the roll-out of the extension of the CPZ could be used as an opportunity to encourage vehicle owners to consider more sustainable transport options, and therefore to agree to investigate the potential to collaborate with public transport operators, the City Car Club and active travel organisations to provide information and incentives to residents to choose more sustainable travel options at the point of CPZ extension

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To note that the Council had traditionally only introduced new parking restrictions in areas where there was significant support amongst residents for such restrictions.

- 3) Consider that the results of the consultation for phase 2 showed a significant majority of respondents were opposed to these plans and therefore conclude that there was not sufficient public demand for their implementation.
- 4) To believe that further consultation and delaying a decision until next year needlessly drew out the process when residents had already made their views clear.
- 5) To therefore, agree not to proceed with the implementation of parking controls in the Phase 2 area.
- 6) To ask that officers now progress with the stadium review as a priority in order to address long-standing concerns regarding the significant impact large events had on parking in the vicinity of stadiums.

- moved by Councillor Hutchison, seconded by Councillor Douglas

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) Having considered the consultation results, the policy justification behind the measures proposed by the Strategic Review of Parking, and the potential for parking migration between areas, to approve commencement of the legal process to introduce parking controls into all areas covered by the Phase 2 proposals.
- 3) To note the operational details for the proposed parking controls for the Phase 2 area, as detailed in Appendix 3 to the report.
- 4) To note the recommended changes arising from the consultation process to the proposed designs as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.
- 5) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 6) To approve the setting of charges related to permits and pay-and-display as detailed in Appendix 4 to the report.
- 7) To note the details in Appendix 5 to the report which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021;
- 8) To agree that high quality public engagement during the roll-out of these proposals would be crucial to its success, and therefore call for a comprehensive public engagement programme to be brought forward, in

particular focusing on the policy justifications for the extension of the CPZ and the likely knock-on effect of adjacent zones coming into operation.

- 9) To further agree that the roll-out of the extension of the CPZ could be used as an opportunity to encourage vehicle owners to consider more sustainable transport options, and therefore to agree to investigate the potential to collaborate with public transport operators, the City Car Club and active travel organisations to provide information and incentives to residents to choose more sustainable travel options at the point of CPZ extension.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Corbett

Amendment 3

- 1) To note the results of the informal consultation for the Phase 2 area as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 2) To respect the clear views expressed during the consultation, regret that it failed to offer residents the option of more nuanced local solution to parking pressures, and agree not to proceed with the legal process to introduce parking controls into the areas covered by the phase 2 proposals.
- 3) To note the intention to further defer consideration of the Stadiums Review, as detailed in the report.
- 4) To note the details in appendix 5 to the report, which outlined the progress made since the previous report in January 2021.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Gloyer

Voting

First Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	27 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes
For Amendment 2	-	8 votes
For Amendment 3	-	8 votes

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

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

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

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

There being no overall majority, and having 3 votes for Amendment 2 and 3 votes for Amendment 3, the Lord Provost gave his casting vote for Amendment 2, therefore Amendment 3 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion and Amendments 1 and 2.

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	27 votes
For Amendment 1	-	25 votes
For Amendment 2	-	8 votes

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

For Amendment 1: 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 2: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Mary Campbell, Corbett, Graczyk, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.)

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

Third Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	35 votes
For Amendment 1	-	25 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

(References - Transport and Environment of 19 August 2021; referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillors Bird, Gardiner, Gordon, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Mowat, Munn and Whyte declared a non-financial interest in the above item as residents of one of the areas affected by the proposed changes.

14 Reform of Transport Arm's Length External Organisations— referral from the Transport and Environment Committee

The Transport and Environment Committee had referred a report on the reform of Transport Arm's Length External Organisations to the City of Edinburgh Council for consideration.

Motion

- 1) To note the considerations of the short life working group, including the options for reform.
- 2) To agree to progress with the reforms to the Transport Arm's Length External Organisation (ALEO) structure, as set out in paragraphs 4.20 – 4.25 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.
- 3) To request updates as implementation moved forward.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 1

- 1) To consider that the report was not clear on how the proposed new structure would deliver on the stated principles.
- 2) To note that the rolling of transport ALEOs into Lothian Buses appeared to be a backward step and was not consistent with the Council's recent approach to transport ALEOs.
- 3) To note the considerations of the short life working group, including the options for reform.
- 4) To therefore instruct officers to recommence the process of examining Report of Transport Arm's Length External Organisations with proposals for a more representative working group and terms of reference to be brought to the Transport and Environment Committee in a report in one cycle, and with a clearer and more substantive report with recommendations to be brought to the Transport and Environment Committee in four cycles.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Amendment 2

- 1) To note the considerations of the short life working group, including the options for reform.
- 2) To agree not to progress with the reforms to the Transport Arm's Length External Organisation (ALEO) structure, as set out in paragraphs 4.20 – 4.25 of the report by the Executive Director of Place.;

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Neil Ross

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	36 votes
For Amendment 1	-	17 votes
For Amendment 2	-	6 votes

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

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

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

(References: Transport and Environment of 19 August 2021; referral from the Transport and Environment Committee, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Bridgman declared a non-financial interest in the above item as the wife of a bus driver and took no part in consideration of this item.

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

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

15 Drainage – Motion by Councillor Mowat

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

“Council:

Council notes that motions from Councillors in August 2020 and August 2013 have asked officers to engage with Scottish Water and then report back as to how flooding in the event of heavy rainfall can be mitigated. Is concerned that after flooding in similar areas of the city which have, in some cases, affected the same homes and businesses.

Further notes that a ‘Vision for Water Management’ was reported to the Transport and Environment Committee in November 2020. While accepting this is a useful vision statement, considers that Council needs to be better informed of the issues around flooding events in Edinburgh to enable Members to respond to the concerns of residents and businesses, and better represent those interests in Council decision making and with other organisations.

Therefore, calls for in 1 cycle:

A report of engagement activity with Scottish Water detailing how the following challenges are being addressed:

Separation of foul water from wastewater:

The survey of the drainage/sewerage system to ascertain where there are blockages, slow draining gullies and to detail what works needs to be done to reduce slow running drains and blocked gullies which lead to localised flooding during spells of heavy rain as agreed in the motion of 2013.

Capacity issues with both the sewerage and drainage system and how this is being addressed.

Road surface design appropriate for intense rainfall events, including camber angles and gully placement and the intelligent use of adjacent surfaces to attenuate flooding and mitigate the risk to property.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mowat.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Webber

Amendment

To delete:

“Therefore, calls for a report in one cycle: A report of engagement with Scottish Water detailing how the following challenges are being addressed” in the motion by Councillor Mowat:

And replace with:

“Therefore, calls for a report by January to the Transport and Environment Committee, requesting that Scottish Water provide information alongside input and information from Council officers detailing how the following challenges are being addressed.”

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mowat:

- 1) To note that motions from Councillors in August 2020 and August 2013 had asked officers to engage with Scottish Water and then report back as to how flooding in the event of heavy rainfall could be mitigated. Was concerned that after flooding in similar areas of the city which had, in some cases, affected the same homes and businesses.
- 2) To further note that a 'Vision for Water Management' was reported to the Transport and Environment Committee in November 2020. While accepting this was a useful vision statement, consider that Council needed to be better informed of the issues around flooding events in Edinburgh to enable Members to respond to the concerns of residents and businesses, and better represent those interests in Council decision making and with other organisations.
- 3) To therefore, call for a report by January to the Transport and Environment Committee, requesting that Scottish Water provide information alongside input and information from Council officers detailing how the following challenges are being addressed:

Separation of foul water from wastewater:

The survey of the drainage/sewerage system to ascertain where there were blockages, slow draining gullies and to detail what works needed to be done to reduce slow running drains and blocked gullies which lead to localised flooding during spells of heavy rain as agreed in the motion of 2013.

Capacity issues with both the sewerage and drainage system and how this was being addressed.

Road surface design appropriate for intense rainfall events, including camber angles and gully placement and the intelligent use of adjacent surfaces to attenuate flooding and mitigate the risk to property.

16 Creating a Safer First and Last Mile Journey for Women and Girls – Motion by Councillor Osler

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

“Council:

- acknowledges the importance of ensuring women and girls can travel safely in Edinburgh including through our open spaces,
- recognises ‘Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces’ is one of the core partnership initiatives in action used by UN Women (of the United Nations) to achieve its 2018 – 2021 strategic plan objective of more cities and other settings having safe and empowering public spaces for women and girls,
- notes Atkins’ ‘Get Home Safe’ which calls on transport planners and urban designers to take action to create safer first and last mile journeys for women, and recommends: improving visibility through low to the ground planting and vegetation and removal of walls and barriers; active building frontages to provide ‘eyes on the street’; and providing emergency contact and digital wayfinding apps, and
- calls for a report to be submitted to Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles on the benefits of adopting such recommendations and on how safety for women should be improved, notably in our parks and open spaces.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Osler.

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Gloyer

Amendment 1

To delete the last paragraph of Councillor Osler’s motion and replace with:

“Council welcomes the motion by Councillor Osler and asks that it be included in the remit of Councillor Watt’s motion: Women’s Safety in Public Places, which was agreed by Council on 29 April 2021. Councillor Watt’s motion asked for a report to Policy and Sustainability Committee within two cycles. This amendment would extend that by two cycles to acknowledge the scope of the work that is being undertaken.”

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

Amendment 2

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

“Notes that violence against women and girls is ultimately caused by perpetrators, and that the responsibility for violence therefore lies with those perpetrators, however recognises that in this context Council can and should take action to make spaces safer whilst working towards an end to violence against women and girls.”

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Rae

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Osler:

- 1) To acknowledge the importance of ensuring women and girls can travel safely in Edinburgh including through our open spaces.
- 2) To recognise ‘Safe Cities and Safe Public Spaces’ was one of the core partnership initiatives in action used by UN Women (of the United Nations) to achieve its 2018 – 2021 strategic plan objective of more cities and other settings having safe and empowering public spaces for women and girls.
- 3) To note Atkins’ ‘Get Home Safe’ which called on transport planners and urban designers to take action to create safer first and last mile journeys for women, and recommended: improving visibility through low to the ground planting and vegetation and removal of walls and barriers; active building frontages to provide ‘eyes on the street’; and providing emergency contact and digital wayfinding apps.
- 4) To welcome the motion by Councillor Osler and ask that it be included in the remit of Councillor Watt’s motion: Women’s Safety in Public Places, which was agreed by Council on 29 April 2021. Councillor Watt’s motion asked for a report to Policy and Sustainability Committee within two cycles. This amendment would extend that by two cycles to acknowledge the scope of the work that is being undertaken.
- 5) To note that violence against women and girls was ultimately caused by perpetrators, and that the responsibility for violence therefore lay with those perpetrators, however to recognise that in this context Council could and should take action to make spaces safer whilst working towards an end to violence against women and girls..

17 Enterprise Car Club - Motion by Councillor Neil Ross

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the recognition within the City Mobility Plan on the importance of the city car club scheme towards meeting the Council’s transport goals, and the commitment within the plan to strengthen partnerships with car sharing partners.
- 2) Agrees that the car club scheme has an important role in addressing congestion and on-street parking capacity by encouraging shared car usage and a reduction in private car ownership.
- 3) Notes that while the Council’s website hosts a map of car club locations and a link to the Enterprise Car Club website, it does not provide a clear process for people to suggest or request new car club locations.
- 4) Agrees that officers should follow the example of the Cyclehoop scheme, where residents are able to suggest new locations, and create a system to allow residents to suggest new sites for car club spaces.
- 5) Requests that such a system be put in place and reported to the Transport and Environment Committee within two cycles.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Neil Ross.

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross seconded by Councillor Osler

Amendment

To delete points 4 and 5 of the motion by Councillor Neil Ross and replace with:

- 4) To note the contract with Enterprise Car Club was to be extended for a further 12 months and that discussions were exploring how to better facilitate requests for new Car Club locations from customers, residents’ and businesses across the city. These discussions included improving visibility and access to forms to request additional local provision and continuing discussions between the Council and Enterprise to effectively facilitate installation of additional local provision. To request that the improvements agreed in the contract extension be reported to the Transport and Environment Committee upon agreement.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Neil Ross:

- 1) To note the recognition within the City Mobility Plan on the importance of the city car club scheme towards meeting the Council's transport goals, and the commitment within the plan to strengthen partnerships with car sharing partners.
- 2) To agree that the car club scheme had an important role in addressing congestion and on-street parking capacity by encouraging shared car usage and a reduction in private car ownership.
- 3) To note that while the Council's website hosted a map of car club locations and a link to the Enterprise Car Club website, it did not provide a clear process for people to suggest or request new car club locations.
- 4) To agree that officers should follow the example of the Cyclehoop scheme, where residents were able to suggest new locations, and create a system to allow residents to suggest new sites for car club spaces.
- 5) To note the contract with Enterprise Car Club was to be extended for a further 12 months and that discussions were exploring how to better facilitate requests for new Car Club locations from customers, residents' and businesses across the city. These discussions included improving visibility and access to forms to request additional local provision and continuing discussions between the Council and Enterprise to effectively facilitate installation of additional local provision. To request that the improvements agreed in the contract extension be reported to the Transport and Environment Committee upon agreement.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Aldridge declared a non-financial interest in the above item as a member of the Enterprise Car Club.

18 Goldenacre Steps - Motion by Councillor Mitchell

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that the Goldenacre Steps form part of the adopted network under ‘City Development’.
- 2) Acknowledges that the ‘City Development’ account is now obsolete, requires to be updated and officially transferred to an existing department and team.
- 3) Therefore agrees that the Executive Director of Place shall prepare a report for the next meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee which will include:
 - a) A list of the existing adopted network remaining under ‘City Development’.
 - b) A transfer of the remaining ‘City Development’ network to appropriate department teams.
 - c) Any referrals of the report to appropriate committees.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mitchell.

- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment

To delete point 3 of the motion by Councillor Mitchell and replace with:

- 3) Therefore agrees that the Director of Place shall resolve any outstanding issues preventing the effective repair and maintenance of the Goldenacre Steps and any other affected areas and updates the Transport and Environment Committee of this resolution in the business bulletin within one cycle.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Mitchell:

- 1) To note that the Goldenacre Steps formed part of the adopted network under 'City Development'.
- 2) To acknowledge that the 'City Development' account was now obsolete, required to be updated and officially transferred to an existing department and team.
- 3) To therefore agree that the Director of Place should resolve any outstanding issues preventing the effective repair and maintenance of the Goldenacre Steps and any other affected areas and update the Transport and Environment Committee of this resolution in the business bulletin within one cycle.

17 Platinum Jubilee Holiday – June 2022 - Motion by Councillor Laidlaw

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that to celebrate HM The Queen’s Platinum Jubilee the UK government has announced a special four-day bank holiday weekend to include Thursday 2nd June and Friday 3rd June 2022.
- 2) Recognises the momentous occasion of Her Majesty celebrating 70 years of serving her country and Commonwealth and that this will be the first time any British monarch has celebrated a platinum jubilee.
- 3) Notes the four days will include special celebrations and festivities including public and community events.
- 4) Recognises that Edinburgh, as Scotland’s capital and the site of Her Majesty’s official residence in Scotland, will play a key part in these celebrations.
- 5) Notes that currently City of Edinburgh Council offices and libraries are scheduled to be open on existing May public holidays in 2022.
- 6) Notes City of Edinburgh schools are scheduled to be closed on Victoria Day on Monday 23 May 2022.

- 7) Acknowledges that additional public holidays are a fitting reward for the hard-work our employees have undertaken during the pandemic.
- 8) Approves a one-off closure of Council offices and libraries 2 nd and 3rd June 2022 and a two-day holiday for all Council staff; taken in lieu for those who provide essential services over the jubilee holiday weekend.
- 9) Approves closure of schools on 2nd and 3rd June to allow pupils to join their parents in enjoying the celebrations, in lieu of the Victoria Day holiday.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Laidlaw.

- moved by Councillor Laidlaw seconded by Councillor Rust

Amendment

To delete paragraphs 8 and 9 of the motion by Councillor Laidlaw and replace with:

- 8) Requests a report to Council in one cycle benchmarking through SOLACE against other authorities and making a recommendation on the way forward for the City of Edinburgh Council’s hardworking dedicated colleagues.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

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 Laidlaw:

- 1) To note that to celebrate HM The Queen’s Platinum Jubilee the UK government had announced a special four-day bank holiday weekend to include Thursday 2nd June and Friday 3rd June 2022.
- 2) To recognise the momentous occasion of Her Majesty celebrating 70 years of serving her country and Commonwealth and that this would be the first time any British monarch had celebrated a platinum jubilee.
- 3) To note the four days would include special celebrations and festivities including public and community events.
- 4) To recognise that Edinburgh, as Scotland’s capital and the site of Her Majesty’s official residence in Scotland, would play a key part in these celebrations.

- 5) To note that currently City of Edinburgh Council offices and libraries were scheduled to be open on existing May public holidays in 2022.
- 6) To note City of Edinburgh schools were scheduled to be closed on Victoria Day on Monday 23 May 2022.
- 7) To acknowledge that additional public holidays were a fitting reward for the hard-work our employees have undertaken during the pandemic.
- 8) To request a report to Council in one cycle benchmarking through SOLACE against other authorities and making a recommendation on the way forward for the City of Edinburgh Council's hardworking dedicated colleagues.

18 Council Condemns Homophobic Attack - Motion by Councillor Staniforth

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

- "1) Council condemns the homophobic attack that occurred on Leith Street on the evening of Friday 27th July.
- 2) Council reaffirms that Edinburgh Council will work to ensure that Edinburgh is an inclusive city in which all people feel safe regardless of their sexuality, gender identity, race or any other protected characteristic.
- 3) Council affirms that as the city opens up and comes out of Covid regulations everyone has a right to enjoy those freedoms without fear of harassment or assault."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Rae

Amendment

To add to the motion by Councillor Staniforth:

- 4) Council is proud of LGBT+ community and their positive contribution to society and the economy in Edinburgh and notes the ongoing work with LGBT and other partners to promote LGBT community in our Capital city.

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Staniforth:

- 1) To condemn the homophobic attack that occurred on Leith Street on the evening of Friday 27th July.
- 2) To reaffirm that Edinburgh Council would work to ensure that Edinburgh was an inclusive city in which all people felt safe regardless of their sexuality, gender identity, race or any other protected characteristic.
- 3) To affirm that as the city opened up and came out of Covid regulations everyone had a right to enjoy those freedoms without fear of harassment or assault.
- 4) Council was proud of LGBT+ community and their positive contribution to society and the economy in Edinburgh and to note the ongoing work with LGBT and other partners to promote LGBT community in our Capital city.

19 Fossil Fuel Non Proliferation Treaty - Motion by Councillor Burgess

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

“This Council;

- 1) Notes that the recent report from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), has been described as ‘a code red for humanity’ by the Secretary General of the United Nations;
- 2) Notes the latest IPCC report reaffirms the vital need for rapid and significant reduction of climate-changing pollution;
- 3) Notes that the UN Paris Climate Agreement is largely silent with respect to the supply and production of fossil fuels - coal, oil and gas – the largest source of climatechanging pollution;
- 4) Notes that global governments and the fossil fuel industry are currently planning to produce an estimated 120% more emissions by 2030 than what is needed to limit warming to 1.5°C and avert catastrophic climate disruption, and that this risks undermining global efforts to reduce climatechanging pollution;

- 5) Notes that the economic opportunities presented by a clean energy transition far outweigh the opportunities presented by an economy supported by expanding fossil fuel use and extraction;
- 6) Believes that Scotland should be committed, as part of our Climate Emergency response, to a just energy transition and to ambitious investments in green infrastructure and industries that will create jobs and rapidly decarbonize our economy;
- 7) Recognises the global initiative underway calling for a ‘Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty’ aimed at ending new fossil fuel exploration and expansion, phasing out existing production in line with the global commitment to limit warming to 1.5°C, and accelerating equitable transition plans;
- 8) Notes that other leading cities including Barcelona, Toronto, Los Angeles and Sydney have endorsed the call for a Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty;
- 9) Therefore endorses the call for a Fossil Fuel NonProliferation Treaty and urges the Scottish Government to support this initiative.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

- moved by Coucillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 1

To delete paragraph 9 of the motion by Councillor Burgess and replace with:

- 9) Calls for a report in two cycles to the Policy and Sustainability Committee setting out the Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation for the City of Edinburgh Council.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

To take no action on the motion by Councillor Burgess.

- moved by Councillor McLellan, seconded by Councillor Rose

In accordance with Standing Order 21(12), the amendment was accepted as an amendment to the motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion (as adjusted) - 41 votes
For Amendment 2 - 17 votes

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

For Amendment 2: 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 Burgess:

- 1) To note that the recent report from the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), had been described as ‘a code red for humanity’ by the Secretary General of the United Nations.
- 2) To note the latest IPCC report reaffirmed the vital need for rapid and significant reduction of climate-changing pollution.
- 3) To note that the UN Paris Climate Agreement was largely silent with respect to the supply and production of fossil fuels - coal, oil and gas – the largest source of climatechanging pollution.
- 4) To note that global governments and the fossil fuel industry were currently planning to produce an estimated 120% more emissions by 2030 than what was needed to limit warming to 1.5°C and avert catastrophic climate disruption, and that this risked undermining global efforts to reduce climatechanging pollution.
- 5) To note that the economic opportunities presented by a clean energy transition far outweighed the opportunities presented by an economy supported by expanding fossil fuel use and extraction.
- 6) To believe that Scotland should be committed, as part of our Climate Emergency response, to a just energy transition and to ambitious investments in green infrastructure and industries that would create jobs and rapidly decarbonize the economy.
- 7) To recognise the global initiative underway calling for a ‘Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty’ aimed at ending new fossil fuel exploration and

expansion, phasing out existing production in line with the global commitment to limit warming to 1.5°C, and accelerating equitable transition plans.

- 8) To note that other leading cities including Barcelona, Toronto, Los Angeles and Sydney had endorsed the call for a Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation Treaty.
- 9) To call for a report in two cycles to the Policy and Sustainability Committee setting out the Fossil Fuel Non-Proliferation for the City of Edinburgh Council.

20 Welcoming Afghanistan Refugees - Motion by Councillor McVey

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

The following motion by Councillor McVey was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17, and verbally altered in terms of Standing Order 22.5:

“Notes that unfolding events in Afghanistan since the US, UK and other nations’ substantive withdrawal have been shocking to witness and that the whole of the UK bears a moral responsibility for dealing with the consequences. Notes efforts of residual personnel still in Kabul to support evacuation of some of those at risk.

Supports the people of Afghanistan in enjoying the liberties previously protected by allied forces and the right to independence of thought, to vote and for women and girls to be educated and play a full part in the work and life of their country- as well as the right to life for at risk groups, such as LGBT Afghans.

Acknowledges that many UK veterans who served in Afghanistan will find the deteriorating security situation extremely difficult and lead them to question the sacrifices they and their colleagues have made and requests the Lord Provost, as Veterans’ Champion, continues to engage with local armed forces.

Agrees that Edinburgh must embrace its responsibility to welcome those fleeing persecution and empower these people to reach their full potential when they arrive. This includes providing good quality immediate temporary accommodation and welcoming Afghan refugees for permanent resettlement in the Capital. Agrees to explore all avenues to secure appropriate accommodation, without putting pressure on existing demand for social homes, such as exploring using short term let properties, to maximise local provision.

Notes ongoing discussions between the Council and the UK Government on arrangements to host a number of Afghan refugees who were locally employed staff as well as ongoing discussions on welcoming further Afghan refugees. Further notes

these discussions will include other third/voluntary sector and Trade Unions to support and welcome refugees along with the continuing dialogue with the Scottish Government of levels of support they can also contribute. Agrees this includes full access to local services and should also include access to support finding employment, without restrictions on ability to work.

Agrees the Council Leader writes to the UK Government to add Edinburgh's voice to calls to increase the number of Afghan refugees, who are not formerly locally employed staff, beyond the 20,000 already committed over 5 years.

Notes the funding arrangements for the formerly locally employed staff and agrees the Council leader and officers continue dialogue with UK Minsters and officials to ensure support is fully funded by the UK Government and delegates to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader and Deputy Leader, to approve any such other costs arising not covered by UK Government funding, or existing budgets, up to £500,000 from the unallocated general reserve.

Notes current arrangements of UK Government funding for formerly employed staff is able to cover private rented property rates and agrees the Council leader and officers communicate directly the need for the same level of support for all refugees being welcomed and resettled in the City.

Notes the very generous offers of direct support from the people of Edinburgh and agrees that Edinburgh should play its part in welcoming of Afghan refugees: both in terms of the need to find immediate temporary accommodation and welcoming Afghan refugees for permanent resettlement in the Capital.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

21 The Edinburgh Festival Voluntary Guides Association 75th Anniversary - Motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan

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

“Council notes:

The roots of the Edinburgh Festival Voluntary Guides Association go back to 1947. That was when Sir John Falconer, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh and the driving force behind the first Edinburgh Festival, appealed for local people to volunteer to run walking tours of the Royal Mile for the many visitors that were expected to attend the Festival. Twelve volunteers stepped forward. The tours, which were advertised in the Festival's official Souvenir Programme, attracted large numbers of visitors and received favourable mentions in the press.

Further volunteers were recruited for the 1948 Festival, at which point the group was officially constituted as the Edinburgh Festival Voluntary Guides Association, with John Bowman, a former City Water Engineer, serving as its first president. In 1998, in order to increase their public profile, they became officially part of the Edinburgh Festival Fringe rather than the International Festival. They have been running tours as part of the International Festival and the Festival Fringe ever since.

Since 2003, the Association has been entirely self-supporting. They receive no public funding of any kind but are, instead, financed by donations and by the charges they make for custom tours outside the Festival season.

In 2013, they were obliged to move their base out of Cannonball House - after 67 years. Thanks to the support of the City of Edinburgh Council, they now use the City Chambers as their meeting point.

In 2019, the Association became part of the Edinburgh's Open Streets project, in which most of the Royal Mile and other streets in the Old Town are closed to traffic – and therefore open to visitors on foot - on one Sunday afternoon each month. These afternoons have provided them with an excellent opportunity to run their tours in a traffic-free environment.

In acknowledging the positive work of the Edinburgh Festival Voluntary Guides Association, Council requests that the Lord Provost, who is the patron of the Association, marks their 75th Anniversary in an appropriate way.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McNeese-Mechan.

22 Great British Sewing Bee Winner – Motion by Councillor Rae

The following motion by Councillor Rae was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17, and verbally altered in terms of Standing Order 22.5:

“Council is delighted to recognise and congratulate Ms Serena Baker, the Glasgow born Edinburgh medical student, currently in her fourth year of study, who took time out from nurturing patients to nurture our hearts and minds by winning The Great British Sewing Bee 2021.

Her skill, precision, dexterity and creativity together with her warmth and personality revealed her to be an enormous credit to both cities, and her country, but more importantly, in a time of crisis, to the NHS which we are all incredibly thankful for.

With links to both Glasgow and Edinburgh, Serena became the third winner of iconic programmes this year, following Edinburgh student Peter Sawkins Great British Bake-off win and Glasgow’s Laurence Chaney who took the RuPaul’s Drag Race crown, ensuring a clean sweep for Scotland.

Council asks that Serena be officially congratulated by the Lord Provost, and that she and her family be invited to celebrate with us at a suitable event in the future when such events resume.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rae.

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Rae.

23 Questions

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

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 23 of 26 August 2021)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Munro for answer by the Chair of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) When will the EHSCP provide fully costed plans that detail how the care services proposed to replace the loss of residential beds in Edinburgh are workable and affordable?

Answer (1) The business case that we provide to the EIJB sets this out in the financial and workforce planning elements. The financial model includes an allowance for reinvestment in community services and enhancement of current staffing models in our remaining care homes. If the proposals are approved, they will be implemented in a phased approach with set evaluation points to ensure there are no unintended consequences. The bed based care project is one project in a wide scale Transformation programme that aims to revolutionise the way health and social care is provided in Edinburgh in a system wide approach. A number of different projects are underway, contributing to a system wide redesign that will enable the EIJB to shift the balance of care from acute settings into the community, increase community capacity and support people to remain at home.

Question (2) Will these plans include local provision within a city wide context?

Answer (2) Yes, as detailed above there are a number of change projects underway that will, where possible, deliver health and social care services in, or as close to people's homes as possible. The proposals presented to the EIJB will increase intermediate care capacity with facilities located in the north and south of the city. Ultimately it will reduce our HBCCC capacity to be delivered in one facility in the north of the city and will reduce the number of care home beds across the city but, our managed care homes will be in both the north and south of the city. Through delivery of more community based services people will only need to access bed based services when there is no alternative.

Question (3) Will these alternate services replicate the 24 hour care currently provided by staff within Council Care Home provision and can we expect to see an increase in the use of external providers?

Answer (3) The plan sets out that the Bed Based Review is to ensure a modernisation of care provision and that we have the right kind of bed based services. Currently there are too many residential beds and not enough facilities in which to deliver more intensive support and nursing care. In terms of an increase in external care home provision, the balance of this won't change.

As before, there are a range of change activities underway that will increase community capacity, enabling us to deliver health and social care as close to people's homes as possible. Through our modernisation and system wide redesign of services we can provide care, support and choice to our citizens in the most appropriate environment to meet their needs and improve their outcomes.

QUESTION NO 2

**By Councillor Munro for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question

Before any closures or changeovers are implemented will there be a meaningful public consultation, with comments invited from all interested parties, but particularly from residents and their families and those others that are impacted?

Answer

In the progress report submitted for the August EIJB meeting, details on the public consultation process have been provided. Consultation activity will be focussed on the wider bed based strategy and a new model of care to meet the needs of the city's residents. We are currently seeking advice on how to approach the public consultation, once received we will progress as advised.

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Munro for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

- Question** (1) As it was known as far back as 2009 that Clovenstone, Ferrylee, Ford's Road and Jewel House had been deemed not fit for purpose by the Care Inspectorate why was the £15m set aside for the building of a 60 bed care home cut from the budget in February 2021?
- Answer** (1) The four older care homes mentioned above are approaching their life expectancy, do not conform to design standards advised by the Care Inspectorate and are not deemed suitable to provide the kind of care required to meet future demand. Capital investment was allocated to the construction of a new facility. However, due to the current fiscal position this amount was reduced by the Council to £2m.
- Question** (2) The deletion of the replacement £15m for a 60 bed care home from the Capital budget strategy refers to a requirement to develop a business case "to identify a partially self-funding model to deliver this new facility, requiring a balance of £2 million". Where is this proposal, is it still to be actioned and can detail be provided?
- Answer** (2) The EIJB's Chief Officer and management team are working closely with officers from the Council and NHS Lothian in respect of future capital requirements.

QUESTION NO 4

**By Councillor Munro for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question (1) Can improvements be carried out in the Care Homes which would satisfy the report recommendations to make them fit for purpose?

Answer (1) No, from the property assessment completed in 2019 and from previous assessments it was determined that it would not be value for money to refurbish, alter or extend these older properties to meet current minimum standards.

Question (2) What is the cost or estimated cost involved?

Answer (2) Further to the answer provided above, the property assessment suggested it would be even more costly to meet the City of Edinburgh Council's own design and quality criteria and therefore would not be viable.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Munro for answer by
the Chair of the Edinburgh
Integration Joint Board at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question (1) If City of Edinburgh Council intend on closing 4 care homes, where is the sense in handing over a fully functioning 60 bed residential care home for a different use by another organisation when demand for placements says otherwise?

Answer (1) The IJB is commissioning care differently and the focus of the Bed Based Review is having the right sort of care and support in the right place to meet the needs of citizens' and improve outcomes. We have too many residential care home beds, the current demand indicates that those who need care home placements have greater needs than we can provide in residential accommodation. We do not have enough intermediate care capacity and we also need to reduce and consolidate the number of HBCCC beds we have across the city. The Bed Based strategy sets out why the IJB is proposing the use of Drumbrae in this way and also why we are strengthening the model of care and support we are commissioning in the remaining care homes. The purpose of Integration is that the resources delegated to the IJB are utilised in an integrated way and it's important that the plans are seen, not as being NHS or Council but as the right integrated approach to meet the population's needs.

Question (2) When City of Edinburgh Council has paid the NHS £16 million for the purchase of Liberton Hospital, why is there no similar financial recompense from the NHS to the Council for the proposed handover over of Drumbrae?

Answer (2) See Answer 1.

Question (3) If money has changed hands, why is not being used for the build of a replacement care home?

Answer (3) Not for the IJB to answer, this question would have to be directed to NHS Lothian.

- Question** (4) When did referrals to Drumbrae halt and where, when and who took this decision taken?
- Answer** (4) From December 2019, Drumbrae Care Home has been subject to an Improvement notice from the Care Inspectorate which halted all admissions until progress was made to meet the improvements. This initially ran to February 2020 and then was extended until July 2020. The large scale investigation process continued throughout 2020 to ensure improvements were maintained. Also, due to the pandemic situation, care homes were closed to admissions if there were any positive cases. Throughout 2020/21, the Bed Based Review was ongoing and we deemed it morally unacceptable to admit into the care homes where the future of the home is under discussion.

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) What is the current status of the review of the city's bus network, as set out on page 26 of the approved City Mobility Plan?

Answer (1) The review of the city's bus network is currently at a very early stage and will need to take account of some key priorities including understanding the scale of patronage recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic; the introduction of the Bus Partnership Fund; and planned growth across the city region. This is also a key priority of the proposals for transport arms length organisation reform.

Question (2) What is the timetable for the completion of the review and subsequent report to committee?

Answer (2) There is no fixed timetable for completion of the review and reporting to Committee. This is because it is currently uncertain, particularly because it is not possible to predict how long it will be before the scale of patronage recovery following the COVID-19 pandemic is known.

Question (3) What opportunities exist for bus users, community councils and other stakeholders to contribute to the review?

Answer (3) Stakeholder engagement will be a key part of the review and, once an engagement plan has been developed, this will be shared with stakeholders.

Supplementary Question In her answer to question 1, the Convener stated the review was "at a very early stage". Can the convener clarify if any work has yet been undertaken and, if so, what?

**Supplementary
Answer**

The commitment to review the city's bus network is embedded in all of the public transport team's work activities.

Current activities include engagement with a variety of stakeholders on the Bus Partnership Fund and Edinburgh City Centre Transformation workstreams, where methodology of determining road use and space hierarchies are being developed.

As part of this, officers have been studying other cities and lessons are being learned from Amsterdam's Plusnet and Ghent's Circulation Plan. Officers have also met with counterparts from Dublin who are working on their BusConnects network review.

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 26 August
2021**

Question (1) How much Scottish Government funding does he expect the Council will receive as a result of the SNP's manifesto pledge to spend £60 million to refurbish all play parks?

Answer (1) City of Edinburgh Council will receive an initial allocation of £414,000 in 2021/22 (of £5m which is being released by Scottish Government in the current financial year). The funding profile for future years has not yet been confirmed.

Question (2) Will this share of funding cover all the anticipated costs of refurbishing play parks maintained by the Council?

Answer (2) The Scottish Government funding so far allocated for play parks will not be sufficient to refurbish all of the Council's play parks. However, the funding will be aligned to the Council's Parks infrastructure investment programme, alongside any thirdparty funding secured, to implement improvements in the Council's play parks in 2021/22.

Question (3) When does he expect to receive the first allocation of funding from the Scottish Government?

Answer (3) It is expected that the initial funding allocated will be received in September 2021.

Question (4) How will the first allocation of funding be prioritised?

Answer (4) As set out above, the funding will be aligned with the priorities set out in the Parks infrastructure investment programme which was presented to Culture and Communities Committee in [June 2021](#).

QUESTION NO 8

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) How many road gullies are on the “sensitive” list?

Answer (1) 1,402

Question (2) Where are they (broken down by ward)?

Answer (2) Please find below a table summarising the number of sensitive gullies, broken down by ward.

Ward	Number
1	95
2	49
3	12
4	19
5	86
6	95
7	40
8	128
9	86
10	193
11	65
12	81
13	19
14	65
15	133
16	86
17	150
	1,402

Question (3) What criteria are applied to meet sensitive status?

- Answer** (3) Sensitive gullies have been selected using historic information and, in general, are based on: areas of known flooding history; generally affect property; are generally at lower lying (double gully) areas; and/or are possibly prone to excessive silting where routine cleansing will help to alleviate flooding or the frequency of it. The decision to add sensitive gullies will be taken following investigation into the surrounding factors by the gully team, often in consultation with the flood prevention team and, on occasion, Scottish Water.
- Question** (4) What resourcing and prioritisation is applied to gullies on the sensitive list compared to other gullies not on the list?
- Answer** (4) Sensitive gullies are cleansed twice a year ahead of historic bad weather windows and leaf fall seasons (June/July and November).
- Question** (5) Is the sensitive list the highest priority list?
- Answer** (5) In terms of routine maintenance, there are only two levels of priority: standard and sensitive, sensitive is the highest priority.
- Question** (6) - if not - What is?
- Answer** (6) N/A
- Question** (7) Please can the questions 1,2,3,4, be applied to 6 if applicable
- Answer** (7) N/A

QUESTION NO 9

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

What instruction is given to waste operatives when returning empty householder bins so that the bins do not obstruct the pavement?

Answer

A toolbox talk and presentation film are used in training waste operatives on how they should return bins after emptying them. The talk and film were developed in conjunction with the Royal National Institute of the Blind and Guide Dogs Scotland.

When returning bins, operatives are encouraged to consider other pavement users, especially more vulnerable pedestrians, and to place the bins back properly at the collection points ensuring there is a clear pathway and that they are not blocking access. They are also instructed to report any presentation point issues to their Driver Crew Leader or Supervisor.

QUESTION NO 10

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

'The 2021-31 Sustainable Capital Budget Strategy – Outturn 2021/21 and Revised Budget 2011/22 report, which was presented to the Finance and Resources Committee on 12th of August, states that as regards Trams to Newhaven there has been out-turn slippage of £6.577m. This slippage is partially attributed to 'utilities diversions being more onerous than forecasted'.

Question

Can the Convener advise

- Which utility diversions are proving more onerous than forecasted?
- What problems have been encountered?
- Whether she remains confident that the Trams to Newhaven project will complete, on budget, by May 2023?

Answer

The report to Finance and Resources committee reported a £6.577m underspend in year 2020/21 for the Trams to Newhaven project. This was the result of programme slippage, partially as a result of utility diversions taking longer than programmed. The most significant additional work was required to the following utilities:

- Diversion of a gas main at Jane Street, which had been diverted by the previous tram project but, when uncovered, was found to be insufficiently deep and therefore further work was required; and
- Discovery of a Victorian sewer at Constitution Street, which required a complete replacement.

From the previous tram construction project, a key lesson learned was the risk of utilities taking longer than programmed and that the potential for associated cost increases. Therefore, a significant risk allowance has been made in the current Trams to Newhaven project to ensure

that any additional costs from utilities can be accommodated within the project budget. In addition, the construction strategy, which utilises large worksites so that work can continue in different locations while difficult utility diversions are completed, has proved effective in these instances.

The project remains within budget and is working towards 'Open for Revenue' service in Spring 2023.

**Supplementary
Question**

Can you please clarify what “working towards ‘Open for Revenue’ service in Spring 2023” means? Does this mean the Tram Extension will be fully operational, the project concluded on time and on budget by Spring 2023?

**Supplementary
Answer**

It is currently anticipated that the line to Newhaven will be complete and open for operation by Spring 2023. As with any project, there are pressures on programme which have to be mitigated, along with opportunities which can mean that work completes more quickly than anticipated. This means that the exact date of opening will become clearer as the project progresses. The project is currently forecast to be delivered within budget.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Culture and Communities Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

The Council's Management Rules for Public Parks and Greenspace state, amongst other things, the following:

"BBQs, Fire and Camping The following acts are prohibited:

6.1 Lighting barbecues outwith designated barbecue sites, where these are provided, or in areas or in a manner likely to burn or scorch the ground or cause danger or nuisance to other Park users or neighbouring residents.

6.2 Failing to remove litter associated with BBQs and picnics"

Despite this, a number of parks have recently been provided with barbecue disposal bins.

Can the Convener answer the following:

- Question** (1) How much did these bins cost and from which budget were they provided?
- Answer** (1) Barbecue disposal bins have been purchased following the complete 'burn out' of a number of litter bin housing units where barbecues had been disposed of unsafely. In total, 30 bins have been purchased at a cost of £8,640. This cost has been met from the Waste and Cleansing budget.
- Question** (2) Using the example of Leith Links what locations within the park exist where it is permitted to light a barbecue whilst remaining compliant with Rule 6.1?
- Answer** (2) There are no dedicated barbecue locations at Leith Links. In total, there are 25 barbecue slabs on the Meadows and Bruntsfield Links and five slabs in Roseburn Park. The slab in Roseburn Park was funded by the Friends of Roseburn Park.
- Question** (3) How is it envisaged that Rule 6.1 is enforced and how many times has this been undertaken in 2020 and 2021 by Council staff?

Answer

- (3)** Park Rangers monitor, provide advice, and enforce as appropriate in line with the relevant sections of the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982. Park Rangers do not log each interaction so although incidents have been managed over the last couple of years, officers do not hold a record of these interactions.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Finance and
Resources Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

- Question** (1) What sum has been received from UK Treasury in furlough payments in financial years 2020-21 and 2021 to date?
- Answer** (1) £0.986m relating to the financial year 2020-21 and £0.238m relating to 2021-22 for period to June 21. Sums stated relate to Council employees with separate claims being made through the Council's ALEOs.
- Question** (2) How many employees remain furloughed, both flexibly and in full?
- Answer** (2) 31 employees are currently furloughed, comprising 11 employees who are fully furloughed and 20 employees who are flexibly furloughed. The use of furlough has reduced significantly during August to facilitate the resumption of Cultural Services and residential services at the Lagganlia Outdoor Centre. Further significant reductions are anticipated in early September as staff prepare for the resumption of services at the Benmore Outdoor Centre on 1 October.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Where there are proposals for interventions in relation to pedestrians (such as the subsequently refused pedestrian crossing on Lanark Road) data is gathered. In relation to the installation, adjustment and retention of cycle lanes what data gathering on cycling is planned and please can you provide details of

- (a) location and
- (b) dates of this data gathering and
- (c) which organisation(s) is/are undertaking this?

Answer

The report to the Council in June 2021 on the potential retention of Spaces for People measures indicated that the monitoring of measures will be reported to Transport and Environment Committee prior to the implementation of the associated Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs).

Supplementary Question

I fear my question has not been answered. I asked what is planned, not about what is to be reported? Please can I have an answer to the question.

Supplementary Answer

Before implementation of the original scheme, the following monitoring was commissioned by Sustrans and carried out during October 2020 by Streetwise and TSP Data:

- Volume of vehicle and cycle traffic across five working days at two locations on Lanark Road (adjacent to Redhall Bank Road, and adjacent to Hailes Gardens) and one location on Longstone Road (adjacent to Longstone Avenue); and
- Speed of vehicle traffic at the same locations.

Following the decision of Council in June 2021, monitoring was commissioned by the Council and carried out by Tracsis during Summer 2021 including:

In July 2021 (within School Holiday period):

- Volume of vehicle and cycle traffic monitoring was undertaken across five working days at two locations on Lanark Road (adjacent to Redhall Bank Road, and adjacent to Hailes Gardens) and one location on Longstone Road (adjacent to Longstone Avenue);
- Speed of vehicle and cycle traffic was monitored across the same period at the same locations; and
- A survey of parking occupancy was undertaken on full length of Lanark Road (from Inglis Green Road junction to Gillespie Road junction), along the full length of Inglis Green Road and on Longstone Road (from Lanark Road Junction to Murrayburn Road junction) on one full working day (05:00 – 20:00) during July 2021.

Monitoring was also carried out in August (outwith School Holiday period) on the volume of vehicle and cycle traffic across five working days at two locations on Lanark Road (adjacent to Redhall Bank Road, and adjacent to Hailes Gardens) and one location on Longstone Road (adjacent to Longstone Avenue).

No further monitoring is planned at this point.

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 26 August 2021**

Question (1) Can the Convener please arrange for this table from November 2020 to be updated, including any new schemes since then, showing the breakdown of Spaces for People expenditure (incurred and scheduled), broken down by project.

Answer (1) The table below is currently being updated and will be shared with Councillors as soon as possible.

Question (2) Now all the Spaces for People schemes have been completed, please also add the estimate for removing each of the schemes and carrying out any extra road repairs for any damage caused by burning the road surface and attaching bollards etc.

Answer (2) A breakdown of the cost for removing each scheme has not been prepared. However, a budget of £450,000 has been set aside for the removal of measures, if required.

Question (3) Please confirm that funding is still ringfenced and available for this as required.

Answer (3) As stated in the answer to Question 2, a budget has been set aside for the removal of measures.

Supplementary Question Does the failure to provide a complete answer for Full Council demonstrate the audit report findings of an over reliance on key officers?

Supplementary Answer Officers have confirmed that the delay in providing this updated table has been due to officer annual leave and that a cost reconciliation is currently underway on the individual schemes and the updated table will be provided when this reconciliation is complete.

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
South Bridge	Awaiting decision	£117,683.55	£12,033.17	£1,369.75	Underway
Waverley Bridge	On	£13,305.46	£371.80	£7,585.46	Underway
Forest Road	On	£52,695.78	£3,839.33	£33,863.78	Underway
George IV Bridge	On	£138,179.63	£5,687.06	£118,389.63	Installed
The Mound	On	£148,331.72	£2,669.17	£148,088.37	Installed
Princes Street East End	On	£100,375.96	£2,469.90	£95,282.23	Underway
Victoria Street	On	£18,501.01	£371.80	£16,781.01	Installed
Cockburn Street	On	£13,638.45	£371.80	£12,716.00	Installed
Chamber St / George IV	On	£136,000.00	£5,032.00	£1,493.45	Underway
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£6,729.45	£0.00	£6,402.17	
City Centre Phase 1		£745,441.01	£32,846.03	£441,971.85	
Queensferry High St	On	£30,000.00	£1,024.55	£0.00	
Great Junction St	On	£14,957.64	£307.51	£2,840.50	Underway
Stockbridge	On	£48,494.40	£3,784.70	£3,126.50	Underway
Portobello High Street	On	£30,132.72	£1,965.44	£2,598.50	Underway
Newington	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Gorgie / Dalry Road	On	£43,812.35	£3,433.65	£42,721.29	Installed
Corstorphine	On	£43,060.40	£2,953.17	£3,243.50	Underway
Bruntsfield	On	£31,983.48	£2,389.81	£29,998.69	Installed
Tolcross	On	£31,761.69	£1,652.80	£29,898.08	Installed
Morningside	On	£63,081.17	£4,229.95	£56,188.81	Installed
Haymarket Terrace	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Easter Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Shopping Streets		£337,283.85	£21,741.58	£170,615.87	
Telford Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Carrington Road	On	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Fountainbridge Dundee	On	£61,858.64	£4,980.14	£0.00	
Ferry Road	On	£106,284.88	£8,168.73	£100,146.32	Installed
Melville Drive	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Teviot Pl / Potterrow	On	£6,952.32	£257.24	£0.00	
Buccleuch St / Causewayside	On	£46,185.52	£3,537.28	£37,378.44	Underway
Crewe Toll Roundabout	On	£28,995.00	£1,880.20	£0.00	
Meadowplace Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Duddingston Road	On	£48,320.48	£3,805.36	£0.00	
Wester Hailes Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Craigmillar Park / Liberton	On	£110,058.80	£7,851.87	£0.00	
Gilmerton Road	On	£42,695.68	£3,717.04	£0.00	
Crewe Road South	On	£88,222.63	£5,116.01	£85,216.63	Installed
Old Dalkeith Road	On	£78,008.98	£3,056.52	£75,002.98	Installed

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
Comiston Road	On	£139,839.05	£10,466.80	£113,207.61	Underway
Ingils Green Road	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Pennywell Road	On	£119,757.32	£8,785.73	£111,788.32	Installed
Mayfield Road	On	£29,715.11	£2,380.00	£0.00	
QC - Meadows / Greenbank	On	£43,680.00	£2,751.46	£0.00	
Queensferry Road 1a	Awaiting decision	£75,261.00	£4,965.51	£0.00	
A1 Corridor	Awaiting decision	£93,692.00	£6,662.40	£0.00	
Slateford Road (A70), Lanark Rd, Longstone Rd & Murrayburn Rd	On	£252,774.00	£19,092.74	£0.00	
Orchard Brae	On	£13,330.00	£851.91	£0.00	
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£5,992.61	£0.00	£0.00	
Phase 1b Bus Lanes	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
West Coates	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Arterial Routes		£1,391,624.02	£98,326.94	£522,740.30	
East Craigs	Awaiting decision	£55,598.00	£4,878.09	£0.00	
Drum Brae North	On	£36,419.00	£2,896.50	£0.00	
Leith Connections	On	£42,880.00	£4,087.20	£0.00	
Non-allocated Expenditure	On	£2,536.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Low Traffic Neighbourhoods		£137,433.00	£11,861.79	£0.00	
Braid Road	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Links Garden	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Cammo Walk	On	£1,700.00	£0.00	£1,700.00	Installed
Warriston Road	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Stanley Street/Hope Street	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Braidburn Terrace	On	£2,000.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Silverknowes Road (South)	On	£33,318.00	£2,464.65	£0.00	
Silverknowes Road (North)	On	£27,900.00	£2,306.09	£0.00	
Granton Sq / Gypsy Brae	On	£77,463.92	£5,981.42	£0.00	
Braid Hills Drive	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Seafield Street	On	£2,174.00	£78.10	£1,467.00	Installed
Kings Place	On	£17,177.00	£929.50	£877.00	Underway
Arboretum Place	On	£12,431.46	£729.55	£1,766.10	Underway
Maybury Rd Temp.	On	£55,883.63	£1,950.00	£22,975.84	Underway

Scheme	Status On / Off	Cost Projection	Maintenance Projection	Actual Cost to Date	Status
Crossing					
Spaces for Exercise		£238,048.01	£14,439.31	£28,785.94	
Broughton Street	Awaiting decision	£49,428.24	£4,939.08	£0.00	
Broughton St Roundabout	Awaiting decision	£50,624.20	£3,817.03	£0.00	
Restalrig Rd South - Opt. 2	On	£6,920.00	£416.20	£0.00	
West End of Princes Street	On	£3,763.00	£316.92	£0.00	
Musselburgh to Portobello Opt. 1 Edinburgh section	On	£55,399.20	£5,601.98	£0.00	
Duddingston Road West	Off	£0.00	£0.00	£0.00	
Fillyside Road - Crossing	On	£30,000.00	£1,950.00	£0.00	
Fillyside Road	On	£4,584.36	£411.93	£0.00	
Glenlockhart Drive	On	£2,798.00	£103.53	£0.00	
Starbank Road	On	£12,608.40	£1,128.81	£0.00	
Commonplace Interventions		£216,125.40	£18,685.48	£0.00	
Schools		£150,000.00		£20,625.49	
Sub-total			£3,413,856.42	£1,184,739.45	
Consultancy Support			£300,000.00	£118,478.78	
Internal Management Costs			£750,000.00	£504,759.07	
Segregation units for maintenance and schemes to be developed			£171,292.00	£0.00	
Monitoring & Evaluation			£175,000.00	£86,410.00	
Removal Allowance			£450,000.00	£0.00	
Street Cleaning Over Winter Period 20/21/22			£50,000.00	£0.00	
Removal of Street Clutter			£50,000.00	£0.00	
Uncertainty - installation, maintenance, removal			£196,005.10	£0.00	
TOTAL PROJECTION			£5,556,153.52	£1,894,387.30	

QUESTION NO 15

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Lord Provost at a
meeting of the Council on 26 August
2021**

Standing Order 22.3 required motions and amendments to be provided to the clerk no later than 2pm on the working day before Council. In the case of June Council, motions and amendments were not published so that Members and the public could view them until after 7pm at night.

- Question** (1) Could the Lord Provost provide an explanation for this protracted delay?
- Answer** (1) 35 motions and amendments were submitted for June Council, which is much more than usual, all of which needed to be checked for competency. 27 were received the day before Council with over half after 12 noon. Following the competency check, a number required to be amended involving engagement with the relevant elected members and group business managers. Further reformatting, adding to templates and the creation of PDF files, both individually and collectively, as well as sorting the bookmarks etc. was required. That is clearly a time-consuming process and the Committee Services staff managed this as quickly as possible, whilst working remotely.
- Question** (2) Would the Lord Provost remind Council that Standing Orders applies to all Members?
- Answer** (2) Standing Orders apply to all Elected Members.
- Question** (3) Would it be in order for the Clerk to set out a timetable for the publishing of Motions and Amendments, and routinely include an explanation of any deviation from such a timetable?
- Answer** (3) Motions and Amendments are published as soon as each has been deemed competent and administrative tasks are complete. Therefore, the additional workload this question proposes being placed upon the Clerk and Committee Services is not supported.

QUESTION NO 16

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 26 August 2021**

The Convener will be aware of recent localised flooding events in Edinburgh.

Question (1) Between 1 July and 17 August, how many requests have been made to clear individual gullies on the roads of Edinburgh?

Answer (1) There have been 2,597 requested received to clear individual gullies.

Question (2) What was the average time between the request being made, and the first physical attendance to the gully?

Answer (2) This information is not recorded. However, the average time from Enquiry Opened to Enquiry Closed for completed enquiries was 8.05 days in the time period 1 July to 17 August.

Question (3) How many reports resulted in attendance to a gully that was not blocked or partially blocked?

Answer (3) This information is not recorded.

QUESTION NO 17

By Councillor McLellan for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

June Council's expression of unanimous dismay at the slur against Lothian Buses by SNP MSP James Dornan

Question **(1)** Can the leader copy the text of what he wrote to SNP MSP James Dornan following the instructions of June Council, agreed under item 8.10 (with addendum) by way of answer to this question?

Answer **(1)** James Dornan MSP

30th June 2021

Dear James,

I note you recently passed on an apology to Edinburgh's Transport Convenor after contacting you following the comments made in relation to action Lothian Buses took following serious violent behaviour against their employees.

These comments were also raised at our Council meeting on June 24th.

A motion was passed expressing dismay at the comments and having engaged with our bus company since, I feel a direct and public apology to the company is still merited to draw a line under this issue. I very much hope you can echo the sincere apology you issued to the Transport Convenor to the Chair of Lothian Buses.

Question **(2)** Can the leader copy any and all responses received as a result of him writing as instructed?

Answer

(2) On 15 Jun 2021, at 16:01, Dornan J (James), MSP
<James.Dornan.msp@parliament.scot> wrote:

Dear Mr McFarlane, I've acknowledged my comments were poorly made and that there was no intention by Lothian Buses to target Irish or Catholics, I never considered there was. Of course I regret the misunderstanding, of my own making admittedly, but the point I was intending to make, and did in other parts of my speech was the lack of attention to a significant cultural day for Irish, which would not have been the case for other culturally significant days. This is in no way only the case at Lothian Buses but throughout Scottish business as a whole.

James Dornan MSP

Sent from my iPhone

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Brown for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Many vulnerable / elderly residents across the city either have no on-line access, do not feel comfortable making card payments over the phone or sadly have no relatives or neighbours who can assist with doing so.

Question (1) I understand a Working Group was set up to look the removal of cash and other options for residents for the future. What are the findings of this working group?

Answer (1) The assessment completed by officers considered all Council services for payment options and the frequency with which payments needed to be made. This assessment reaffirmed the need for a range of payment options to support individual circumstances. These options vary depending on the nature and scale of the service and currently can include online payment, direct debit, standing order, BACs, automated payment lines, payment via a Contact agent or cash payments for Council Tax/Housing. In addition, when the current Council Resilience Centres revert to locality office service provision, individuals will be assisted by Council staff to make card payments via the Council's easy to use self-help machines.

Question (2) As the Council no longer accept cash payments in our Local Offices, where can residents make cash payments if they don't have online access?

Answer (2) There is currently no cash payment option for the service. The Garden Waste service has been an online or phone registration service since February 2020. This has proved successful with over 90% signing and paying online, with the remainder registered over the phone. This phone registration process is supported by a dedicated contact team who can support people through the registration and payment process. Further payment options will continue to be explored by the service.

QUESTION NO 19

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Please could the convener confirm the number of injuries recorded by members of staff in each Ward, where applicable, over the course of the last five years whilst emptying:

- a) Grey bins
- b) Green bins
- c) Brown bins
- d) Blue boxes
- e) Red boxes
- f) Food caddies
- g) Gull proof sacks

Answer

The SHE portal is the Council's incidents/accidents reporting system and the categories used are from the Health and Safety Executive's grouping for incident causations (e.g. manual handling, slips trips and falls etc). Therefore, as the information requested is not recorded, it is not possible to provide the breakdown requested. However, the table below provides a summary of the number of incidents recorded on the SHE portal relating to doorstep collection of recycling (including gull proof sacks).

Year	Incidents from GP sacks /Doorstep collection of recycling
2016	2
2017	7
2018	4
2019	3
2020	2

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question (1) Who created the brand name "Spaces for People"

Answer (1) In response to the outbreak of COVID-19, the Scottish Government announced funding to enable physical distancing and to improve conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling in April 2020. This funding was titled 'Spaces for People'.

Question (2) Who designed the adverts for the retaining Spaces for People consultation (used on lampposts and digital formats) for Council to approve and implement?

Answer (2) These were designed internally within the Council.

Question (3) Why is the programme, largely consisting of the same schemes, being rebranded as "Travelling Safely"?

Answer (3) As set out in Question 1, the Spaces for People initiative was specifically to enable physical distancing and to improve conditions for walking, cycling and wheeling in response to COVID-19. These measures were introduced using Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders (TTRO).

In June 2021, the Council agreed to introduce Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETRO) in some areas where measures which are currently in place under TTRO have the potential support the Council's objectives in the longer term.

This is a new approach rather than a rebranding of the programme.

Question (4) When there have been so many accidents relating to existing Spaces for People schemes, with a number of personal injury claims, could the Council be accused of misrepresentation by rebranding the programme "Travelling Safely"?

- Answer** (4) The schemes which have been approved to progress to ETRO and those which are currently being reviewed are all designed to improve connectivity and to link into other schemes, therefore the new programme has been titled Travelling Safely.
- Question** (5) Why is the programme not more clearly being branded in relation to the main aim of supporting the Net Zero target?
- Answer** (5) The aim of supporting the Net Zero target was set out clearly in the consultation and in the reports to Transport and Environment Committee and the Council, alongside the other strategic priorities which the new programme will support moving forward.
- Question** (6) Please can you provide evidence of the exact dangers and number of incidents in the last 5 years in Edinburgh that the "Travelling Safely" programme is aiming to address broken down by each road user group?
- Answer** (6) The Travelling Safely programme is aiming to provide safer, more desirable routes around the city as an alternative to using motorised vehicles. The programme is designed to encourage cycling and walking around the city for people who do not feel safe with the current infrastructure or who do not have access to a motorised vehicle.
- Question** (7) Please can you provide the target of reduced accidents by category of road user group, that the "Travelling Safely" programme is aiming to address, in what timescale, and how that will be measured
- Answer** (7) The priority of the Council is to make travelling around the city as safe as possible, with the ultimate aim of there being no accidents on the city's roads. The Travelling Safely programme does not have specific targets attributed to it.
- Supplementary Question** In answer to questions (3) it is stated this a new approach. Why therefore, for clarity are we not starting again from scratch?

**Supplementary
Answer**

As discussed at Council in June and set out in answer (3) above, there are some measures which are currently in place under Spaces for People which have the potential to support the Council's objectives in the long term. The approach to this new programme was set out in a report to Transport and Environment Committee on [19 August 2021](#).

QUESTION NO 21

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

As the cost of providing the service has increased by 40% to £35, can the Convener please pinpoint and specify what is driving such a significant increase?

Answer

The Council introduced a charge for the garden waste collection service to assist in recovering some of the costs associated with this non-statutory service.

Scottish Councils are limited by regulation to only recover costs related to collection, but not disposal. The increase from £25 to £35 enables the service to fully cover the current garden waste collection costs and takes into account overhead costs (e.g. fuel, labour, transportation) which have increased since the charge was first introduced and allows for investment to improve the registration process for customers.

Supplementary Question

I requested to “pinpoint and specify” yet I have been given general high level statement. I have submitted a reasonable request.. As local Cllrs we are all accountable for this and therefore can you please provide a detailed breakdown of the relative costs?

Supplementary Answer

The business case for the introduction of the charge in 2018 was based on a mix of known costs and predicted costs based on assumptions such as sign up levels, subscription management costs and system costs.

The table below outlines the forecasted (or actual for 2019/20) cost of the service, projected income and anticipated revenue budget allocation required between the original business case to introduce the charge in 2018, 2019/20 collection year (used in the cost recovery business case as the last full collection year before the proposal was

developed); and the cost recovery and increased mid-year window business case:

	Cost of Service	Income	Budget Requirement
Business case assumptions when charges were introduced	£1.8m	£1.5m	£0.256m
Actual 2019/20	£2.5m	£1.9m	£0.634m
Updated business case for 2021/22	£2.6m	£2.3 - 2.5m	£0.088m - £0.341m

It is important to note that the service can only recover costs related to the garden waste collection service and cannot generate a surplus.

The £35 charge has been calculated on this basis, with the forecast income based on both projected high and low levels of resident sign up.

The increase in service collection costs from the original business case, and therefore increase required to the charge, has been caused by factors such as:

- The cost of vehicles – the number of vehicles required increased following the move from 5-day double shifts to 4-day collections (a cost increase of £0.215m);
- The cost of frontline staffing – additional crew members were required and pay awards, pay steps and the pay changes from the move to 4-day week have led to an increase in the cost of frontline staffing (a cost increase of £0.294m);
- The cost of systems and administration – the original business case does not breakdown these costs in the same way as the cost recovery calculations so a direct comparison is not possible, however additional resources have been added to the subscription team and funding identified for the system developments to

improve the process and increase the period when sign up can be processed (a cost increase of £0.207m);

- Communications – the ongoing need for a communication and marketing budget (including permit and mailing costs) has led to an annual budget being created for communications (the annual budget has increased by £0.065m);
- Provision of bins – particularly for customers signing up at new developments or at addresses that have not been receiving the service (the cost of this has increased by £0.064m);
- Bank charges – charges for transaction processing were not accounted for in the original business case. The charge is a percentage of the transaction cost and varies from bank to bank. This cost is met from the income received (this equates to a reduction in income of between £0.058m and £0.065m); and
- Achieving full cost recovery – as outlined above, the service can only recover costs related to the collection service and cannot generate a surplus. The £35 charge is based on the cost of service delivery; however, the associated income was forecast on the basis of both high and low sign up levels

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Question

Has the City Council reported to Scottish Government as funder of Spaces for People through Sustrans about the red audit finding and if not, does it intend to do so?

Answer

No, the Council has not reported this to Sustrans as officers do not believe that there is reason to do so.

Supplementary Question

I note that officers do not believe there is a reason to do so. Given we have a councillor and administration led council and the question was of the Convener, what does the convener think?

Supplementary Answer

The provision of Scottish government funding for the Spaces for People pandemic response did not include any conditions of grant relating to how the programme was administered. There is therefore no specific reason to share the findings of an internal audit with the Scottish Government or with Sustrans. The internal audit is in the public domain and could, of course, be shared with them if they request it.

It should also be recognised, as it was in the internal audit report, that, in the interim period between the internal audit being undertaken and the report being published, there had been significant management actions to meet concerns expressed within the report.

‘Management had identified a number of areas where improvement was required, and had either addressed them (for example, retrospective publication of prioritisation outcomes) or were implementing improvements (for example, creating a programme risk register) during the audit or as at our audit completion date.’

The internal audit report also recognised ‘the challenges associated within urgent implementation of SfP initiatives to support citizens during initial Covid-19 lockdown measures’.

The internal audit report is a very useful document which serves to provide guidance on this particular project and to provide lessons for future project implementation.

QUESTION NO 23

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Vice-Convenor of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

On 21 January 2020 the Evening News reported that the Vice Convenor of the Transport and Environment Committee, Councillor Doran would be “devastated” if she found out a loved-one's bench had been burned and that “she did not know how the scandal could have happened” and that “the person behind the decision must be held accountable”. The article quotes Councillor Doran directly saying: “I don't know how this would have happened and that is what we need to investigate. We need to find out who made that decision.”

The article also notes the Council Leader as saying a full investigation was underway.

Can the Vice-Convenor answer the following:

Question (1) Has the investigation concluded?

Answer (1) The investigation referred to by the Council Leader was concluded. This found that the person that was allegedly responsible for the burning of the benches is no longer employed by the Council.

However, further evidence has come to light in recent weeks which has caused this finding to be questioned and a new investigation is underway.

Question (2) How did the incident happen?

Answer (2) Given the new investigation that has commenced, it would not be appropriate to answer this question at this point.

Question (3) Who made the decision?

Answer (3) Given the new investigation that has commenced, it would not be appropriate to answer this question at this point.

Question (4) Has anyone been held accountable?

Answer

- (4)** Following the conclusion of the first investigation, no disciplinary action was taken as the individual that was alleged to be responsible had left the employment of the Council.

As stated above, however, further evidence has become available and has led to a new investigation being commenced.

If it is the case that there is evidence that shows that there has been a breach of the Council's Disciplinary Code or Employee Code of Conduct, then the appropriate sanctions will be applied. However, it is not appropriate to pre-judge the outcome of this new investigation to ensure that it remains impartial

QUESTION NO 24

By Councillor Booth for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 26 August 2021

Further to the letter sent to the Education Secretary by the Convener and Vice-Convener of Education on 12 August and circulated to GME parents, please could the Convener respond to the following points:

Question **(1)** The letter mentions a table outlining site options the council has already explored for GME secondary. Will the council publish that table?

Answer **(1)** The table is provided below in appendix

Question **(2)** Have the following sites been considered for GME secondary? If they have been ruled out, what are the grounds for this?

- a) Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion
- b) Old Royal High School
- c) Old Tynecastle High School
- d) Lothian Buses depot, Annandale Street
- e) Russel Road Depot (former)

- Answer** **(2)** a) Princess Alexandra Eye Pavilion
- Not Council Owned. Still Operational and no date for closure. Site too small for a High School
- b) Old Royal High School
- Site too small and building not suitable for a modern High School
- c) Old Tynecastle High School
- Not owned by Council. In the blast zone for the brewery. Site too small.
- d) Lothian Buses depot, Annandale Street
- It's an operational bus depot and no proposals by LRT to relocate.
- e) Russel Road Depot (former)
- See table below.

Question **(3)** What steps are the council taking to ensure that demand for GME within Edinburgh is met, and that the situation in Glasgow, where parents are being refused places at GME primary, is not repeated in Edinburgh?

Answer **(3)** The draft statutory consultation paper outlining proposals for the growth of GME in Edinburgh was considered by the Education, Children and Families Committee on 28 May 2021. The proposal includes the intention to establish two new dedicated GME teaching units, one in the south east of the city and one in the west, initially within existing primary schools but with a path for growth to full primary schools identified.

Question **(4)** Will the council conduct a further informal consultation on options for GME secondary before proceeding to a statutory consultation? If so, when?

Answer **(4)** No further informal consultation is planned.

Question

(5) Please can the Convenor clarify:

a) whether the proposed consultation on GME Secondary is a 'discontinue' consultation in terms of paragraph 1 of schedule 1 of the Schools (Consultation) (Scotland) Act 2010?

b) If so, and if the council consults and does not proceed with its proposal, can the council consult again on proposals to discontinue GME education at JGHS within 5 years?

Answer

(5) a) Yes, it is a discontinue consultation.

b) Yes the 5 year rule would apply unless there was a significant change in the school's circumstances.

Opportunity for development of GME School	Associated School	Barriers to progression	Estimated Site Size (for an 800 capacity secondary school 14 acres required – although not ideal 8 acres for playing fields can be off site).	Timescales	Implications for Statutory Consultation
Bus depot site adjacent to Drummond High School	Drummond High School	Operational Lothian Buses depot. Would be a small site for a high school but might be possible if we reduce some school building standards and use off site playing fields. There is also an efficiency opportunity due to location directly adjacent to Drummond High School.	6 acres	Could take a significant amount of time to relocate the current users as no known plans for this at present.	Consultation could not proceed until site availability confirmed. Secondary GME would remain at JGHS in interim. If consultation proceeded in relation to growth of primary GME only from August 2022 then new secondary school would need to be deliverable by August 2029 There would be a significant risk in taking forward growth of GME primary without a confirmed secondary solution, because Darroch annexe will only accommodate current numbers until 2028-29.

Fettes Police Station	Broughton High School	Operational police station. Would require Scottish Government support to provide the site for the school and additional funding.	14 acres	Could take a significant amount of time to relocate the current users as no known plans for this at present.	As above
Royal Victoria Hospital Site	Broughton High School	Site not owned by Council and targeted for housing development. Would require Scottish Government support to provide the site for the school and additional funding.	14.4 acres	Further information required from NHS	As above
Council's depot at Russell Road;	Tynecastle	Still operational. Would be a small site for a high school but might be possible if we reduce some school building standards and use off site playing fields. Council has wider regeneration plans for the site and is anticipating a capital receipt for this site.	6 acres	Longer term option due to ongoing operational use and wider regeneration plans.	As above – except Council has ownership of the site so easier to confirm site available for this option before statutory consultation proceeds.

QUESTION NO 25

**By Councillor Booth for answer by
the Leader of the Council at a
meeting of the Council on 26 August
2021**

Question

Further to his supplementary answer to my question at full council on 24 June 2021, please can the council leader confirm when he met with Gaelic parents to hear their concerns, and what was the outcome of this meeting?

Answer

As stated in the supplementary answer on June 24th to question 21, I'm happy to meet parents to hear their views and appreciate those who have got in touch directly so far. There is continuing dialogue between parents and the Convenor and Vice Convenor of Children and Families, including a meeting with parent council and Comann nam Parent representatives just last week, and I'm happy to attend any meeting I'm invited to. Cllr Booth is aware of recent developments have meant the consultation has yet to be agreed, but I would again reiterate the importance of views being captured through the consultation to ensure a full and accurate picture.