

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 17 March 2022

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
Cammy Day
Alison Dickie
Denis C Dixon
Phil Duggart
Karen Doran
Scott Douglas
Catherine Fullerton
Neil Gardiner
Gillian Gloyer
George Gordon
Ashley Graczyk
Joan Griffiths
Ricky Henderson
Derek Howie

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

1 Statements by the Lord Provost

a) Pre -Election

Councillors

Per the document and email circulated by the Chief Executive last week I wanted to remind you that we are now in the pre-election period. As such, and as you are aware, the legislation prohibits the Council from publishing material which is designed to affect support for a political party. We can largely continue as normal today. There are no constraints on discussing usual Council business, performance or policies. However, I would remind Councillors that they should avoid referring to the upcoming election by, for example, linking that with the achievements or failures of their party or another party. I would also remind Councillors that they must not have any campaign material on view when they are on camera.

I hope that today's Council can be conducted with that in mind and thank you all in advance for your restraint and compliance in this regard.

b) Correction of Comments made at the meeting on 10 February 2022 in regard to the report on Independent Review into Whistleblowing and Organisational Culture

I would like to take the opportunity to make a brief statement of correction in relation to the discussions around Item 7.1, "Independent Review into Whistleblowing and Organisational Culture – Next Steps" at last month's meeting of Full Council on 10 February 2022.

During the course of discussions around Item 7.1, unfortunately an incorrect statement was made that Ms Tanner QC had offered to meet with contributors to the Review to discuss her findings.

Ms Tanner QC had confirmed to Council in December when she presented her report that she would consider and check any potential factual inaccuracies that people wished to bring to her attention, but that she would not change her independent findings to suit the subjective wishes of a whistleblower, or any other person.

Following Council in February, Ms Tanner QC has confirmed that she had not committed to meet with individuals as indicated at Council last month. On behalf of the Council, I apologise for any confusion which may have been caused in this regard.

In relation to her commitment to check any potential factual inaccuracies that people wished to bring to her attention she has done this, and the Review

Team has responded to the two people who made representations to the Review about parts of the content of the Report without any inaccuracies having been identified. As the Review's fifty recommendations have been accepted for implementation by the Council, the Review Team considers the Review and its role now to be at an end.

In keeping with comments made by the Chief Executive at Full Council on 10 February 2022, the offer by him to meet with any whistleblowers or others with a genuine interest who may wish to speak to still obviously stands in relation to how the implementation of the Review recommendations can be dealt with moving forward.

2 Points of Order

a) Webcast Issues – Councillor Doggart

Councillor Doggart raised a Point of Order in terms of Standing Order 18.2, that members of the public were unable to access the live webcast of the meeting.

The issue was checked and confirmation given that the live webcast was operating.

b) Suspension of Standing Order 22.15 – Motion by Councillor Jim Campbell

Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Rust moved in terms of Standing Order 10.1(b), that Standing Order 22.15, the 40 minute rule, not apply to item 7.6 on the agenda (Monitoring Officer Report).

Voting

The voting was as follows:

To suspend Standing Order 22.15	-	18 votes
To not suspend Standing Order 22.15	-	39 votes

(To suspend Standing Order 22.15: Councillors Bridgman, Brown, Cameron, Jim Campbell, Cook, Dickie, Doggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.

To not suspend Standing Order 22.15: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Day, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Lang, Macinnes, Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey,

Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Louise Young.)

Decision

To not suspend Standing Order 22.15 for Item 7.6 on the agenda (Monitoring Officer Report).

3 Support for Businesses Affected by CCWEL Motion by Councillor Douglas

a) Deputation – Roseburn Traders - CCWEL

The deputation asked the Council to consider a small business support scheme to help businesses through the difficult times they were facing during the CCWEL road works in Roseburn. They stressed that in just under 6 weeks, a number of businesses in the area had reported a decrease in turnover of between 40% and 70%, which could not be sustained for the duration of the works.

The deputation urged the Council to investigate the possibility of the introduction of an assistance scheme for businesses affected by the works and improved signage for members of the public regarding the works and accessibility to the shops in the area.

b) Motion by Councillor Douglas

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

“Council:

Asks the Transport Convener to urgently set-up a meeting with the owners and operators of businesses on Roseburn Terrace to discuss the adverse effect the recently started CCWEL works have had on their income.

Notes that many businesses have seen a sharp decrease in their takings since the work began, with some shops reporting a 70% drop in just a week.

Believes that these businesses are a vital part of the Roseburn community, and that the council should do everything within its powers to make sure they are able to survive the disruption caused by these works.

Understands that measures undertaken to help these businesses so far have proven to be insufficient and that more needs to be done to support them.

As such agrees to look into the possibility of setting up a compensation scheme for those businesses who have been adversely affected by the works to ensure they continue to operate over the coming months that the roadworks are in place.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Douglas.

-moved by Councillor Douglas, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Amendment 1

Notes that the Transport Convener had a meeting at Roseburn yesterday (16th March) with the local ward councillors and businesses to discuss the impact of temporary CCWEL project works in this immediate area.

Notes that some businesses along this part of the route have indicated that there has been an impact on their business takings while this work is progressing.

Believes that businesses in Roseburn form a very important part of the community.

Notes that the Council has put in place a programme of signage, outdoor advertising and paid social media campaigns to promote what is available in the area and that businesses continue to be open for business during the works. Notes that this programme is similar to a scheme which was put in place to support Brighton Place traders when an extensive sett re-laying project was taking place.

Notes that as a Roads Authority the Council is not required to provide compensation (and indeed we understand that other local authorities in Scotland do not undertake compensation schemes for road works or placemaking projects).

Notes that, once completed, this project is expected to encourage people to arrive at local businesses by bike and on foot in greater numbers than before, as well as by vehicle. Research noted in August 2020's Spaces for People – Response to Motion <https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/documents/s25363/Item%206.10%20-%20Spaces%20for%20People%20Initiative%20-%20Response%20to%20Motion-%20FINAL.pdf> Transport and Environment Committee report indicates that this is a frequent aspect of projects like this and that local businesses will usually benefit from increased visits and higher expenditure.

Notes that comparisons with the Leith Walk business support package, created as part of the Full Business Case for the Tram Extension, are difficult as the circumstances are very different. This is due to the longer term nature of the work, the extensive periods of disruption already experienced by businesses on Leith Walk due to previous tram works and our unique ability to create a set of financial

conditions for a business support package which allowed for some limited financial support alongside more general support measures.

Requests that officers continue their engagement with local businesses on further development of the promotional campaign.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment 2

To amend the motion by Councillor Douglas to read:

Notes that some businesses on Roseburn Terrace, which are a valuable part of the community, have reported a drop in takings at the beginning of the CCWEL works, which began in February as scheduled and extensively communicated;

Asks council officers to identify any forms of engagement and support that the Council offers to businesses during projects which have not yet been provided, and to brief ward members and transport spokespersons;

Notes that areas with increased footfall of people walking, wheeling and cycling due to better active travel infrastructure often benefit from an increase in business takings, and calls on officers to identify any schemes or support for businesses to plan for the changes in customers that may be available to them when the project is completed.

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Burgess

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	25 votes
For the Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	34 votes

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

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Day, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes,

McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson and Work.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted amendment by Councillor Macinnes:

- 1) To note that the Transport Convener had a meeting at Roseburn yesterday (16th March) with the local ward councillors and businesses to discuss the impact of temporary CCWEL project works in this immediate area.
- 2) To note that some businesses along this part of the route had indicated that there had been an impact on their business takings while this work is progressing.
- 3) To believe that businesses in Roseburn formed a very important part of the community.
- 4) To note that the Council had put in place a programme of signage, outdoor advertising and paid social media campaigns to promote what was available in the area and that businesses continued to be open for business during the works. To note that this programme was similar to a scheme which was put in place to support Brighton Place traders when an extensive sett re-laying project was taking place.
- 5) To note that as a Roads Authority the Council was not required to provide compensation (and indeed we understand that other local authorities in Scotland do not undertake compensation schemes for road works or placemaking projects).
- 6) To note that, once completed, this project was expected to encourage people to arrive at local businesses by bike and on foot in greater numbers than before, as well as by vehicle. Research noted in August 2020's Spaces for People – Response to Motion <https://democracy.edinburgh.gov.uk/documents/s25363/Item%206.10%20-%20Spaces%20for%20People%20Initiative%20-%20Response%20to%20Motion-%20FINAL.pdf> Transport and Environment Committee report indicates that this was a frequent aspect of projects like this and that local businesses would usually benefit from increased visits and higher expenditure.
- 7) To note that comparisons with the Leith Walk business support package, created as part of the Full Business Case for the Tram Extension, were difficult as the circumstances were very different. This was due to the longer term nature of the work, the extensive periods of disruption already experienced by businesses on Leith Walk due to previous tram works and our

unique ability to create a set of financial conditions for a business support package which allowed for some limited financial support alongside more general support measures.

- 8) To ask council officers to identify any forms of engagement and support that the Council offers to businesses during projects which had not yet been provided, and to brief ward members and transport spokespersons.

4 Whistleblowing - Motion by Councillor Rose

a) Deputation – Whistleblowers Group

The deputation acknowledged the apology given by the Lord Provost at the start of the meeting and the written apology for the misinformation provided at the meeting of the Council on 10 February 2022. They indicated that they were representing the concerns of Whistleblowers who felt that the investigation had not been handled correctly by the Council and that the misinformation did not inspire confidence in Council officials for any new whistleblowers coming forward.

The deputation urged the Council to call for a public inquiry as they felt that the truth had not been established and that there were still attempts being made to suppress the truth coming out.

b) Motion by Councillor Rose

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

- “1) Notes that at the Council meeting on 10th February 2022 in relation to item 7a) Independent Review into Whistleblowing and Organisational Culture – Next Steps there was presentation on the matter from a representative of a group of whistleblowers.
- 2) Notes that assurances were given in various terms from the Leader Councillor McVey, the Lord Provost Councillor Frank Ross and from the Chief Executive Andrew Kerr, that an offer had been made by Susanne Tanner QC to meet with whistleblowers post publication of the Report and that encouragement was given to whistleblowers concerned with the process to take up that offer.
- 3) Notes information suggesting that any such offer was not available to whistleblowers and that Susanne Tanner has indicated that the statements made at the February Council meeting were incorrect and the Review Team is drawing this to the attention of those who made the statements.

- 4) Notes that this information, apparently incorrect, was given in the context of assuring an openness to the concerns expressed by the deputation.
- 5) Requests that appropriate corrections and apologies be given as soon as possible.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Rose.

-moved by Councillor Rose, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment

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

Notes that the Chair of Independent Inquiry and review offered to correct any statement in the reports that were not accurate if people came forward.

Notes this was incorrectly communicated at the Council meeting in February as an open offer to meet on wider matters. Further notes that the comments in relation to the Chief Executive’s offer to meet were accurate.

Apologises for any confusion caused and encourages anyone looking to raise concerns to contact the Council’s Independent Whistleblowing service or take advantage of the Chief Executive’s offer.

Further notes the Council has accepted the recommendations and approved the actions to strengthen whistleblowing culture as set out in the report to Council in February.

Further acknowledges that these actions have now been resourced by Council following the budget meeting in February, despite all Conservative Councillors failing to outline any resources in their budget motion to deliver the recommendations of the Inquiry and review reports, having provided no credible alternative to the action plans.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Point of Order

Councillor Whyte raised a point of Order in terms of Standing Order 22.8 that the final paragraph of the amendment by Councillor McVey be ruled incompetent with its reference to no resources in the Conservative Group budget which he indicated was factually incorrect.

The Lord Provost ruled that there was no basis to rule any part of the amendment incompetent.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	19 votes
For the amendment	-	40 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the amendment by Councillor McVey.

5 Edinburgh's Friendship with Taiwan Motion by Councillor Day

a) Deputation – Taipei Representative Office in the UK Edinburgh Office

The deputation indicated that in recent years there had been many developments in a wide range of fields between Taiwan and Edinburgh such as green and renewable energy, smart city, culture, academic cooperation and beyond.

The deputation indicated that Taiwan was known for the world's leading producers of information and communication technology products and had moved to the goal of becoming a digital nation and smart island. They felt that Edinburgh and Taiwan shared the same vision to a smart future for cities and looked forward to working closely together to promote development to smart city, smart transportation and smart health and the journey toward the digital economy.

The deputation indicated that they very much looked forward to further deepening their friendship and collaborations with the Council to force the partnership together.

b) Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council Celebrates the positive relationships between Scotland and Taiwan traced back over 150 years, and Scottish Missionary Dr James Laidlaw Maxwell Senior born and educated in Edinburgh established the first hospital in Formosa (Taiwan).

Acknowledges the relations between Scotland and Taiwan have developed in Green and Renewable energy, Smart City exchange, Science & Technology, and many Cultural and Educational exchanges with a Memorandum of understanding between University of Edinburgh and National Taiwan Ocean University on offshore wind, wave and tidal energy, and a long standing relationship with Royal Botanic Gardens Edinburgh.

Royal Society of Edinburgh (RSE) and the Ministry of Science and Technology have a partnership working on joint scientific research projects, and Culture relationships with ‘Taiwan Season’ have been actively involved in Edinburgh’s Festival Fringe winning many cultural awards.

Agrees that the Chief Executive brings back a report on a potential memorandum of understanding to help foster the existing collaborations.”

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor McVey

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

6 Joint Award of Freedom of the City of Edinburgh on the Mayor of Kyiv and President of Ukraine – Motion by Councillor McVey

a) Deputation – Ukraine Association in Edinburgh

The Lord Provost ruled that the request for a deputation received from the Ukraine Association in Edinburgh, 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 deputation thanked the Council for the support and solidarity shown towards Ukraine over the previous three weeks. They welcomed the motion by Councillor McVey to confer the Freedom of the City on Kyiv Mayor Vitaliy Klitschko and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy both of whom in the

face of an aggressor had stood steadfast via their offices in the Capital Kyiv and looked forward to being able to welcome both gentlemen to the city in the near future to collect their honours.

The deputation felt that it was important that the world stand together with Ukraine and seek to isolate Russia wherever possible. They indicated that the motion by Councillor Day sent a clear message that Russia, it's instruments of state and cultural exports were not welcome in the City while it chose the path of aggression.

The deputation asked the Council to consider other ways of providing support to Ukraine and stressed that as one of Kiev's closest allies, Edinburgh would have a crucial role to play over the coming years, while the immediate concern was for Ukraine to navigate its way through the conflict, they urged the Council to consider how they could enhance and strengthen the city's relationship with Kyiv and Ukraine.

b) Motion by Councillor McVey

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

“Council:

Commends the outstanding leadership of the Mayor of our twin City, Kyiv and the President of Ukraine who has remained in Kyiv to fight against the Russian invasion. Commends the heroism of the Ukrainian people, led by their President, members of parliament and Mayors from across the Country in fighting side-by-side to defend their nation. Agrees to confer the Freedom of the City of Edinburgh on Kyiv Mayor Vitaliy Klitschko and Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy in recognition of their Leadership and heroism.

The Culture and Communities Committee had referred a report on on the People's Network and Open Plus to the Council for approval of the reallocation of £350,000 of capital funding (from Open Plus) to the People's Network, in order to update the hardware for the existing free public access to computing and internet service across the city.”

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

7. Russian Invasion of Ukraine - Motion by Councillor Day

a) Deputation

See item 6 above.

b) Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council condemns the horrific and illegal attacks on the Independence of Ukraine, its people, and their homes. Council also commends the Ukrainian people for their heroic defence of their land in fighting the illegal invasion. Further acknowledges the protests in Russia of brave citizens opposing this war and those Russians within Edinburgh who have stood with Ukraine in making clear this is not in their name.

Council agrees to withdraw all support and cooperation and will withdraw and decline any future invitations to and from the Russian Consulate with immediate effect.

Council agrees to write to the Russian Ambassador, advising that the Russian Consul is no longer welcome in our city and write to the UK Foreign Office to request the expulsion of Russian diplomatic staff from the City of Edinburgh until Russian troops vacate Ukraine.

Notes the Lord Provost has written to the Mayor of Kyiv, expressing our support and further meetings have taken place between the Council Leader, Deputy Leader and Lord Provost, City partnership members and the Ukrainian acting Consul, along with local Ukrainian community leaders.

Notes the relationship Edinburgh had with St Petersburg expired in October 1998.

Further agrees to:

Ban all Russian Government-supported arts and cultural events and performances in Edinburgh Council-owned venues and encourage other venues in the City to do the same.

Write to the Home Office encouraging unrestricted refugee visas and agrees to work locally to source host families to house refugees, with a focus on those with cultural and language understanding to best support unaccompanied children, families and individuals. This should utilise existing

work and organisations like Positive Action on Housing's "room for refugees" programme.

Agrees to publicise the DEC appeal through Council communication channels and encourage financial donations as the best way the people of Edinburgh can help.

Agrees to allocate up to £100,000 from unallocated reserves to help coordinate local efforts of humanitarian aid with the Edinburgh Partnership to maximise supplies to Ukraine and support local infrastructure within Edinburgh to facilitate donations and transport supplies to distribution centres in Poland and other locations.

Agrees to write to the MOD to request access to unused temporary accommodation for those travelling to Edinburgh from Kyiv and wider Ukraine in the knowledge that those people will overwhelmingly want to return to their Country when the war is over.

Agrees officers will continue preparations to make sure that schools are prepared to continue any Ukrainian children's education who are coming to Edinburgh and work to prepare other support services to support those fleeing the conflict."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor McVey

Amendment 1

To add to the motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) Council recognises that many Russians have risked going to jail to condemn President Putin and many have bravely opposed this war publicly and felt the consequences through job losses and arrests. All measures - sanctions, airspace denial, loss of access to funds etc. - are critical to repelling the Russian invasion. However, even as those measures are taken, Council makes clear that this city is not an enemy of the Russian people, just this war and recognises the courageous people of conscience across the Russian population who have expressed opposition to this war and the territorial policies of Russia's ruler.
- 2) Council welcomes the statement from the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court on its intention to open an investigation into events in Ukraine

“as rapidly as possible” in respect to possible crimes against humanity and war crimes committed within Ukraine.

- moved by Councillor Rust, seconded by Councillor Cook

Amendment 2

To add to the motion by Councillor Day:

Agrees to continue further actions in support of Ukraine, including researching options for street renaming and agrees that the Council Leader will write to the Lothian Pension Fund to request it investigates divestment of holdings that support the Russian economy.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Miller

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To condemn the horrific and illegal attacks on the Independence of Ukraine, its people, and their homes. To also commend the Ukrainian people for their heroic defence of their land in fighting the illegal invasion. To further acknowledge the protests in Russia of brave citizens opposing this war and those Russians within Edinburgh who have stood with Ukraine in making clear this was not in their name.
- 2) To agree to withdraw all support and cooperation and would withdraw and decline any future invitations to and from the Russian Consulate with immediate effect.
- 3) To agree to write to the Russian Ambassador, advising that the Russian Consul was no longer welcome in our city and write to the UK Foreign Office to request the expulsion of Russian diplomatic staff from the City of Edinburgh until Russian troops vacated Ukraine.
- 4) To note the Lord Provost had written to the Mayor of Kyiv, expressing our support and further meetings had taken place between the Council Leader, Deputy Leader and Lord Provost, City partnership members and the Ukrainian acting Consul, along with local Ukrainian community leaders.
- 5) To note the relationship Edinburgh had with St Petersburg expired in October 1998.

To further agree to:

- 6) Ban all Russian Government-supported arts and cultural events and performances in Edinburgh Council-owned venues and encourage other venues in the City to do the same.
- 7) Write to the Home Office encouraging unrestricted refugee visas and agrees to work locally to source host families to house refugees, with a focus on those with cultural and language understanding to best support unaccompanied children, families and individuals. This should utilise existing work and organisations like Positive Action on Housing's "room for refugees" programme.
- 8) Publicise the DEC appeal through Council communication channels and encourage financial donations as the best way the people of Edinburgh could help.
- 9) Allocate up to £100,000 from unallocated reserves to help coordinate local efforts of humanitarian aid with the Edinburgh Partnership to maximise supplies to Ukraine and support local infrastructure within Edinburgh to facilitate donations and transport supplies to distribution centres in Poland and other locations.
- 10) Write to the MOD to request access to unused temporary accommodation for those travelling to Edinburgh from Kyiv and wider Ukraine in the knowledge that those people would overwhelmingly want to return to their Country when the war was over.
- 11) Officers continuing preparations to make sure that schools were prepared to continue any Ukrainian children's education who were coming to Edinburgh and work to prepare other support services to support those fleeing the conflict.
- 12) To recognise that many Russians had risked going to jail to condemn President Putin and many had bravely opposed this war publicly and felt the consequences through job losses and arrests. All measures - sanctions, airspace denial, loss of access to funds etc. - were critical to repelling the Russian invasion. However, even as those measures were taken, Council make clear that this city was not an enemy of the Russian people, just this war and recognised the courageous people of conscience across the Russian population who had expressed opposition to this war and the territorial policies of Russia's ruler.
- 13) To welcome the statement from the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court on its intention to open an investigation into events in Ukraine "as

rapidly as possible” in respect to possible crimes against humanity and war crimes committed within Ukraine.

- 14) To agree to continue further actions in support of Ukraine, including researching options for street renaming and agrees that the Council Leader would write to the Lothian Pension Fund to request it investigates divestment of holdings that supported the Russian economy.

8 Minutes

Decision

- a) To approve the minute of the Council of 10 February 2022 as a correct record.
- b) To approve the minute of the Council of 24 February 2022 as a correct record.

9 Leader’s Report

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

- Ongoing operations to support people in Ukraine
- Final scheduled Council meeting – tribute to colleagues

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Councillor Whyte | - | Final Council meeting – recognition of Labour group coalition |
| Councillor Burgess | - | Councillors Main and Mary Campbell’s contributions over the last 5 years |
| | - | Refugees from Ukraine arriving in Edinburgh - support |
| Councillor Aldridge | - | Gratitude to everybody assisting those in Ukraine |
| | - | Tribute to colleagues |
| | - | Tram Inquiry - delay |
| Councillor Day | - | Tribute to colleagues |
| | - | Commend officers for support to Ukraine community |
| Councillor Kate Campbell | - | Tribute to colleagues |
| | - | Delivery of new Castlebrae School – community support |

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Councillor Webber | - Economic recovery – East side of the City congestion – Waverley Bridge |
| Councillor Miller | - Tribute to colleagues |
| | - Free public transport - extension for refugees and asylum seekers |
| Councillor Lang | - Resignation of SNP Group members during past 5 year term |
| Councillor Munro | - Work done in Leith ward |
| | - Regret that the Capital grant settlement for the city is the lowest in the country |
| Councillor Gordon | - Reducing pressure and strain on the NHS |
| Councillor Jim Campbell | - Tribute to colleagues |
| | - Victoria Primary School move – resources for school travel plan |
| Councillor Barrie | - Funding for building new homes – borrowing options |
| Councillor Gardiner | - Progress of mixed tenure pilot project - Murrayburn |
| Councillor Howie | - Lack of Gilmerton Medical Centre – clarification of current position of local GP services |
| Councillor Macinnes | - Tribute to colleagues |
| | - Roads maintenance work – improvement in roads conditions index |

10 Performance Update Report - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had a referred a report which provided the second update on Council performance following the initial performance report to Elected Members in November 2021, to the City of Edinburgh Council for decision.

Motion

- 1) To note the Performance Update report at Appendix A to the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To note the progress to next steps for implementation of the Council's Planning and Performance Framework as set out in the report.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

- 1) To recognise the work and willingness of officers to improve matters and continue to develop a suitable Performance framework as set out in the aims described in Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.3 of the report by the Chief Executive.
- 2) To note with regret that it took the current Council Administration four years to agree to remodel the performance framework and that this had only happened following a highly critical Best Value Audit. This Audit re stated previous external calls for an improved performance system ignored by the previous Administration made up of the same political groups, strongly criticised performance reporting to the public and was an echo of the Conservative Group's repeated calls for improved performance reporting.
- 3) To consider that a change to the performance framework so late in this Council Administration's term meant few backward comparisons could be made with this latest report largely only providing half year data to November/December 2021 so limiting the usefulness to the public in reviewing the closing performance of this Council Administration. In this context was notable that almost half of the "High Level Overview" Targets were new or had no or partial data against which they could be considered.
- 4) To note with concern the areas where performance was unacceptable, examples of which were:
 - a) Litter monitoring scores showed a dramatic drop in street cleanliness which had seen Edinburgh's score drop such that we had the dirtiest streets of the cities in Scotland.
 - b) Domestic Waste Recycling while given a Green RAG status had only improved to the level inherited by this Administration in 2016/17 at 43%, was 3% below the 46% figure the Administration claimed was the rate in 2017 when it set its Coalition Commitments and had made no progress whatsoever towards this Administration's 60% target.

- c) Affordable homes completion rates were being measured against a target of 1218 which would barely be met and failed to build to the 20,000 target for 2027 given performance in the previous two years average approximately 1,100 completions a year.
 - d) Edinburgh's roads and pavements still had a £77m repair backlog and there was no indicator to determine progress with resolving this issue which remained a major concern for residents.
 - e) Indicators on pupil attainment, particularly for those most disadvantaged were worsening.
- 5) To consider the results of the "Performance by Priority" section of the report to be a damning indictment of this Administration's approach to delivery of their own Priorities given that:
- a) Only two of 39 targets under "Ending Poverty by 2030" were on or ahead of target.
 - b) Only two of 17 targets under "Becoming a Sustainable and Net Zero City" were on or ahead of target.
 - c) While 19 of 31 targets under "Wellbeing and Equality" were on or ahead of target, many of these were ongoing administrative measures that did not fundamentally change wellbeing or Equality but simply maintained existing and expected service standards.
- 6) To consider that this late adoption of a new Performance Framework taken alongside the politically driven reporting on the Coalition Commitments, highlighted the approach of this Administration that had hidden from performance reporting throughout its term, had failed to focus on service improvement or delivery of its political promises and illustrated its failure to act on the core priorities of the Council elected to serve the people of Edinburgh.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Mowat

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	41 votes
For the amendment	-	16 votes
Abstain	-	2

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

Key, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Main, Miller, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rae, Rankin, Neil Ross, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Louise Young.

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

Abstentions: Councillors Barrie and Bridgman.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(Reference – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 22 February 2022 (item 10); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

11 Coalition Commitments Progress Update 2021/22 - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a report on the Coalition Commitments Progress Update 2021/2022 to the City of Edinburgh Council for decision. In summary, of the 52 commitments, 30 had been fully achieved, 18 partially achieved and 4 would not be achieved.

Motion

Council notes the final achievements status, determined by officers, based on data, definitive actions and outcomes presented in the report.

Notes this has been the most challenging Council term in living memory, with more than 40% of this Administration being dominated by a global pandemic and another five years of a UK Conservative Government who have deliberately pushed thousands of our residents and children into poverty with disgraceful decisions on universal credit, triple lock pension guarantee and the family cap- with its disgusting “rape clause”.

Council notes in spite of these factors, and many others, the Council has kept focus on improving local services, fighting poverty and tackling climate change while working with colleagues at COSLA on fair funding from Scottish Government for local authorities to help us deliver these aims.

Council notes that 48 of the 52 commitments have either been fully achieved or partially achieved with substantial progress being made. These include the expansion of 1140 hours of childcare for every 3, 4 and vulnerable 2 year old, the delivery of a world-class new Meadowbank Sports Centre, planting a net increase of 50,000 extra trees and the biggest City Deal in Scotland, turning Edinburgh into the

Data Capital of Europe and doubling the delivery of Council homes built as well as staying on track to deliver 20,000 affordable homes by 2027- to name a few.

Further notes even within the 4 set at “not achieved”, these include a commitment to limit Council tax increases to 3% a year, and while this was not achieved each year in isolation, it was achieved as an average through the whole Council term. Also notes this includes trying to get a community right of appeal in planning applications, which the Council did work with communities to try and achieve but as the decision was not in our gift, ultimately this wasn’t successful.

Council thanks officers across all departments for their hard work in the last five years in such challenging circumstances, implementing policies and changes that the people of Edinburgh voted for at the last election.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 1

Council:

- 1) Notes the report and that previous Conservative amendments in 2017, 2018 and 2019 sought to improve both the pledges and the reporting process but were rejected by the SNP/Labour Administration.
- 2) Notes that the Administration has sought to continue the approach of its predecessor in taking up officer time attempting to measure and justify unmeasurable political ambitions.
- 3) Recognises the considerable time and effort officers have spent in producing this report and acknowledges that they accept the commitments were not accompanied by trackable SMART outcomes.
- 4) Therefore, agrees that the current politically based pledge and reporting process is flawed and notes that this has been superseded by the revised performance framework and Council Business Plan.
- 5) Agrees that in future officer resources should not be used to produce, monitor or validate overtly party-political agreements and that a protocol to this end should be included in induction packs for the new Council following the May 2022 council election.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

Amendment 2

Council:

- 1) Notes this report on commitments made in 2017 by the SNP/Labour coalition administration and that these commitments do not necessarily reflect the priorities of Green Councillors in acting to deliver on Climate Change and social justice. Further notes the generally constructive approach taken by Green councillors throughout this council term towards the achievement and strengthening of those commitments that are held in common;
- 2) Recognises that this council administration has taken place during the Covid-19 pandemic which has seriously affected the ability of the council to deliver services in the usual way and to further develop services as intended. Nonetheless believes that progress on certain commitments should be re-evaluated as follows;
- 3) Notes that the coalition commitment 8 to 'Explore the introduction of **fair rent zones**' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. Further notes that the council has been unable to introduce a Rent Pressure Zone under the legislation and guidance as it stands, that it would require this to be altered to make it possible to implement such a zone, and that continued rising rents contribute to the cost of living crisis. Welcomes the Scottish Government's plans to introduce rent controls which will truly allow the necessary action to tackle out of control private sector rents. Therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 8 to 'Will Not Be Achieved' to reflect the lack of impact of the current legislation for residents paying unaffordable rents;
- 4) Notes that the coalition commitment 18 to 'Improve Edinburgh's **air quality** and reduce **carbon emissions**. Explore the implementation of Low Emission Zones' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. Further notes that the 'Key Measure' of percentage (%) reduction in CO2 emission has not been quantified in the final year and that the 'Key Measure' of a decreasing long-term trend of Air Quality Management Areas has not been met. Therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 18 to 'Partially Achieved' to reflect the progress towards a implementing a Low Emission Zone but the slower progress on air quality and carbon emissions;
- 5) Notes that the coalition commitment 24 to 'Reduce the incidence of **dog fouling** on Edinburgh's streets and public parks' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. However notes that in the 2018 Edinburgh People Survey, the last date for which figures are available, shows that 50% of respondents report that dog fouling is very common or fairly common in their neighbourhoods; notes that a reduction in dog fouling service requests does not necessarily mean that fewer incidents of dog fouling are occurring and may in fact indicate

that residents feel reporting makes no difference; nonetheless notes some progress on initiatives such as 'My Beach Your Beach' campaign, and therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 24 to 'Partially achieved';

- 6) Notes that the coalition commitment 25 to 'Increase **recycling** to 60% from 46% during the lifetime of the administration' has been reported as 'Will not be achieved'. Is disappointed that recycling rates have actually fallen, rather than increased, during most of the coalition term and ending at only 43.1%. Agrees with this evaluation and recognises that any future administration will have to significantly improve performance in this area to meet with sustainability goals;
- 7) Notes that the coalition commitment to 27 'Tackle **pavement parking** and reduce **street clutter** to improve accessibility' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. Further notes that while progress has been made to reduce and remove street clutter, there has been little or no progress in practice towards tackling pavement parking and that the Transport Act contains exceptions which will allow some pavement parking to continue when the council begins enforcement activity. Therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 27 to 'Partially Achieved' to reflect the good progress on street clutter but the lack of progress on pavement parking;
- 8) Notes that the coalition commitment 35 to 'Improve access to **library services and community centres** making them more digital and delivering them in partnership with local communities' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. Further notes that, although digital access to libraries may have increased through the covid-19 pandemic lockdown, access to libraries and community centres was severely curtailed and that access has still not been restored to pre-lockdown levels with some libraries continuing to act as testing centres and some community centres still not fully operational. Therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 35 to 'Partially Achieved' to reflect that access to libraries and community centres has not been improved;
- 9) Notes that the coalition commitment 36 to 'Support the continued development of **Gaelic Medium Education**' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. However notes the council has failed to agree a site or identify funding for a GME secondary school; has failed to identify locations or funding for new GME primary schools; has failed to publish a strategy for the recruitment and retention of GME teachers, and that a recent survey of GME parents/carers found that 86 per cent had little or no confidence that the council's plans would meet the educational needs of their children. Nonetheless, notes and welcomes the appointment of a Corporate Gaelic Development Officer and other progress on GME and therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 36 to 'Partially achieved';

- 10) Notes that the coalition commitment 38 'Take steps to increase the length and flexibility of **care visits** and increase the **availability of care** to help people to live in their own homes' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. Further notes that report does not acknowledge the crisis in Health and Social Care: the delayed discharge numbers reported only reflect a small proportion of the demand for social care, and the vast majority are those people waiting in the community for assessment and a package of care - the unmet need list reached almost 900 people in December. Further notes that H&SCP was put back into emergency measures over the winter in order to cope with demand; that un-filled posts across the system are running at around 30%, that some of the external contractors, who provide around 80% of care at home, were unable to cope with their existing care commitment in the months to December 21, handing back almost 1400 hours of care-packages back to the Council. Further notes that council staff who are to be commended for their continuing commitment, are exhausted and demoralised having worked through the pandemic and continuing crises to look after our frail residents. Therefore amends the evaluation of the Coalition Commitment to 'Partially Achieved';
- 11) Notes that the coalition commitment 44 to 'Increase **allotment provision** and support and expand the network and the number of community gardens and food growing initiatives' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. Further notes that while the number of growing spaces has increased by 154, that the number of people on the waiting list has increased dramatically over the council term from 2,814 to 5,658 and therefore that there are now only 0.35 allotments per person on the waiting list compared to 0.64 at the start of the coalition term reflecting a worsening capacity to meet demand. Therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 44 to 'Partially Achieved' to reflect that overall provision in relation to demand has worsened;
- 12) Notes that the coalition commitment 48 to 'Continue to make a case to the Scottish Government for the introduction of a **Transient Visitor Levy** and explore the possibility of introducing more flexibility in the application of business rates. Explore the possibility of introducing a workplace parking levy.' has been evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. However notes that whilst the case was made for a TVL, that the Council still does not have the ability to collect a visitor levy and therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 48 to 'Partially achieved' as whilst there has been progress, there is still a need for the Council to pursue implementation of the TVL with the Scottish Government;
- 13) Notes that the coalition commitment 47 to 'Become a leading council in Scotland for community engagement - 1% of the Council's discretionary budget will be allocated through **participatory budgeting**' has been

evaluated as 'Fully Achieved'. However notes that only 0.32% of the council's discretionary budget was allocated through PB in 2021/22, and that this figure has only been achieved through redesignating the NEP budget as PB and therefore amends the evaluation of coalition commitment 47 to 'Will not be achieved'.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment 3

Council notes the report 'Coalition Commitments Progress Report 2021/22' as prepared by officers.

Council notes that that many of the commitments made in 2017 were vague and were agreed by the SNP and Labour groups without a clear understanding of how success would be measured.

Nevertheless, Council believes the content of the report shows a record of failure by the SNP / Labour coalition over the last five years, specifically the:

failure to build at least 10,000 affordable homes, with only 5,508 completed.

failure to deliver any meaningful difference to the condition of Edinburgh's road network, having repeatedly voted against investing substantial extra sums for roadway repairs and resurfacing.

failure to deliver on its promise to increase street cleanliness.

failure to deliver any proper or sustained increase in recycling levels whilst introducing the unpopular 'garden tax' on brown bin collections and reneging on its promise to abolish the charge for bulky uplifts.

failure to eliminate the use of B&B accommodation for families who are homeless.

failure to deliver an effective low emission zone, with the agreed SNP/Labour scheme ignoring key pollution hotspots outside the core city centre and risking a worsening of air quality in certain streets.

failure to deliver the promised tram extension on time, with the project now representing a significant financial risk on Council finances because of the flawed financial case.

failure to tackle the growing issue of pavement parking, caused in part by the SNP Scottish Government failure to fully implement the necessary provisions within the Transport (Scotland) Act 2019.

failure to build the 12 new schools by 2021 as promised whilst inexcusably cutting teacher budgets at each and every school at the height of the COVID pandemic.

failure to improve community safety following the administration's decision to scrap all council funding for community policing across the city.

Council believes:

a decade of SNP and Labour control of Edinburgh Council has failed the city.

the people of Edinburgh deserve far better in return for the council tax they must pay each year.

- moved by Councillor Aldridge, seconded by Councillor Lang

Voting

First vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	26 votes
For Amendment 1	-	16 votes
For Amendment 2	-	9 votes
For Amendment 3	-	6votes
Abstentions	-	1

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

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

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

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

Abstentions: Councillor Barrie.)

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

Voting

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	26 votes
For Amendment 1	-	16 votes
For Amendment 2	-	9 votes
Abstentions	-	7

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

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

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

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(Reference – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 22 February 2022 (item 11); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted.)

12 Point of Order

Councillor Jim Campbell raised a point of Order under Standing Order 25.1 that as it had now reached 5pm that Item 7.6 on the agenda (Monitoring Officer Report) should not be subject to the terms of the 5pm rule should be debated in full.

- moved by Councillor Jim Campbell, seconded by Councillor Cook

Voting

That Standing Order 25.1 should not apply	-	19 votes
That Standing Order 25.1 should apply	-	36 votes
Abstentions	-	2

(That Standing Order 25.1 should not apply: Councillors Arthur, Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Dickie, Daggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rae, Rose, Rust, Webber and Whyte.

That Standing Order 25.1 should apply: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rankin, Neil Ross, Smith, Staniforth, Watt, Wilson, Work and Louise Young.)

Abstentions: Councillors Main and Miller.)

Decision

That Standing Order 25.1 should apply to Item 7.6 on the agenda (Monitoring Officer Report).

13 Annual Treasury Management Strategy 2022/23 - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resource Committee had referred a report on the Annual Treasury Management Strategy 2022/23 to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval of the report and the change to the Council's Treasury Management Policy Statement.

Decision

To approve the Annual Treasury Strategy 2022/23 and the change to the Council's Treasury Management Policy Statement.

(Reference – Finance and Resources Committee of 3 March 2022 (item 5); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

14 Sustainable Capital Strategy 2022-32 – Annual Report - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred a report on the Sustainable Capital Strategy 2022-32 – Annual Report to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval.

Motion

To approve the Sustainable Capital Strategy 2022-32 – Annual Report.

- moved by Councillor Munn, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Amendment

To add to the motion by Councillor Munn:

Notes that there is considerable uncertainty as to the adequacy of future funding arrangements, with concerns raised within the report that 'later phases of the programme could not be delivered within the ten-year strategy.

Requests that a report be brought back to the first Council of the new term setting out alternative options should said funding fail to materialise.

- moved by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Bruce

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	42 votes
For the amendment	-	16 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(References - Finance and Resources Committee of 3 March 2022 (item 6); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

15 Office of Lord Provost: Year 5 Final Report 2021/22

An annual report had been submitted to Council for each year of the current Lord Provostship. For this fifth and final report under the current administration, the timeline had been shortened to the ten month period June 2021 to March 2022.

Details were provided on the work and commitments of the Civic Leadership from June 2021 to March 2022, a period of ongoing restriction in the daily life of the city and the range of activity undertaken was described in the context of partial recovery and the scope to resume key civic functions in the latter part of 2021. Further detail

was also provided on other policy related initiatives, including the support for the OneCity Trust, City Vision and the Lord Provost's Commission 'The Strategy for Our Ex Forces Personnel'.

Key requirements of the new administration and Civic Leadership had been identified along with specific proposals for the marking of The Queen's Platinum Jubilee.

Motion

- 1) To note the continuing impact of COVID restrictions on the operation of the civic diary in 2021/22.
- 2) To welcome the partial resumption of civic life in 2021/22 and commend the range and volume of key civic events taking place over the last year.
- 3) To agree the need to continue the excellent working relationships between the Lord Provost, Depute Lord Provost and Bailies, as set out in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 4) To welcome the further action taken on specific policy initiatives during this Lord Provostship as set out in paragraphs 4.7 to 4.17 of the report.
- 5) To note the requirement for the new administration to support core business including succession planning for the monarchy as set out in paragraphs 4.18 to 4.21 of the report.
- 6) To welcome the opportunity to celebrate the Platinum Jubilee in 2022.
- 7) To approve expenditure of up £30,000 from the reserve fund in Civic Hospitality on Jubilee events taking place on 5 June 2022 as set out in paragraphs 5.1 to 5.4 of the report.

- moved by The Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Amendment

To add at the end of paragraph 7 of the motion by the Lord Provost:

"and that any unused funds will be made available to support council-approved community 'Playing Out' events."

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Rae

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by the Lord Provost:

- 1) To note the continuing impact of COVID restrictions on the operation of the civic diary in 2021/22.
- 2) To welcome the partial resumption of civic life in 2021/22 and commend the range and volume of key civic events taking place over the last year.
- 3) To agree the need to continue the excellent working relationships between the Lord Provost, Depute Lord Provost and Bailies, as set out in paragraphs 4.4 and 4.5 of the report by the Interim Executive Director of Corporate Services.
- 4) To welcome the further action taken on specific policy initiatives during this Lord Provostship as set out in paragraphs 4.7 to 4.17 of the report.
- 5) To note the requirement for the new administration to support core business including succession planning for the monarchy as set out in paragraphs 4.18 to 4.21 of the report.
- 6) To welcome the opportunity to celebrate the Platinum Jubilee in 2022.
- 7) To approve expenditure of up to £30,000 from the reserve fund in Civic Hospitality on Jubilee events taking place on 5 June 2022 as set out in paragraphs 5.1 to 5.4 of the report and that any unused funds will be made available to support council-approved community 'Playing Out' events.

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

16 Monitoring Officer Report

The Lord Provost ruled that the Coalition amendment, 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

Details were provided on an investigation into practices and activities within ESS following a whistleblowing disclosure which had identified significant failings over a lengthy period of time (over 10 years). Given the serious and sustained failings recorded in the investigation outcome report, the Monitoring Officer considered that these should be brought to the attention of Council in terms of section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989. The full detail of the disclosures had been set out in the background papers which had been made available to elected members on a confidential basis given the sensitive nature of the content. Details of the service's Action Plan to address the matters identified were also provided.

Motion

- 1) To note that an internal investigation into alleged malpractice within Edinburgh Secure Services (“ESS”) had been completed.
- 2) To note that the Council’s Monitoring Officer was reporting to Council, under s.5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, that in the course of the discharge of the Council’s functions he considered that there had been illegality, maladministration and injustice.
- 3) To note the seriousness of the issues highlighted in the Whistleblowing Major Investigation Outcome Report (Edinburgh Secure Services) and express sincere gratitude for those who had highlighted these issues and contributed to the establishment of the facts of these events.
- 4) To apologise to the young people affected and commit to the swift implementation of the actions outlined in the appendix to the report by the Monitoring Officer.
- 5) To agree not to be diverted by anyone attempting to use these events to shift focus away from the fundamental role as a Council, and as Councillors, to support people who had been victims of wrongdoing or abuse.
- 6) To note the words in section 9.1 of the Independent investigation reported to Council on October 2021 which were applicable:

“The Recommendations are intended to provide a positive framework for the organisation to address many of the identified failings of the past and it would not be in the interests of the CEC, or those whom it serves, for the Inquiry Team’s conclusions, observations or Recommendations to be seized upon by elected members or their parties and used for political gain. It is the Inquiry Team’s view that to do so would be reprehensible, particularly given the extremely sensitive nature of the Inquiry’s subject matter and the interests of the survivors.”
- 7) To agree the behaviour of the Conservative group was playing politics with these events and inappropriately, unfairly, unprofessionally targeting an individual officer with no notice or providing no opportunity to respond. This behaviour explicitly undermined progress towards an open, transparent and accountable culture.
- 8) To note that in the recent independent reports, culture change was evidenced by the independent review team and the independent Chair following the appointment of Andrew Kerr as Chief Executive.

- 9) To further note the holistic independent recommendations had been adopted in full and resourced by Council, being delivered by the Chief Executive and Council management - in stark contrast Conservative Councillors had supported no resource allocation to support the implementation of the recommendations and no credible alternative plan to improve Council Culture.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment

Council notes the Monitoring Officers Report.

Council expresses concern that the full report, available to councillors in a data room, describes a series of service failures over a number of years that amount to illegality, maladministration and injustice to a number of the most vulnerable young people in the care of the Council. There is ample evidence that these failings were known about but that the action required to resolve them was not driven through the system by management despite previous action plans.

Council notes that this situation is similar to the approach to resolving risk and concern exemplified by four red rated Internal Audit Overviews in a row and the slow progress in addressing overdue audit actions across the Council.

Council notes that the cultural issues described in the background information are similar, but magnify, the types of failings that have been described by Suzanne Tanner QC in her Independent Review of Culture within the Council which resulted in 50 recommendations for action and that, in this case these significant issues were present within the service at least until 2019.

Council records that the Chief Executive has given continued assurance to councillors, in public and in private, that he has been driving cultural improvements within the organisation since 2016 and that some of this has been founded on changes to the Whistleblowing Policy from earlier than that. That assurance was based on the suggestion that any wrongdoing was historic and management practices had improved to address concerns since then. However, the evidence of this report and others suggests that significant cultural issues remain that the Chief Executive fails to recognise and has not taken steps to address.

Council therefore agrees it has no confidence in the ability of the Chief Executive to drive the cultural change within management that is necessary to resolve the failings within the Council.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Johnston

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	39 votes
For the amendment	-	17 votes
Abstentions	-	1

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

For the amendment: Councillors Bridgman, Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Cook, Dickie, Doggart, Douglas, Hutchison, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte

Abstentions: Councillor Barrie.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor McVey.

(Reference - report by the Monitoring Officer, submitted.)

17 Council Response to Latest UN IPCC Report on Climate Change - Motion by Councillor Burgess

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

“Council;

- 1) Recognises the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) issued a “a dire warning about the consequences of inaction” on Climate Change on 28 Feb 2022. In this latest report the IPCC warned that accelerated action is required to adapt to the climate crisis, as well as rapid, deep cuts in greenhouse gas emissions.
- 2) Notes that although Edinburgh Council has set its own target of Net Zero carbon by 2030 and produced a 2030 Net Zero Strategy for the City, the Council implementation plan and city-wide working are at an early stage and will require significant investment of resources to be successful.

- 3) Notes that the Council revenue budget for 2022/23 sets aside an additional £500k for climate change in the coming year.
- 4) Therefore, requests a report to the next Policy and Sustainability Committee that lays out the most recent IPCC report findings and sets out options for allocation council funding and resources to accelerate action on the Climate Emergency in response to the latest UN IPCC report.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Rae

Amendment 1

To replace paragraph 4 of the motion by Councillor Burgess with:

Therefore, requests an update in the Business Bulletin of the next Policy and Sustainability Committee that sets out allocation of Council funding and resources to accelerate action on the Climate Emergency in the context of the latest UN IPCC report.

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

To accept points 1) to 3) of the motion by Councillor Burgess.

To replace point 4) of the motion with:

‘4) Therefore instructs the Council Leader to write to the Scottish Government to seek additional funding to accelerate action on the Climate Emergency in response to the latest UN IPCC report, in particular to provide funding for flood prevention and coastal protection measures, and to request a report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee that sets out options for the allocation of any additional funding. This report should also set out options for the allocation of existing council funding and resources to support the same objective.’

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross, seconded by Councillor Osler

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Burgess:

- 1) To recognise the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) issued a “a dire warning about the consequences of inaction” on Climate Change on 28 Feb 2022. In this latest report the IPCC warned that accelerated action was required to adapt to the climate crisis, as well as rapid, deep cuts in greenhouse gas emissions.
- 2) To note that although Edinburgh Council had set its own target of Net Zero carbon by 2030 and produced a 2030 Net Zero Strategy for the City, the Council implementation plan and city-wide working were at an early stage and would require significant investment of resources to be successful.
- 3) To note that the Council revenue budget for 2022/23 set aside an additional £500k for climate change in the coming year.
- 4) To therefore, request an update in the Business Bulletin of the next Policy and Sustainability Committee that set out allocation of Council funding and resources to accelerate action on the Climate Emergency in the context of the latest UN IPCC report.
- 5) To therefore instruct the Council Leader to write to the Scottish Government to seek additional funding to accelerate action on the Climate Emergency in response to the latest UN IPCC report, in particular to provide funding for flood prevention and coastal protection measures.

18 Updating the Taxicard Scheme - Motion by Councillor Staniforth

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

“Council notes

That the Edinburgh Taxicard scheme is intended to improve mobility access to those who have difficulty accessing public transport owing to disability.

That the card is valid for up to 104 journeys a year and means that for the first £5 of any journey the holder only pays £2, effectively making it a £3 subsidy on virtually any journey.

That neither number of journeys allowed nor the size of the discount has been updated since the scheme’s instigation. The latter meaning that the card has lost a great deal of value in real terms in the intervening years.

Council therefore:

Resolves that officers will hold a consultation with Taxicard holders (and any other relevant stakeholders) on potential updates to the Taxicard scheme including but not limited to increasing the number of journeys allowed and increasing the discount it grants.

Resolves that a report on potential updates to the scheme should come to Finance and Resources Committee with due time for parties to be able to consider adding such an update to their proposed budget for the year 2023/24.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Howie

Amendment

1) To replace the last 2 paragraphs of the motion by Councillor Staniforth with:

“Notes the engagement and consultation with stakeholders already planned as part of the review of the Taxicard service and that recommendations relating to this review will be reported to Transport and Environment Committee in Spring 2023.

Agrees that briefings will be provided by officers to parties as part of the next budget process on options for consideration.”

- 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 Staniforth:

- 1) To note that the Edinburgh Taxicard scheme was intended to improve mobility access to those who had difficulty accessing public transport owing to disability.
- 2) To note that the card was valid for up to 104 journeys a year and meant that for the first £5 of any journey the holder only paid £2, effectively making it a £3 subsidy on virtually any journey.

- 3) To note that neither number of journeys allowed nor the size of the discount had been updated since the scheme's instigation. The latter meant that the card had lost a great deal of value in real terms in the intervening years.
- 4) To note the engagement and consultation with stakeholders already planned as part of the review of the Taxicard service and that recommendations relating to this review would be reported to Transport and Environment Committee in Spring 2023.
- 5) To agree that briefings would be provided by officers to parties as part of the next budget process on options for consideration.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Howie made a transparency statement in respect of the above item as a Taxicard holder.

19 Homelessness Funding - Motion by Councillor Johnston

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

“Regrets that Council did not receive Homelessness funding on the same basis as Glasgow City Council.

Agrees in principle to seek to bring Council's Homelessness services under the umbrella of the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board, this being the only way to get fair funding for Edinburgh from the Scottish Government

Instructs the Chief Executive to prepare the necessary reports for Committee to implement this change in organisation. Further instructs that the Chief Executive explores how retrospective funding for Edinburgh's Homelessness service could be claimed from the Scottish Government.

Said report should set out the options for increasing elected member democratic oversight, were the EIJB delegated said authority”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Johnston

- moved by Councillor Johnston, seconded by Councillor Jim Campbell

Amendment

To delete all after 'Glasgow City Council' in the motion by Councillor Johnston and replace with:

Notes this is part of ongoing discussions between the Council Leader and Deputy Leader, during their meetings with the Cabinet Secretary for Finance and the Economy, and the Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Housing and Local Government.

Agrees to work collectively to make the case for fair funding for homelessness services in Edinburgh.

Further agrees the HHFW Convener and Vice Convenor will write to restate our request to the Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Housing and Local Government and;

Further to request that the Scottish Government works with COSLA to ensure that funding for Rapid Rehousing Transition Plans is allocated on the basis of need, taking into account factors such as the number of households in temporary accommodation and the waiting time for social housing, not just on homeless presentations.

- moved by Councillor Kate Campbell, seconded by Councillor Watt

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	16 votes
For the amendment	-	42 votes

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

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

Decision

To approve the following amendment by Councillor Kate Campbell:

- 1) To regret that Council did not receive Homelessness funding on the same basis as Glasgow City Council.
- 2) To note this was part of ongoing discussions between the Council Leader and Deputy Leader, during their meetings with the Cabinet Secretary for Finance and the Economy, and the Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Housing and Local Government.
- 3) To agree to work collectively to make the case for fair funding for homelessness services in Edinburgh.
- 4) To further agree the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee Convener and Vice Convener would write to restate the Council's request to the Cabinet Secretary for Social Justice, Housing and Local Government.
- 5) To further request that the Scottish Government work with COSLA to ensure that funding for Rapid Rehousing Transition Plans was allocated on the basis of need, taking into account factors such as the number of households in temporary accommodation and the waiting time for social housing, not just on homeless presentations.

20 Review into Stadium Parking - Motion by Councillor Douglas

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

“Council:

Notes that alongside the second phase of the Strategic Review of Parking, council officers were investigating the possibility of introducing controlled parking areas around stadiums in Edinburgh on days when large events were taking place.

Understands that as part of the administration's decision to carry out further engagement on the Strategic Review of Parking until Autumn 2022, plans for a potential stadium permit were unnecessarily delayed in the meantime.

Appreciates that this is a pressing issue for many residents who are adversely affected by the huge influx of parked vehicles around their homes during these events.

Agrees that the stadiums review should be progressed separately as soon as possible so that engagement can begin with communities on the demand for parking restrictions in their area during these events.

Therefore, asks for officers to present a report with their proposals to the first Transport and Environment Committee held after this May's elections."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Douglas.

- moved by Councillor Douglas, seconded by Councillor McLellan

Amendment

To amend paragraph 2 of the motion by Councillor Douglas to read:

"Understands that as part of the administration's decision to carry out further engagement on the Strategic Review of Parking until Autumn 2022, plans for a potential stadium permit were delayed in order to retain the joined up approach;"

To replace paragraphs 4-5 of the motion as follows:

"Agrees to continue with the Strategic Review of Parking including stadium parking, so that changes to parking are coordinated;

Calls for the next report from officers on the Strategic Review of Parking to include comment on how stadiums and Council could work in partnership to increase the number of people choosing sustainable transport to events, in advance of implementation of changes to car parking."

- moved by Councillor Miller, seconded by Councillor Burgess

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	24 votes
For the amendment	-	34 votes

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

For the amendment: The Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bird, Booth, Burgess, Cameron, Kate Campbell, Mary Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gordon, Graczyk, Griffiths, Henderson, Howie, Key, Macinnes,

Main, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Miller, Munn, Munro, Perry, Rankin, Rae, Staniforth, Watt and Work.)

Decision

To approve the following amendment by Councillor Miller:

- 1) To note that alongside the second phase of the Strategic Review of Parking, council officers were investigating the possibility of introducing controlled parking areas around stadiums in Edinburgh on days when large events were taking place.
- 2) To understand that as part of the administration's decision to carry out further engagement on the Strategic Review of Parking until Autumn 2022, plans for a potential stadium permit were delayed in order to retain the joined up approach.
- 3) To appreciate that this was a pressing issue for many residents who were adversely affected by the huge influx of parked vehicles around their homes during these events.
- 4) To agree to continue with the Strategic Review of Parking including stadium parking, so that changes to parking were coordinated;
- 5) To call for the next report from officers on the Strategic Review of Parking to include comment on how stadiums and Council could work in partnership to increase the number of people choosing sustainable transport to events, in advance of implementation of changes to car parking.

21 Endorsement of Plant-Based Treaty - Motion by Councillor Burgess

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes requests by residents for the Council to support the call for negotiation of a Plant Based Treaty by national governments as a companion to the UN Paris Climate Agreement [www.plantbasedtreaty.org].
- 2) Notes the Treaty aims to halt the widespread degradation of critical ecosystems caused by conventional animal agriculture, to promote a shift to more healthy, sustainable plant-based diets and to actively reverse damage done to planetary functions, ecosystem services and biodiversity, with three core principles:

- a) Relinquish: no land use change, ecosystem degradation or deforestation for conventional animal agriculture;
 - b) Redirect: an active transition away from animal based food systems to plant-based systems;
 - c) Restore: actively restore key ecosystems, particularly restoring forests and rewinding landscapes.
- 3) Requests a report on the implications for the council if it were to endorse the call for this treaty and integrate its principles and relevant actions, including for cities and education, into current strategies and action plans.”

- moved by Councillor Burgess, seconded by Councillor Booth

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Burgess.

22 Barriers to Elected Office - Motion by Councillor Main

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

“Council notes that

- 1) In May 2017 only 29% of Councillors elected across Scotland were women, although they make up 50% of the population.
- 2) Subsequently the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) set up a Barriers to Elected Office Special Interest Group (BEO SIG) to look at ways of addressing this issue. The remit was later expanded to include not just women facing to barriers to office but all under represented groups.
- 3) The SIG has taken a long term approach, and although it has had some notable successes, including undertaking research that clearly identified barriers and a commitment from Ben Macpherson, Minister for Social Security and Local Government, to a joint independent review with COSLA of Councillors remuneration to be undertaken at pace this year, there is much still to be achieved before election results reflect the make up of the population.

Therefore

- 4) This Council agrees to continue to work to remove barriers that face women and all under-represented groups in standing as candidates in local Authority elections and carryout the role of an elected councillor.

- 5) Council requests a short report, giving a breakdown of the numbers of candidates and elected councillors by gender and by under-represented groups to Policy and sustainability Committee, (or the relevant Committee) at the first meeting after the 5th May election, to inform discussions and further action to be taken.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Main.

- moved by Councillor Main, seconded by Councillor Miller

Amendment

To add to the motion by Councillor Main:

“Council requests that this report includes details of work that could be undertaken at a Council level to meet our collective commitment to increase the diversity of the councillor group and to ensure that CEC is a representative democratic body serving all of Edinburgh’s communities.

- moved by Councillor Bird, seconded by Councillor Day

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Main:

- 1) To note that In May 2017 only 29% of Councillors elected across Scotland were women, although they make up 50% of the population.
- 2) To note that subsequently the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA) set up a Barriers to Elected Office Special Interest Group (BEO SIG) to look at ways of addressing this issue. The remit was later expanded to include not just women facing to barriers to office but all under represented groups.
- 3) To note that the SIG had taken a long term approach, and although it had had some notable successes, including undertaking research that clearly identified barriers and a commitment from Ben Macpherson, Minister for Social Security and Local Government, to a joint independent review with COSLA of Councillors remuneration to be undertaken at pace this year, there was much still to be achieved before election results reflected the make up of the population.

- 4) To therefore agree to continue to work to remove barriers that faced women and all under-represented groups in standing as candidates in local Authority elections and carryout the role of an elected councillor.
- 5) To request a short report, giving a breakdown of the numbers of candidates and elected councillors by gender and by under-represented groups to Policy and sustainability Committee, (or the relevant Committee) at the first meeting after the 5th May election, to inform discussions and further action to be taken.
- 6) To request that this report includes details of work that could be undertaken at a Council level to meet our collective commitment to increase the diversity of the councillor group and to ensure that CEC is a representative democratic body serving all of Edinburgh's communities.

23 Edinburgh Opposes Freeports - Motion by Councillor Booth

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes the UK government's aim to establish “freeports” around the UK which would provide duty free import and export of goods, simplified customs procedures and varied economic regulations; further notes the recent announcement that the Scottish Government will cooperate with the UK Government on the establishment of “green freeports” in Scotland.
- 2) Notes that freeports have been associated with tax avoidance, money laundering, organised crime, erosion of workers' pay and conditions and poor environmental standards and that any attempt to brand them “green freeports” is simply greenwashing.
- 3) Agrees the council will not support the Port of Leith, Edinburgh Airport or any other application or consortium within the Edinburgh council area pursuing “green freeport” status.
- 4) Agrees to write to the relevant Scottish Government and UK Government ministers expressing the council's opposition to “green freeports” in these terms.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Booth.

- moved by Councillor Booth, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

Amendment 1

- 1) To accept paragraph 1 of the motion by Councillor Booth.
- 2) To replace paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the motion with:
 - “2) Notes the Council have been involved in discussions on what “green free port” status would mean;
 - 3) Notes the importance of the Forth continuing to bring inclusive and sustainable economic opportunities to the Edinburgh and the potential for high quality job creation towards a just economic transition to net zero;
 - 4) Notes that information would have to be presented to Council to identify the merits of such a status and addressing any concerns before the Council support would be confirmed;
 - 5) Agrees that Council will remain involved in discussions to better understand these matters and bring forward a report for Councillors to consider in future.”

- moved by Councillor McVey, seconded by Councillor Day

Amendment 2

- 1) To replace paragraph 1) of the motion by Councillor Booth to read:

“Notes that both of Scotland’s Governments have worked collaboratively to create a tailored version of ‘Freeports’ in Scotland known as ‘Scottish Green Freeports’ with £52m of investment to establish two ports in Scotland.”
- 2) To replace paragraph 2) of the motion to read:

“Notes that the UK Government's Freeport model embraces the highest employment and environmental standards, with Scottish industry modelling predicting ‘Scottish Green Freeports’ have enormous potential for greater inclusive economic growth”.
- 3) To replace paragraph 3) of the motion to read:

“Notes that Forth Ports is submitting a bid for a Firth of Forth ‘Scottish Green Freeport’, which includes consideration of the Port of Leith, where work has already begun to create the nation’s largest offshore renewable energy hub with BP.”

4) To replace paragraph 4) of the motion to read:

“Agrees that the Council group leaders shall write a cross-party letter to the UK Government and the Scottish Government expressing support for Forth Ports’ bid to establish a ‘Scottish Green Freeport’ at the Port of Leith.”

- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor McLellan

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	8 votes
For Amendment 1	-	33 votes
For Amendment 2	-	15 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Booth, Burgess, Graczyk, Howie, Main, Miller, Rae and Staniforth.

For Amendment 1: The Lord Provost, Councillors Aldridge, Arthur, Barrie, Bird, Bridgman, Kate Campbell, Child, Day, Dickie, Dixon, Doran, Fullerton, Gardiner, Gloyer, Gordon, Griffiths, Henderson, Key, Lang, Macinnes, McNeese-Mechan, McVey, Munn, Munro, Osler, Perry, Rankin, Neil Ross, Watt, Wilson, Work and Louise Young.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Duggart, Douglas, Hutchison, Johnston, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rose, Rust, Smith, Webber and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor McVey as follows:

- 1) To note the UK government’s aim to establish “freeports” around the UK which would provide duty free import and export of goods, simplified customs procedures and varied economic regulations; further notes the recent announcement that the Scottish Government will cooperate with the UK Government on the establishment of “green freeports” in Scotland.
- 2) To note the Council had been involved in discussions on what “green free port” status would mean.
- 3) To note the importance of the Forth continuing to bring inclusive and sustainable economic opportunities to the Edinburgh and the potential for high quality job creation towards a just economic transition to net zero.

- 4) To note that information would have to be presented to Council to identify the merits of such a status and addressing any concerns before the Council support would be confirmed.
- 5) To agree that Council would remain involved in discussions to better understand these matters and bring forward a report for Councillors to consider in future.

24 Living Wage Accreditation and ALEOs - Motion by Councillor Kate Campbell

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

“Council:

Notes that Edinburgh is now an accredited Living Wage City.

Notes the action plan being progressed through the Living Wage Action Group, which is focused on engaging with, and encouraging, businesses across the city to sign up to accreditation.

Notes the positive progress our ALEOs are making on the fair work agenda, including becoming accredited Living Wage employers, but notes that not all our ALEOs are accredited Living Wage employers.

Recognises that if we are asking private sector businesses to join the Living Wage movement, we must also look to our own armslength companies to do the same.

Council therefore instructs the chief executive to write to the chief executives of all ALEOs, on behalf of the council as shareholder, to set out our expectations that all ALEOs should be accredited within one year of this motion being passed.

Further requests officers to work with the ALEOs on how this can be achieved, offering support to help them achieve accreditation and revising SLAs to include these expectations.

Agrees to bring back a report to the August Full Council to report on progress.”

- moved by Councillor Kate Campbell, seconded by Councillor Watt

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Kate Campbell.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Kate Campbell made a transparency statement in respect of the above item as a Director of EDI and its subsidiaries and a member of CEC Holdings and Edinburgh Living.

Councillor Gordon made a transparency statement in respect of the above item as a member of Capital City Partnership, Edible Edinburgh and EICC.

25 Get Me Home Safely Campaign - Motion by Councillor Watt

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

“Council:

Notes the “Get Me Home Safely Campaign” and that journeys to or from work at night can expose workers to violence, the threat of violence or fears about personal safety and security. Research referenced by the campaign found that women feel particularly vulnerable when travelling to and from work. Waiting at a bus stop in the dark, walking home at night or having to park their car in an isolated spot means being exposed to the risk of harassment and assault.

Notes that East Dunbartonshire Council’s Licensing Board has made safe transport home a requirement of any venue wishing to apply for a new or 1am licence.

Requests a report within two cycles to the Licensing Board, considering options to require applicants for new or extended licences to outline the provisions for ensuring their staff have safe travel home for any shift that ends after 11pm.”

- moved by Councillor Watt, seconded by Councillor Work

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Watt.

26 International Women’s Day 2022 - Motion by Councillor Bird

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

“Council:

Recognises International Women's Day on Tuesday 8th March with the 2022 theme #BreakTheBias. Celebrates the significant social, economic, cultural, and political achievements of women in our city, yet distinct lack of visible recognition of this, such as commemorative statues.

Notes with concern the estimates by UN Women that the pandemic could wipe out a quarter of a century of increasing gender equality.

Notes with deep regret reports that at least 125 women have been killed in the UK since Sarah Everard was kidnapped and murdered on 3rd March 2021.

Condemns the destructive languages and behaviours that lead to gender-based violence of all kinds.

Reaffirms our role as Edinburgh's elected leaders to empower our women and girls and do everything we can to make our city the most equal and safe place it can be.

Acknowledges the importance of improving the lives of women and girls in Edinburgh and placing them at the heart of the council's policy and decision making.

Commits, therefore, to only using languages and behaviours that reflect this and that enshrine positive attitudes towards women and girls at all times.

Instructs the chief executive to strengthen equalities impact reporting to help capture any implications of the council's work on women and girls and ensure that the relevant training is rolled out to both elected members and officers."

- moved by Councillor Bird, seconded by Councillor Watt

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Bird.

27 Street Names Honouring Gaelic in Edinburgh - Ainmean Sràide a' toirt urram don Ghàidhlig ann an Dùn Èideann - Motion by Councillor Macinnes

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

"Council:

Notes that this city and Council are rightly proud of the success of Gaelic Medium Education in Edinburgh, representing as it does, a strong connecting line to the culture, community and language of a significant part of Scotland and to the presence of Gaelic in Scotland's capital city. But as anyone with a passing knowledge of Gaelic's history will know, the importance of the Gaelic language and culture was not always recognised so well. There were many years, notably in the middle decades of the 20th century, when investment and recognition were thin on the ground.

There were, however, many individuals, who made Edinburgh their home, and who worked extremely hard to keep those links to Gaelic alive and well in Edinburgh. Their efforts, through performance, song, storytelling and discussion, formed the basis for a lively and welcoming Gaelic-speaking community and culture in Edinburgh.

Agrees that recognising the effort of these individuals is appropriate as we continue to build upon their contribution to the cultural life of our city.

Recognises that for the young people currently benefitting from Gaelic education it is important to see their language recognised and supported in this wider sense.

Requests that our choices in the naming of new streets should include some of these key figures as early as possible and that when these names are applied there should be media information provided to explain the reasons and background to this decision. There should be also be an opportunity for additional names to be proposed and added to that list.

Comhairle:

A' toirt fa-near gu bheil am baile-mòr seo agus a' Chomhairle pròiseil à soirbheachas Foghlam tro Mheadhan na Gàidhlig ann an Dùn Èideann, a' riochdachadh mar a tha e, ceangail làidir ri cultar, coimhearsnachd agus cànan pàirt de dh'Alba agus ri làthaireachd na Gàidhlig ann am prìomh bhaile na h-Alba. Ach, mar a bhios fios agaibhse aig a bheil eòlas air eachdraidh na Gàidhlig, cha robhar an-còmhnaidh ag aithneachadh cho cudromach sa bha cànan is cultar na Gàidhlig. Bha mòran bhliadhnaichean ann, gu sònraichte anns na deicheadan meadhan den 20mh linn, nuair nach robh moran aithne agus tasgadh air a thoirt dhan Ghàidhlig.

Bha, ge-tà, mòran dhaoine a rinn an dachaidh ann an Dùn Èideann, agus a dh'obraich gu cruaidh gus na ceanglaichean sin ris a' Ghàidhlig a chumail beò ann an Dùn Èideann. Bha na hoidhirpean aca, tro chluichd, òrain, seanchas agus deasbaireachd, nam bun-stèidh airson coimhearsnachd agus cultar Gàidhlig a bha beothail agus aoigheil ann an Dùn Èideann.

Ag aontachadh gu bheil e iomchaidh a bhith ag aithneachadh oidhirp nan daoine sin agus a' cumail oirnn a' togail air na chur iad ri beatha chultarail ar baile-mòr.

Ag aithneachadh gu bheil e cudromach don òigridh a tha andràsda a' faighinn buannachd à foghlam Gàidhlig a bhith ag aithneachadh a' chànan aca agus toirt taic dhith mar seo.

Iarrtasan gum bu chòir na roghainnean againn ann a bhith ag ainmeachadh shràidean ùra a bhith a' toirt a-steach cuid de na prìomh dhaoine sin cho luath sa 's urrainn dhuinn agus nuair a thèid na h-ainmean sin a chur an sàs gum bu chòir fiosrachadh meadhanan a thoirt seachad gus adhbharan agus cùlfhiosrachadh a'

cho-dhùnaidh seo a mhìneachadh. Bu chòir cothrom a bhith ann cuideachd ainmean a bharrachd a mholadh agus a chur ris an liosta sin.

Ceangal gu liosta de eachdraidhean-beatha

List of Names:

Joan MacKenzie 1929 - 2007

Seonag NicCoinnich Donald MacKinnon 1839-1914

Dòmhnall MacFhionghuin Sorley MacLean (1911 – 1996)

Somhairle MacGillEain.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

- moved by Councillor Macinnes, seconded by Councillor Doran

Amendment

To accept the first four paragraphs of the motion by Councillor Macinnes but replace the final paragraph with

‘Welcomes suggestions of names for new streets from the Gaelic community, including key figures from the past in the city, in line with the existing street naming policy. Encourages suggestions from all parts of Edinburgh culture and history to the bank of suggested street names and reminds residents that suggestions for any names can be made at any time to the Council or via their local councillors.’

- moved by Councillor Neil Ross, seconded by Councillor Louise Young

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	36 votes
For the amendment	-	9 votes
Abstentions	-	12

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

For the amendment: Councillors Aldridge, Barrie, Bridgman, Gloyer, Lang, Osler, Rose, Neil Ross and Louise Young.

Abstentions: Councillors Brown, Bruce, Jim Campbell, Doggart, Douglas, Cook, McLellan, Mitchell, Mowat, Rust, Smith and Webber.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Macinnes.

28 Shirley Jamieson School Crossing Patrol on Lanark Road Juniper Green - Motion by Councillor Webber

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

“Council

Recognises the commitment to the community of Juniper Green by Shirley Jamieson.

Shirley Jamieson has served the community of Juniper Green at the Lanark Road pedestrian crossing for over fifteen years as the School crossing patrol and is regarded as an unfaltering asset to our local community.

Shirley Jamieson efficiently, cheerfully, and faithfully, assists all members of the community, young and old, able-bodied, and disabled cross safely in all weathers.

Notes that this is a busy road that every resident must cross to access the village shops, services, access public transport and sustainable travel routes.

Commends Shirley Jamieson for going above and beyond her duties as a School Crossing Patrol. For example, when she crosses with young people as they learn to walk to school independently or ensures people with dementia get to the right bus stop to get home.

Notes that despite driving twenty miles daily to get to this crossing point, Shirley Jamieson is known throughout the community of Juniper Green.

Calls on the Lord Provost to write to Shirley Jamieson, acknowledging her long service and extend the appreciation and regard the community has for her and recognising all she does for those living in the area.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

29 2022 Beijing Winter Olympic Curling Success - Motion by The Lord Provost

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

“Council notes:

That Team GB won two medals at the 2022 Beijing Winter Olympics and these were both won in the Curling competition.

Following a successful season both teams from Scottish performed at the highest level and represented their country and their sport with great distinction over the two weeks of competition.

The Women’s team of Eve Muirhead (Dunkeld)- skip – Vicki Wright (Leswalt) , Jennifer Dodds (Carrington) ,Hailey Duff (Forfar) and Mili Smith (St Martin’s) are Olympic Champions following their Gold winning performance in the final.

The men’s team of Bruce Mouat - skip- (Gogar Park), Grant Hardie (Crocketford), Bobby Lammy (Leswalt), Hammy McMillan (Castle Kennedy) and Ross Whyte (Crocketford) won silver medals following an extra end game against the current world champions.

That Jennifer Dodds and Bruce Mouat also represented Team GB in the Mixed Doubles competition finishing a very credible 4th.

In addition to achieving sporting success at the highest level all the players demonstrated a tremendous sporting ethic and represent great role models for those young people wish to participate in the sport of Curling.

Curl Edinburgh, where Jennifer Dodds and Bruce Mouat are based, is located in Murrayfield and all ward councillors Frank Ross, Scott Douglas and Gillian Gloyer agree that Edinburgh as the Capital of Scotland has a duty to acknowledge this national sporting success and

Council requests that the Lord Provost recognises this success in an appropriate manner.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Griffiths

Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

30 Questions

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

31 Investment - Temporary Accommodation Property - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Committee, in terms of Section 50(A)(4) of the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, excluded the public from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business for the reason that it involved the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 8 and 9 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

Approval was sought for prudential borrowing for Investment – Temporary Accommodation Property.

Decision

Detailed in the confidential schedule, signed by the Lord Provost, with reference to this minute.

(Reference – Finance and Resources Committee of 3 March 2022 (item 36); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 31 of 17 March 2022)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 10 February 2022

This question was asked at the Council meeting on 10 February 2022, however, due to the complexities of the information requested, and after discussion with Councillor Webber it was agreed that a fuller response to this question would be available for the next meeting of Full Council on 17 March 2022

Question

- (1) Delivery of KEY critical services have been impacted by the guidance for individuals with possible coronavirus infection. Can the Convener provide information on the weekly number of absences related to Covid since the emergence of the Omicron variant on 29th November 2021. By department and job category (ie Team Member operational / Team Leader / Manager / Senior Manager) by each week.

A separate table can be provided for each department.

Answer

- (1) The data that we hold does not allow us to provide an answer in the format requested and after consultation with Cllr Webber we have provided the data as we hold it.

Additionally, there has not been a requirement for colleagues to declare or record if their covid related absence has been as a result of PCR, LFT result or close contact imposed isolation.

Employee covid related absences have been recorded as follows (albeit the reasons have changed during the course of the pandemic in response to changing guidance):

Unable to work from home:

1. **COVID-19 - Self isolating (up to 10 days) - unable to work from home**
Employee has coronavirus symptoms or contact with someone who is symptomatic, is self-isolating, and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.
2. **COVID-19 – High risk - unable to work from home**
Employee is clinically vulnerable and, following risk assessment, can't attend work, and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative role, from home.
3. **COVID-19 - Care for a dependant - unable to work from home**
Employee is unable to attend work due to caring responsibilities and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.
4. **COVID-19 - Sick / infected - unable to work from home**
Employee has contracted coronavirus and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.
5. **COVID-19 - Cannot return from travel - unable to work remotely**
Employee is not able to return home from travel and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, remotely.
6. **COVID-19 – Building or office closure - unable to work from home**
Employee's normal place of work is closed and is unable to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.
7. **COVID-19 – Covid vaccine reaction - unable to work from home**
Employee experiences illness following Covid vaccination and is unfit to attend work or to work from home.

Able to work from home reasons

1. **COVID-19 - Self isolating (up to 10 days) - working from home**

Employee has coronavirus symptoms or contact with someone who is symptomatic, is self-isolating, and they're able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.

2. **COVID-19 - High risk - able to work from home**

Employee is clinically vulnerable and, following risk assessment, can't attend work. They're able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home

3. **COVID-19 - Care for a dependant - working from home**

Employee is unable to attend work due to caring responsibilities, and they're able to perform their role, or a suitable alternative role, from home.

4. **COVID-19 - Sick / infected - working from home**

Employee has contracted coronavirus and is able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.

5. **COVID-19 - Building or office closure - working from home**

Employee's normal place of work is closed and they're able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, from home.

6. **COVID-19 - Can't return from travel - able to work remotely**

Employee is unable to return home from travel and is able to carry out their role, or a suitable alternative, remotely.

7. **COVID-19 - Carry out role & redeployed/repurposed**

Employee's place of work is closed but they've been temporarily moved to another role or service to support the delivery of key Council services.

Based on the above reporting definitions, the number of absence instances related to Covid (which could range from 1 day to longer absences) for the period 29/11/2021 to 13/03/2022 are:

Count of Absence Reason		
Absence Reason	Gr9 and above	Grand Total
Covid-19	GR8 and below	117
	GR9 and above	3
COVID-19 - Building or office closure - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	7
COVID-19 - Can't return from travel - unable to work remotely	GR8 and below	5
COVID-19 - Care for a dependant - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	229
	GR9 and above	1
COVID-19 - COVID vaccine reaction - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	410
	GR9 and above	2
COVID-19 - High Risk: Unable to work from home	GR8 and below	51
COVID-19 - Self isolating (10 days) - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	1185
	GR9 and above	1
COVID-19 - Shielding - able to work from home	GR9 and above	1
COVID-19 - Sick / infected - unable to work from home	GR8 and below	1675
	GR9 and above	32
Grand Total		3719

Therefore, there has been a total of 3,679 instances of absences for Grade 8 and below roles (which account for 95.6% of total organisational FTE) and 40 instances of covid related absences for Grade 9 and above (which account for 4.4% the total organisational FTE). These absences span a substantial range of roles across services including key services

w/c	Department / Service	Job Role	Covid +ve (PCR or LFT)	Close Contact imposed Isolation	1st Absence due to Covid +
29 th November 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
6 th December 21		TMO			

		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
13 th December 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
20 th December 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
27 th December 21		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
3 rd January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
10 th January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
17 th January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
24 th January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
31 st January 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			
7 th February 22		TMO			
		TL			
		Man			
		Senior Man			

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) What percentage of (a) primary and (b) secondary school teachers are on fixed term contracts as opposed to permanent contracts?

Answer

(1)

Row Labels	CFSLSP Primary Schools	CFSLSS Secondary Schools	Grand Total
Fixed Term	17.42%	11.00%	14.35%
Permanent	82.58%	89.00%	85.65%
Grand Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Question (2) What is the reason and rationale for using fixed term contracts for Council funded teaching posts?

Answer (2) Fixed term contracts are required for probationer teachers (c.230/year) as well as cover for maternity leaves, career breaks, flexible work options, secondments and acting up posts where the permanent post must be held for the substantive postholder to return to.

Question (3) What additional monies have been received from the Scottish Government since January 2021 for the recruitment of permanent teaching posts in Edinburgh and how has this funding been used?

Answer (3) City of Edinburgh Council received funding of £3.628m as it's share of £50m nationally for the establishment of permanent Teacher and Support assistant posts. This rises to £4.809m as a share of £65.5m nationally to reflect the full year cost of these posts.

The funding was invested per Scottish Government requirements to establish 73 permanent Teaching and 36 permanent Support Assistant posts.

Within our authority this included the establishment of Wellbeing Hubs in all secondary schools, Transition Teachers for each cluster and additional Support Assistants for P1-P3.

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 17 March 2022**

Question

How many public litter bins have been removed since 1 January 2020, broken down by council ward?

Answer

We do not hold data on the number of litter bins removed since 1 January 2020.

The policy on litter bin siting is reviewed annually and was last reported to Transport and Environment Committee on [11 November 2021](#).

The objective of the litter bin siting policy is to ensure that the location and size of a litter bin is based on the demand and changing usage patterns at individual locations.

**Supplementary
Question**

Does the Convener believe it would be good to keep track of the numbers of litter bins removed or added going forward so we can understand overall capacity levels?

**Supplementary
Answer**

Going forward we will keep track of any litter bins removed, as we currently do with those that are added, to monitor capacity levels across the city.

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

At the 10 February 2022 meeting of the Council and in response to a Leader's question on delays to the safety improvements at the Davidson Main's roundabout, the Council Leader said:

"I am happy to follow this up with officers and find out exactly where this is in the process and exactly why this has taken so long."

Question (1) Can the Council Leader confirm what discussions he has had with officers since 10 February regarding the Davidson Mains roundabout?

Answer (1) I raised this with officers on the day of February 10th Council and have had a number of exchanges since, as has the Convener.

Question (2) What explanation has he received as to why the promised safety improvements have been delayed?

Answer (2) My understanding from officers is that the timeline has moved due to the work required to find the right solution, but the urgency is understood.

Following the occurrence of six collisions at the roundabout between 2013 and 2016, three of which involving pedestrians, the Road Safety team sought to identify potential engineering interventions aimed at improving safety for vulnerable road users at the roundabout.

Over the 2017-2019 period, various options were investigated, including replacing the existing roundabout with a traffic signal-controlled junction. However, following traffic modelling, this was not deemed to be a suitable option, mainly due to the lengthy pedestrian waiting times that would have been required to ensure adequate traffic flows were maintained during busy periods.

In addition, the extents of new parking restrictions that would have been required to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the junction would have had a significant impact on loading facilities for nearby businesses and there would have been a requirement to relocate the listed structures at the entrance to East Barnton Gardens.

While the above work was underway, a fatal collision involving a pedestrian occurred on one of the zebra crossings at the roundabout.

The proposals that are now being developed for implementation involve retaining the current mini roundabout format, but with significantly reduced crossing widths on all approaches, which will be achieved by localised footway widenings with tightened corner radii and by removing the central traffic islands.

A section of raised road surface will also be provided at each of the zebra crossings to encourage reduced traffic speeds.

Question (3) What information he has received as to the current timetable for getting the promised changes in place?

Answer (3) The statutory process for the Redetermination Order required to deliver the proposed changes to the junction layout will happen by the end of March 2022.

Finalise the street lighting design will also be by the end of March 2022.

Stage 2 Road Safety Audit on the proposals will start by end of May 2022.

Finalised construction drawings, Bill of Quantities and tender package, so that the project will be tender ready in advance of the conclusion of the Redetermination Order process.

The final timescales for full delivery will depend on the Redetermination Order process and while this will depend on whether any formal objections are received, I am determined this is processed as quickly as possible.

I will arrange a meeting with ward members and officers to go through this in more detail.

QUESTION NO 5

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 17 March 2022**

Question (1) Which of the road strengthening, resurfacing and surface treatment projects listed in appendix 1 of the 17 June 2021 Transport & Environment committee report "Transport Infrastructure Investment - Capital Delivery Priorities for 2021/2022" have been delivered, as at 15 March 2022?

Answer (1) Table 1 below shows the number of carriageway schemes completed as at 11 March 2022. In addition to the schemes in the table, a further 11 schemes are expected to be completed by the end of April 2022.

Question (2) Which of the footway surface treatment and footway reconstruction projects listed in appendix 1 of the 17 June 2021 Transport & Environment committee report "Transport Infrastructure Investment - Capital Delivery Priorities for 2021/2022" have been delivered, as at 15 March 2022?

Answer (2) Table 2 below shows the footway schemes completed, as at 11 March 2022. A further three schemes are expected to be completed by the end of April 2022.

Table 3 shows a number of footway schemes which were identified for surface treatment but have been identified as not suitable for slurry sealing and will now be reprioritised.

Table 1 - Carriageway schemes completed as at 11 March 2022

Scheme	Treatment
Greenbank Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Oxgangs Park, Oxgangs Row & Oxgangs Rise	Carriageway Resurfacing
Regent Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Buckstone Gate	Carriageway Resurfacing
Longcraig Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Inverleith Row	Carriageway Resurfacing
Stevenson Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Lothian Road Phase 2	Carriageway Resurfacing
Blackford Hill Grove, Blackford Hill Rise & Blackford Hill View	Carriageway Resurfacing
Cliftonhall Road	Carriageway Resurfacing
Queen Anne Drive	Carriageway Resurfacing
Newmills Crescent	Carriageway Resurfacing
Stenhouse Drive	Carriageway Resurfacing
Craigleith Crescent	Carriageway Resurfacing
Silverknowes Road & Silverknowes Road East (inc. Davidson Mains Roundabout)	Carriageway Resurfacing
East Trinity Road	Surface Treatment
Hopetoun Road	Surface Treatment
Barnton Park Drive	Surface Treatment
Durham Square	Surface Treatment
Almondhill Road	Surface Treatment
Silverknowes Gardens	Surface Treatment
Laverockbank Road	Surface Treatment
Old Kirk Road	Surface Treatment
Saughton Grove	Surface Treatment
Durham Road	Surface Treatment
St Katharine's Crescent	Surface Treatment
Silverknowes Eastway	Surface Treatment
Langton Road	Surface Treatment
Saughton Mains Avenue	Surface Treatment
Hosie Rigg	Surface Treatment
Telferton	Surface Treatment
New Mart Road	Surface Treatment
Farrer Terrace	Surface Treatment
Echline Avenue	Surface Treatment
High Street to St Mary's Junction	Carriageway Setts

Table 2 – Footway schemes completed as at 11 March 2022

Scheme	Treatment
Ryehill Gardens	Footway Reconstruction
Buckstone Gate	Footway Reconstruction
Colinton Mains Road	Footway Reconstruction
Rutherford Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
South Gyle Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Clermiston Grove	Footway Surface Treatment
Baird Grove	Footway Surface Treatment
Silverknowes Loan	Footway Surface Treatment
Comiston View	Footway Surface Treatment
Ferry Road/Crewe Toll/Boswall Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
Bailie Terrace Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment
Dolphin Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Pentland View	Footway Surface Treatment
Colinton Mains Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Craigeleith Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
Crewe Road South	Footway Surface Treatment
Belford Gardens	Footway Surface Treatment
Kekewich Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment
Mountcastle Gardens	Footway Surface Treatment
Ulster Crescent	Footway Surface Treatment
Swanston Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Orchardhead Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Easter Drylaw Grove	Footway Surface Treatment
Longstone Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment

Gardiner Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Drylaw Crescent	Footway Surface Treatment
Priestfield Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Glenallan Drive	Footway Surface Treatment
Pentland Terrace	Footway Surface Treatment
Ladysmith Road	Footway Surface Treatment
Pilton Drive Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment

Table 3 - Streets deemed unsuitable for slurry sealing

Scheme	Treatment	Progress
Langton Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Parkgrove Drive	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Bailie Grove	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Pilton Place	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
South Oswald Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Assessment deemed no treatment was required
Blackford Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Pilton Park Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment	Only partially suitable for slurry sealing
Oswald Road	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Woodhall Bank Phase 1	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Woodhall Bank Phase 2	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Eva Place	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Lennel Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing
Longstone Avenue	Footway Surface Treatment	Treated in 2021
Baird Drive	Footway Surface Treatment	Unsuitable for slurry sealing

QUESTION NO 6

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Vice-Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

I refer the Vice-Convener to my question and her answer at Council on 26 August 2021 regarding the investigation into the burning of memorial benches by Council staff in 2020.

Given that it is now more than two years since the Evening News reported this matter noting that the Vice Convener 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”, and directly quoted Councillor Doran as 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.”

Can she please now answer the four questions I posed in August 2021 with regard to the second investigation she indicated was ongoing at that time, namely:

Question (1) Has the investigation concluded?

Answer (1) The investigation has now concluded, and action is now being taken in line with the Council’s disciplinary policy. The relevant disciplinary hearings have been arranged but have not yet taken place.

Question (2) How did the incident happen?

Answer (2) Given that the full disciplinary process has not yet concluded, it is not possible to provide this information yet.

Question (3) Who made the decision?

Answer (3) Given that the full disciplinary process has not yet concluded, it is not possible to provide this information yet.

Question (4) Has anyone been held accountable?

Answer

- (4)** As referred to in the last council question response, 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 the disciplinary process to ensure that it remains impartial.

QUESTION NO 7

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

I refer the Convener to the answer she provided with regard to this site on 12 March 2020. She will recall the details that:

A project team was first initiated for this site in 2014 – some eight years ago;

Committee agreed the site should be redeveloped in January 2016 – some six years ago;

A planning application was lodged in 2018 and then paused with no indication of further progress towards planning permission being publicly obvious – four years ago;

Even taking into account the delay she indicated in buying back homes to allow redevelopment this concluded before her last answer in Summer 2019 – almost three years ago.

Given that two years have now elapsed since her last answer:

Question (1) Can she indicate whether any progress has been made, other than the demolition she indicated was impending in 2020?

Answer (1) The demolition of the homes for the development at Coatfield Lane commenced in September 2020 and was completed April 2021.

As outlined in the answer on 12 March 2020, as site of significant archaeological interest an archaeological survey was required. The findings of the survey were submitted to the Planning service in June 2021. Taking account of the archaeological requirements and feedback from Planning, the scheme design has been altered.

In early April 2022, a public event will be held to update the community and allow comments to be made on the revised design, before the revised scheme is submitted to Planning at the end of April 2022.

Question **(2)** Does she consider these delivery timescales acceptable either in terms of providing new social housing or with regard to leaving an empty and blighted site at the heart of a community for so long?

Answer **(2)** This is a particularly difficult site, in no small part down to the requirement to buy back properties that had been sold under the Conservative Right to Buy Policy. A policy that has made it especially difficult for the council to manage and maintain homes in mixed tenure blocks, as well as bringing about the loss of around 40k council homes in Edinburgh alone. Now that buy backs and demolition are complete, and the archaeological survey is also complete, we expect to consult with the community – as we have done successfully on many council sites, ensuring that we deliver regeneration in a way that meets the community’s needs – and then progress swiftly with delivery of these homes.

Question **(3)** Can she say whether any action can be taken to improve the appearance of the area (other than the graffiti boards which are sometimes damaged by those seeking access to the area) given that the lack of progress means it may be some time before any further work is undertaken?

Answer **(3)** In order to improve the appearance of the site, local artists have been granted permission to use the hoarding for street art. To maintain the security of the site, regular health and safety checks are undertaken and any identified issues are rectified. In addition, the concierge officer located within Linksvie House completes a regular visual inspection of the perimeter of the site and reports any issues.

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 17 March 2022**

Further to my question to the Transport and Environment Convener at the August 2018 meeting of the Full Council and the follow up meeting in her office can the Convener please confirm;

Question (1) How many non-compliant chicanes have been eliminated across the city since the question was first raised?

Answer (1) The Council does not keep a central record of the installation or removal of chicanes. Since August 2018, 18 chicane/barrier/bollard locations have been identified and action taken to remove or adjust (or are planned for before the end of June 2022) as part of the Active Travel programme where they impede access by people in wheelchairs, mobility scooters and non-standard bikes. A further programme is planned

Questions (2) Has the Convener actively engaged with the Planning Convener to help ensure no new non-compliant chicanes are put in place?

Answer (2) A discussion took place on 3 September 2018 between the Transport and Environment Convener, the Planning Convener and officers on the issue of Developers installing footway chicanes in new developments which did not form part of their consent.

Developers should be complying with the principles of the Edinburgh Street Design Guidance, Designing Streets and guidance in Cycling by Design.

The Conveners and officers continue to work together to seek to ensure that there is compliance with the principles of the guidance.

Questions (3) How many new non-compliant chicanes have been installed across the city since the question was first raised?

Answer (3) As noted in the answer to question 1, the Council does not keep a central record of the installation or removal of chicanes.

Question (4) Does the Convener believe that her efforts in taking the simple step of removing non-complaint chicanes to aid permeability for cyclists have been successful?

Answer (4) Yes, and I also look to the significant progress made in this city in recent years to provide improved safe cycling infrastructure which is key to cyclists' and potential cyclists' view of permeability, safety and their likelihood to choose greener, more sustainable transport options, where suitable.

The funded £118m active travel programme recently approved by the Transport and Environment will build upon actions such as the removal of non-compliant chicanes, street clutter etc to continue creating a much more welcoming environment for all those who wish to walk, wheel or cycle in this city.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Hutchison for answer
by the Convener of the Planning
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 17 March 2022**

Further to my question to the Transport and Environment Convener at the August 2018 meeting of the Full Council and the follow up meeting in her office can the Convener please confirm;

- Question** (1) Whether the issue of non-compliant chicanes has been discussed in consideration of planning applications by his committee?
- Answer** (1) Designs submitted as part of planning applications are expected to eliminate any requirement for barrier chicanes. If such measures are proposed, then the applicant is expected to demonstrate both the requirement and compliance with acceptable design. Details of such proposals would be considered as part of any Quality Audit and Road Safety Audit and would require further permission under Road Construction Consent.
- Questions** (2) Whether his committee have approved any new non-compliant chicanes since August 2018.
- Answers** (2) The Planning Service is not aware of any such approvals.
- Questions** (3) If so, how many and why?
- Answers** (3) N/A

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Can the convener provide information on the methods and processes for charging our EV fleet.

Question (1) What locations are used to charge - please specify if public or on CEC owned land?

Answer (1) There are various locations across the city where Electric Vehicle charging can take place. Details of the publicly available charging points are included on the [Chargeplace Scotland](#) website. There are also dedicated charging points within Council depots and at other Council buildings which are dedicated to charging of fleet vehicles. These sites are not publicly accessible and are not externally advertised as such.

Question (2) What time of day is charging taking place?

Answer (2) Charging of vehicles takes place throughout the day, depending on the operational needs of the service.

Question (3) Is charging carried out during shifts/working hours?

Answer (3) Wherever possible, charging should take place outside the hours which the vehicle is required to be operational however there may be instances where this is not possible.

Question (4) If during shift, how long are employees at charging points?

Answer (4) Where this charging is required during shifts, the time taken would be dependent on the amount of charge required for the vehicle.

Question (5) Can the Charge Place Scotland monthly statements be provided for last 12 months?

Answer (5) As there is no charge tariff currently in place for use of either Council fleet chargers or publicly accessible chargers there are no statements available. However, these tariffs will be implemented from 1 May 2022 and thereafter, monthly statements will be available.

Question **(6)** How is the account managed (eg - the CPS card is linked to vehicle or the member of staff has a card that can be used for any CEC vehicle)?

Answer **(6)** CPS cards are issued with the Council fleet vehicle. This card will allow charging of that or any other Council fleet vehicle.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Jim Campbell for answer by the Convener of the Housing, Homelessness and Fair Work Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) How many affordable homes have been built in Edinburgh per year since 2017?

Answer (1) The table below shows the number of affordable homes approved and those completed between 1 April 2017 and 31 March 2021, as well as, the estimated outturn at the end of March 2022.

Financial Year	1	2	3	4	5	Total
	17/18	18/19	19/20	20/21	21/22*	
Approvals	1,475	1,626	1,914	1,285	1,300	7,600
Completions	966	1,152	1,367	1,087	968	5,540

* Estimated outturn

Question (2) How does this compare with the target for affordable house building as outlined in the Capital Coalition 52 Pledges

Answer (2) The programme to deliver 20,000 homes by December 2027 is on track.

Question (3) How is the “energy efficiency” of these homes determined, have all of the homes been built to the same standard or if there are different standards please record these for each year since 2017

Answer (3) Section 7 of current Scottish Building Standards relates specifically to sustainability, setting out a range of different standards homes can be built to (ranging from Bronze to Platinum). All Council homes built since 2017 achieve ‘Silver Standard Active’ level and have a minimum energy efficiency rating of EPC B.

Since November 2020, all Council homes in development are being designed to achieve a net zero carbon (NZC) outcome with the first homes expected to complete in 2023. The NZC approach takes into account the technical

performance of the buildings, inclusion of zero emission heating as well as low carbon impact that can be achieved through approaches such as green infrastructure, active travel routes, sustainable drainage and tree planting.

QUESTION NO 12

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Planning Committee at a meeting of
the Council on 17 March 2022**

The Council has promoted its intention to have a Short Term Lets Control Area including in a press release on 23 February 2022.

Given that the changes to Planning rules will not affect properties that have operated in this way for more than 10 years:

Question (1) What number and proportion of short term-lets is it expected will be required to seek planning permission to continue operating?

Answer (1) The automatic requirement for planning permission to operate a short-term let (STL) applies only to letting of a dwelling that is not a principal home, it does not apply to home sharing or home letting. The majority of short-term lets in Edinburgh are entire property lets.

In October 2021, 4,022 entire properties were registered on Airbnb (which is one of the online platforms that enable bookings of short-term lets). This was 77% of all registrations.

The forthcoming short-term licensing scheme will require applicants within the short-term let control area to demonstrate planning permission or that it is not required. It is not known how many properties will seek planning permission however from our planning enforcement investigations, it is thought the majority of those operating will have been doing so for less than 10 years.

Question (2) What is the expectation with regard to how many of these may be successful in gaining planning permission?

Answer (2) It is not possible to pre-judge the outcome of planning applications. Current planning policy allows consideration of the appropriateness of short-term letting within a residential context. Where this is appropriate it allows for STLs. In 2021 there were 25 applications for planning permission for STLs determined. 15 of these were granted.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor Webber for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council recently started a project to provide iPads to every pupil in the city from P6 upwards which was promoted by the Council Leader last month.

Question (1) What proportion of P6 to S6 pupils will have been issued with an iPad by 5 May when the Council election takes place?

Answer (1) As of 11/03/22 we have delivered **8,261** new Ipads to Schools. We have also migrated across **6,181** devices that were in scope and now on the new Empowered Learning Platform.

So, in total, **14,442** are now in use by Pupils and teachers in Primary, Secondary and Special Schools.

The ratio is 1:1 for Pupils in P6 – S6 and all teachers will be 1:1.

The ratio is 1:5 for pupils in P1 – P5.

iPads have been deployed to all teachers and pupils in Secondary elevate schools(8 High Schools)

IPads deployed to all Build and Grow Secondary teachers (15 high schools)

We will have deployed to **50%** of all pupils by the 5th may and on track to complete by the end of the year.

Question (2) When is the roll out expected to be complete?

Answer (2) The programme will be complete by December 2022. All pupils from P6 – S6 will have received an Ipad and we will have also deployed iPads for shared use at a ratio of 1:5 for pupils from P1 – P5. The programme will also make sure that all teachers have an Ipad and a keyboard.

QUESTION NO 14

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council Leader is very keen to promote the Edinburgh City Deal, seemingly indicating that it is a very particular achievement of his Council Administration:

Question (1) How many other Scottish City Deals have been signed and how many were concluded earlier than Edinburgh's?

Answer (1) In the first weeks of this administration I led the Council and City's participation in negotiations to conclude agreement on final details of the Deal. Even at this late stage of the deal's discussions, many key agreements, including the overall envelope of UK Government investment were not agreed along with other key aspects of the deal.

The UK Government could have been a more effective and honest partner to work with. This is a common complaint among colleagues who have also signed deals. Even upon the deal's agreement, UK Conservative Ministers broke communication agreements- this is just one example of the unconstructive behaviour from the UK Conservative Government. I complained in person about this and other matters of unhelpful conduct to a junior UK Government Minister.

The £1.3bn Edinburgh and South East Scotland City Region Deal will deliver the largest investment of any Scottish City Region or Growth Deal. It was the fourth to be signed of the nine City Region or Growth Deals that have reached Full Deal agreement and are in delivery in Scotland.

Question (2) What share of the £1.3Bn (both in cash and percentage terms) is being provided by the UK Government, the Scottish Government, the City of Edinburgh Council?

Answer (2) The Scottish Government and UK Government are providing £300m of investment each to the Deal.

The City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) is providing £21m of investment to the Deal made up of £5m towards the Dunard Centre and £16m towards the West Edinburgh Transport Improvement Programme. CEC are also providing £248m of on-lending to Edinburgh Living.

The original value of the Deal amounted to £1.330bn but is now estimated to be £1.384bn.

Funder	Funding	Percentage of Overall Deal value
UKG	£300m	22%
SG	£300m	22%
CEC	£269m*	19%

*includes on-lending

Question (3) What share of the £1.3Bn (both in cash and percentage terms) is being spent on Council services in Edinburgh, Regional Transport services, the Universities?

Answer (3) The City Region Deal is delivering transformational programmes and projects across Innovation, Skills, Transport, Culture and Housing to deliver a step-change in inclusive growth to benefit the Edinburgh and South East Scotland city region, Scotland and the United Kingdom. City Region and Growth Deals are not intended to fund existing Council services.

Council led projects (West Edinburgh Transport Improvement Programme, Edinburgh Living, Dunard Centre and share of the Integrated Regional Employability and Skills Programme) amount to £377m which equates to 27% of the Deal.

Regional Transport initiatives (West Edinburgh Transport Improvement Programme and Sheriffhall) amount to £156m which equates to 11% of the Deal.

Investment in the region's University led projects amounts to £719m which equates to 52% of the Deal.

Question (4) What City Deal projects have delivered to date?

Answer

- (4) The City Region Deal is a 15 year programme. Already business cases for 18 out of the 20 projects have been approved. The City Region Deal's Data-driven innovation initiative is helping to ensure that the region is the Data Capital of Europe.

Having our universities play a greater role in the economy helps our region become a counterbalance to investment in the South East of England. Our City region Deal is proving to be a catalyst for greater regional prosperity and is delivering economic growth, social change and improved services for residents, driving the region forward in a sustainable and inclusive manner. Our Deal is also leading the way in the development of a Benefits Realisation Plan.

The National Robotarium will open in the summer and will be a world-leading centre for Robotics and Artificial Intelligence, translating cutting edge research into new technologies delivering substantial benefits for society. This complements and enhances the other data-driven research, development and innovation sectoral hubs – Edinburgh Futures Institute, Easter Bush, Bayes Centre and Usher Institute.

Key achievements are set out in the latest Annual Report <https://tinyurl.com/447nubnh>

Highlights delivered across the various programmes to date include:-

- Over 344 families have moved into quality affordable homes delivered by Edinburgh Living;
- Launch of the Advanced Care Research Centre, a £19.5m collaboration with Legal & General to transform care in later life, bringing together data science and technology;
- The Covid-19 Data Collaborative of the DataLoch programme (Usher Institute) provided the data foundation for regional and national research into the outbreak;
- The End Violence Lab secured a \$7m donation from the Human Dignity Foundation to set up a global Data Institute for Child Safety, dedicated to fight online sexual abuse and exploitation of children;
- Through the Data Driven Innovation programme, over 1100 jobs have been created or secured in construction and start-ups;

- The Data-Driven Entrepreneurship (DDE) programme has supported over 50 start-ups in through skills development, accelerator programmes and connecting innovators with investors;
- Over 7,465 skills improvements have been delivered through the Integrated Regional Employability and Skills programme; and
- The dedicated jobs portal created in response to the pandemic has advertised over 3,800 job vacancies.

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Rust for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question

The Council is often keen to promote the achievement of the provision of 1140 nursery hours per child. When was this delivered and how does it related to the promised timescale as outlined in the Capital Coalition 52 Commitments or any official Council pledge?

Answer

Commitment 32 – Achieved. Edinburgh has been phasing in the early years expansion since August 2017 and was on track to fully delivery this by the original due date in August 2020. Due to the pandemic the Scottish Government delayed the delivery to August 2021 and since this date all eligible children in Edinburgh are able to access their funded entitlement which begins the term after their third birthday.

Commitment 33 – Partially Achieved. Whilst all eligible children now receive their funded entitlement. The flexibility we had hoped to deliver has been impacted by COVID restrictions. (Morning and Afternoon only places have not been available in local authority settings due to the cleaning requirements and footfall across the middle of the day.)

At the moment we can only provide the following:

Term time places

- Asymmetric week to match school days

Or

Full year places

- 10 hour day placements

We had planned to offer morning and afternoon places as one of the full year options. This would have provided 5 days at 4 hours 35 minutes each morning or afternoon

COVID cleaning requirements and the number of adults entering or leaving the building across the middle of the day means this option has not been available

We are hopeful we will be able to reintroduce these from August 2022.

QUESTION NO 16

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 17 March 2022**

The Council has promoted that it has achieved “Living Wage City status” for Edinburgh.

Question (1) What actions had to be taken to achieve this?

Answer (1) In November 2021 Edinburgh became the second Scottish city to be recognised under the Living Wage Places programme. This accreditation is provided by the Scottish Living Wage Foundation in recognition of a city’s commitment to fair work, the strength of its employer partnerships, and credibility of its plans to increase real living wage accreditation through local action.

In order to achieve this accreditation, the Council:

- Led the establishment of an action group of real living wage accredited employers in the city, including representatives from private sector employers, business representative organisations, higher education, third sector organisations, and trades unions.
- Agreed an action plan for delivery by the group over the next five years including a target to double the number of living wage accredited employers in the city.

Further details on the Living Wage Places programme administered by the Scottish Living Wage Foundation are [available here](#).

Full details on the Edinburgh Living Wage City Action Group, its membership, targets and planned actions are [available here](#).

Question (2) How many employees have seen a wage increase directly related to their employer signing up for accreditation following encouragement by the Council?

Answer

- (2) Data on new living wage accreditations are provided to the action group by Living Wage Scotland on a quarterly basis. The first substantive update on progress against these metrics since the launch of the Edinburgh Living Wage City Action Plan will be available in April 2022.

Over the next five years the Edinburgh Living Wage Action Group aims to secure Living Wage provision for up to 40,000 employees, with a specific target to ensure that at least 10,000 employees benefit from an immediate pay uplift as a result of accreditation.

Question

- (3) How many additional employers have been accredited each year since the Capital Coalition 52 commitments was published in 2017 and how does this compare with the target in the Council's Performance Framework to increase the number by 100 per year?

Answer

(3)

Financial year	Living wage employers in Edinburgh	New accreditations per annum
2016/17	151	
2017/18	216	65
2018/19	281	65
2019/20	359	78
2020/21	422	63
Dec-21	497	75 (year to date)

Since publication of the Capital Coalition 52 commitments the number of living wage accreditations in Edinburgh has risen by an average of some 69 employers per annum.

The target of 100 new accreditations per annum was introduced in November 2021.

QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Jim Campbell for
answer by the Convener of the
Transport and Environment
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 17 March 2022**

The Council has publicly promoted that it has reduced its carbon footprint by around 60%, claimed the award of £7.7m from Zero Waste Scotland for communal recycling as a success and regularly claims to have planted additional trees.

Question **(1)** What proportion of the cut in the Council's carbon footprint relates to external factors like grid decarbonisation and the new Energy from waste Plant at Millerhill which has been criticised by Friends of the Earth Scotland for exporting Edinburgh's carbon emissions?

Answer **(1)** The Council's carbon footprint decreased by 66% between 2005/06 and 2020/21.

During this time, the carbon content of a unit of electricity has been cut by more than half (52%), thanks to the closure of coal power plants and the growth in renewables to generate electricity. Had the decarbonisation of the grid not occurred, the Council's carbon footprint would have decreased by 54%, not 66%.

Since 2019/20, the Council has diverted most of the previously landfilled waste to Millerhill for energy recovery via incineration. Emissions from incineration are included in the Council's footprint, in line with our legal responsibilities under the Public Bodies Climate Change Duties reporting and are therefore reported using the methodology set down by the Scottish Government. The impact of diverting waste from landfill to the Millerhill plant is responsible for 40% of the Council's decrease in greenhouse gas emissions. If the Council was still landfilling 100% of the non-recyclable waste, its carbon footprint would have decreased by 40%, not 66%.

Question **(2)** What was the recycling rate inherited by the Convener in 2017 and what has it been in each of the years since?

Answer**(2)** The recycling rates per year are set out in the table below:

Date	Recycling rate
2017	41.0%
2018	38.8%
2019	38.6%
2020	37.0%
2021	41.9% (still to be validated by SEPA)

The decrease in the recycling rate from 2017 – 2020 is in line with the decrease of the Scottish national average over the same period.

It is useful to note that the significant award from Zero Waste Scotland of £7.7m to support Edinburgh’s Communal Bin Review was designed to improve our recycling rates and recognises that the wider context for recycling has changed.

Question**(3)** How many trees has the Council pledged to plant and by when and how many have actually been planted?**Answer**

(3) The Council is committed to:

- Planting an additional 1,000 trees in communities (as set out in the Council Commitments 2017- 2022); and
- Becoming a Million Tree City by 2030. To achieve this, 250,000 trees will need to be planted over the next 10 years across a range of public and private land. It is currently projected that around 30% (i.e. 75,000) of these trees will be on Council-owned land.

Question**(4)** What proportion of the trees planted are still in place and thriving?**Answer**

(4) Given the high number of trees which have been planted since 2017/18, it is not practicable for officers to be able to record where there has been a loss of any of the new trees planted.

Question (5) What is the net change in number of trees in the City since 2017 given that many have been removed including in high profile cases by the Council or on Council land such as in East Princes Street Gardens and at Ocean Drive?

Answer (5) From the 1 April 2017 to 31 December 2021, there has been a net increase in the number of trees in the city of 49,443.

The form of the question seems to indicate that the author was casting doubt on what has emerged under this administration in this important part of our Council response to climate and other pressures. I trust that the information provided proves that the 'claims' are correct and indicates a progressive, coordinated approach across these and other related areas.

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Bruce for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Convener regularly refers to “record investment” in terms of spending on roads, paths, pavements and bridges.

Question (1) What was the breakdown of funding between each of these categories in each year since 2017?

Answer (1) The table below shows the investment each year since 2017 on roads, pavements, paths, structures, and (capital only) public transport:

2017/18	£20.356m
2018/19	£31.791m
2019/20	£44.081m
2020/21	£41.091m
2021/22	£26.221m (to January 2022)

Question (2) What is the repair backlog in Edinburgh and at the current rate of spend how many years will it take to resolve?

Answer (2) During the term of this Administration, the Council’s road condition index has improved thanks to the investment and approach delivered by the Council, but we accept there is more to do. As a result, the road backlog figure, as outlined in the road condition index score, has reduced from £94,823,000 to £77,346,000. Due to continual deterioration across the network, and in particular in years with severe winter weather, there will always be roads that should be considered for investment so this number will never will zero. But the reducing trend does highlight the progress being made in delivering better quality roads, pavements and paths for the people of Edinburgh.

QUESTION NO 19

**By Councillor Rust for answer by the
Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 17 March
2022**

The Council used a press release on 24 November 2021 to welcome planning approval for the Dunard Concert Hall project.

Question (1) What proportion of the funding for the Dunard Concert Hall is sourced from the Council and what proportion from philanthropic sources?

Answer (1) As reported to Finance and Resources Committee on [3 March 2022](#), the funding package for the centre includes £5 million of funding from the Council's capital budget. Philanthropic donations amount to £35 million, with a further £15 million to be raised from general fundraising. The overall project cost is £75 million so the proportion of Council funding is 1:14 or 7%.

Question (2) How far behind schedule is the project following legal disputes over the Planning Consent process which relates directly to the functioning of the Council?

Answer (2) The project is approximately two years behind schedule.

The previous design received planning consent in Autumn of 2019 but was subsequently the subject of a petition for a Judicial Review by the developers of the St James Quarter. Following a mediation process, IMPACT Scotland agreed to submit a revised design for the centre.

Question (3) What increase in cost or reduction in scope was required as a result of these delays?

Answer (3) The project was redesigned as a result of the mediation process, leading to some changes in scope. Costs have been impacted by Brexit, COVID -19, labour and material costs, inflation and conformity requirements.

Question (4) What were the direct costs to the Council Taxpayer in legal fees?

Answer (4) The cost to the Council of legal fees was £5,950 plus VAT.

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Finance and Resources Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

The Council created what the Council Leader has described as “a free face-to-face service that helped thousands of EU citizens living in Edinburgh secure settled status after Brexit.”

Question (1) How many EU citizens are living in Edinburgh at present?

Answer (1) 66,000 people

[from National Records Scotland publication - Population by Country of Birth and Nationality, Scotland, July 2020 to June 2021]

Question (2) How many have secured settled status?

Answer (2) There have been 69,190 applications processed (as at December 2021). 36,020 have secured settled status and further 30,300 have pre-settled status (right to remain for 5 years).

[Above figures for Edinburgh from Home office publication - EU Settlement Scheme quarterly statistics local authority tables, December 2021. These statistics are released as Experimental Statistics]

Question (3) How many used the free face-to-face service and how many secured their settled status without this help?

Answer (3) From September 2018 until March 2020, 2265 people from all over Scotland attended an appointment with the free EUSS Service provided by City of Edinburgh Council. Additionally, on a daily basis, individuals turned up to the office without appointments requesting support – in some cases a follow up appointment was made, for others some brief guidance on the mobile app was sufficient for them to complete the application on their own. A record for individuals where guidance on the app only was provided was not made and so cases are not included in the figures quoted above.

The figures in part 2 reflect the totals for settled and pre settled status applications for Edinburgh.

Question (4) What did the service cost in total and per service user?

Answer (4) It is not possible to give an exact total or per service user cost as this service was provided by Registration colleagues as part of their regular activity. However, the following staff were involved in providing this support with their work split between normal registration services and the support services for people seeking settled status - 1 Grade 5 and 1 Grade 3 Modern apprentice for period Sept 2018 to Sept 2019 and 2 Modern apprentices (Grade 3) for period Sep 2019 to March 2020.

The number of applications using this service reached a peak of 506 appointments in September 2019, dropping to 477 in October, 129 in November, 55 in December and 38 to 14 January 2020. During September due to the high levels of demand an additional Saturday session was added to the usual appointment schedule. The service otherwise carried out this work as part of their regular activity. The apportioning of exact costs is further complicated by the following:

- The service was demand led with 2,265 EU, EEA and Swiss citizens and their family members receiving face to face appointments. However, it should be noted that on a daily basis citizens arrived at the office without appointments. In those cases staff either made an appointment for them or in some cases they were provided with brief guidance on how to use the mobile application which was sufficient for them to complete the application on their own. Only those who received a face to face appointment are accounted for in the numbers above.
- Whilst appointments were scheduled for 15 minutes this time was often over run due to the complexity or lack of relevant documentation required for the process.
- There was no recording of time spent on telephone call, emails or for those who attended as drop in appointments.

QUESTION NO 21

**By Councillor Johnston for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 17 March 2022**

The Council has supported Lothian Buses during the pandemic with a package of Council and Scottish Government Covid support that apparently amounted to £70m.

Question (1) What proportion of the £70m directly related to Barnett consequential of support provided for bus services by the UK Government and passed to the Scottish Government as additional funding to allow it to provide the equivalent support in Scotland?

Answer (1) 74% being £52m Transport Scotland funding with the remaining sum being loss of Lothian Buses dividend £18m.

Question (2) What proportion of this fund relates to the UK Government's Covid Furlough Scheme?

Answer (2) Zero, as this funding was not provided by either Scottish Government or the Council. For information, £17m was received from the UK Government's Furlough Scheme.

Question (3) Please give an estimate of the future reductions in turnover for Lothian Buses because of each of the following: i) the opening of the Tram completion project to Newhaven, ii) the "to not through" policy in the City Centre transformation and iii) any alterations to Lothian Bus Tours and Lothian Buses Airport services as a result of Council traffic changes?

Answer (3) Given current uncertainties in overall passenger numbers, I am unable to provide estimates for these events.

QUESTION NO 22

By Councillor Laidlaw for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) The Census or the Census?

In school and council communications for parents and children relating to the Health & Wellbeing Census, it is often referred to as “the Census”.

However, this is an optional survey and not an official “Census” where there is a legal obligation to participate.

There is obvious risk of causing confusion as this is running concurrently with the once-in-a-decade real Census.

- a) Has the council liaised with the Scottish Government team managing the real Census to ask for their approval to refer to this survey as “the Census”?
- b) Was it a conscious decision to run the two exercises concurrently?

Answer (1) Census is a statistical term and refers to the fact that all pupils are asked to take part. It does not mean it’s mandatory (unlike the Population Census). The HWB Census is optional and there is no legal obligation to participate. This differs from a sample survey, where only a selection of pupils are asked to participate.

“The census” is not a protected term in the UK. The Population Census in Scotland also uses the phraseology “the census” as do census offices across the UK and internationally. Approval to use the term “the census” is not required.

All references to the HWB Census as “the census” by the Scottish Government are within clearly titled Health and Wellbeing Census documentation, on the SG Health and Wellbeing website.

Question (2) Health & Wellbeing Census Data processing

The Health and Wellbeing survey responses are being cross linked with other personal information held against a child's Scottish Candidate Number (SCN) such as free school meal status, exclusion, attendance and absence.

- a) Please can you confirm all other categories of data that are linked with a child's SCN?
- b) Is this data being merged and analysed in the SmartSurvey platform?
- c) Please explain fully how long data will be stored and in what format and whether this will be linked with the SCN:
 - i) At school level
 - ii) At local authority level?
 - iii) At Scottish Government level?
- d) When will the SCN link be permanently deleted at each level?
 - i) At school level
 - ii) At local authority level?
 - iii) At Scottish Government level?

Answer (2) a) The SCN will be used by the Scottish Government to link the HWB Census data to the to the Pupil census data (which does not contain variables which allow direct identification of pupils, such as a child's name).

This information will only be linked in order to enable the Scottish Government to undertake statistical analysis and research based on these socio-economic and characteristics, for example to monitor and assess the impact of its policies on sub-populations and diverse equality groups.

The Scottish Government DPIA states Scottish Government may share the HWB Census dataset in order to enable other organisations (public bodies, third sector organisations and academics) to undertake research which can provide evidence on the health and wellbeing of children and young people in the broader public interest. Researchers and academics can apply to access Scottish Government data, for research purposes.

Any onward sharing will be on a case by case basis and with a clearly identified legal gateway and data sharing agreement in place. Any sharing or linkage of data by the SG will be done under the strict control of Scottish Government, and will be consistent with our data policy and the National Data Linkage Guiding Principles. Decisions on the sharing or linkage of data will be taken in consultation with relevant colleagues and individuals within and outwith Scottish Government as part of a Data Access Panel. At all times the rights of the individual (children or adults) under the UK GDPR and other relevant legislation will be ensured. There are processes and procedures in place to ensure that any data shared with externally approved researchers does not include direct identifiers (such as the SCN).

- b) No. The responses are downloaded from SmartSurvey prior to any linking or analysis happening. Data cannot be linked in SmartSurvey – it is a digital data collection platform only.
- c) Please explain fully how long data will be stored and in what format and whether this will be linked with the SCN:

- i) At school level

Schools do not hold or have access to any individual level data at any point. When a pupil responds, the response is stored on the SmartSurvey platform, accessed by the relevant local authority SmartSurvey contact.

ii) At local authority level?

Once the data has been shared with the Scottish Government, we will remove the SCN and store the rest of the data in SmartSurvey

iii) At Scottish Government level?

The SG DPIA , published on the SG Health and Wellbeing website, sets out all the data management and security, including access, by SG after they receive the data shared by local authorities.

SG DPIA and Privacy Notice state regarding the retention of data, Article 5 of the UK GDPR “Principles relating to processing of personal data” states:

“personal data may be stored for longer periods insofar as the personal data will be processed solely for archiving purposes in the public interest, scientific or historical research purposes or statistical purposes in accordance with Article 89(1) subject to implementation of the appropriate technical and organisational measures required by this Regulation in order to safeguard the rights and freedoms of the data subject”.

The data are processed in line with this legislation. The information collected will be used to inform planning and provision of education, and the linkage of such data to educational outcomes or health data. For example, researchers or charities may be interested in applying for access to education data to meet their own research needs.

d) i) At school level

Schools do not hold or access individual level data. Schools will receive their own aggregated data which has been disclosure controlled data only.

ii) At local authority level?

We will delete it once we have shared the data with the Scottish Government.

iii) At Scottish Government level?

The Scottish Government retain the SCN in the data shared with them. The Scottish Government does not have access to any data which contains pupil's name or address. Therefore the Scottish Government is unable to link the child's SCN to other information in order to directly identify any pupil (such as a child's name). The SCN allows internal linkage with other datasets, following existing procedures. The SCN is not shared with any external data users.

Question (3) Health & Wellbeing Census Disclosure Scotland

Some IT support workers and other staff within the council and external supplier, SmartSurvey, may be able to identify vulnerable children and have access to an unprecedented range of personal data for each individual. They will be working in a position of trust, even if they shouldn't have direct contact. Although they would be committing an offence, staff would have the data to be able to email a child directly or would be in a position where they could provide that data to others.

Do all internal and external staff with direct or indirect access to this data, including IT support workers, have a PVG Disclosure Record?

Answer (3) PVG disclosure applies to 'regulated work' and can also apply to certain positions of trust within organisations, even where the role doesn't involve any direct contact with children or protected adults. The HWB Census does not fall within this. The Local Authority (as data controller of their data) and the Scottish Government (as data controllers for the data shared by Local Authorities) are required to meet

the data protection principles as set out in the Data Protection Act 2018. The Scottish Government DPIA sets out how the data is shared, stored, who has access, and security measures in place. The Data Processor Agreement between the local authority and the SG sets out security. The SG contract with SmartSurvey sets out the security processes for SmartSurvey in providing use of the platform. Again, IT support workers and other staff outwith the local authority do not have any information (such as name or address) in which to directly contact individual pupils.

The local authority staff with access to the data both have a PVG Disclosure Record

Question (4) Health & Wellbeing Census Validation

We are led to believe that several of the census questions have been adopted from several different established surveys. Conventionally these individual surveys have been developed after a rigorous validation process for a specific purpose. Therefore, the set of questions posed in the census is a new survey; one in which questions can be removed, changed or added reflecting local authority preferences.

Has the census been subjected to an independent validation process to ensure it fulfils the task in the least restrictive manner?

Answer (4) The questionnaires were developed by the Health and Wellbeing Census Content Group. The Content Group consisted of representation from: Scottish Government, NHS Health Scotland (now Public Health Scotland), University of Glasgow (formerly University of St Andrews), Glasgow City Health & Social Care Partnership, Education Scotland, Perth & Kinross Council, Falkirk Council, MRC/CSO Social & Public Health Sciences Unit, an Independent consultant, South Lanarkshire Council, NHS National Services Scotland, Education Institute of Scotland (EIS), Association of Headteachers and Deputies in Scotland (AHDS), and ScotGen Social Research. There was also

representation from 2 schools. NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Health Board provided an advisory role rather than a formal member of the Content Group.

Question (5) Health & Wellbeing Census Ethics

Has CEC and/or Scottish Government put its chosen question sets for the Health & Wellbeing Census through an ethical review process, that considers all questions in the full context in which they are asked?

Answer (5) Yes. The Health and Wellbeing Census questionnaires have been ethically approved by independent researchers within the Scottish Government. An Ethics Peer Review is an internal process by which a group of independent Social Research colleagues supports the assessment of challenging ethical issues relating to a particular social research project. Ethics Peer Review is a form of self-regulation by qualified members of the profession to maintain professional quality standards, improve performance and maintain credibility. The principles are set out in the Government Social Research ethics guidance [2021-GSR Ethics Guidance v3.pdf \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](#). The process applies to the survey as a whole.

Question (6) Health & Wellbeing Census future intentions

This “census” has chosen to link all responses to a child’s Scottish Candidate Number, rather than work on an anonymous basis. We are now led to believe it is the intention to repeat the census every four years.

- a) Is it the intention to repeat the HWBC survey in future years with the same responders - how is this possible if the original linking mechanism (SCN) will be deleted?
- b) Is it the intention to cross link additional data from participants in future years?
- c) If additional data will be cross linked, what could this include, eg exam results?

Answer

- (6)** a) Local authorities can undertake the census at any interval that provides them (and their partners) with the evidence they need to fulfil their legislative duties.

The Scottish Government agreement was originally to share the data from local authorities every four years, using existing surveys in between to report national level measures. Covid-19 has impacted the timing of the HWB Census and other data collections, so further consideration of the future timeline is required, taking into account the timing of other data collections.

If local authorities and/or the Scottish Government were to delete the SCN, they could each consider involving a third party organisation in order to pseudonymise the data. Pseudonymisation is a technique that replaces or removes information in a data set that identifies an individual. The UK GDPR defines pseudonymisation as:

“...the processing of personal data in such a manner that the personal data can no longer be attributed to a specific data subject without the use of additional information, provided that such additional information is kept separately and is subject to technical and organisational measures to ensure that the personal data are not attributed to an identified or identifiable natural person.”

Pseudonymisation may involve replacing names or other identifiers which are easily attributed to individuals with, for example, a reference number. Whilst you can tie that reference number back to the individual if you have access to the relevant information, you put technical and organisational measures in place to ensure that this additional information is held separately.

Pseudonymising personal data can reduce the risks to the data subjects and help meet data protection obligations. However, pseudonymisation is effectively only a security measure. It does not change the status of the data as personal data. Recital 26 makes it clear

that pseudonymised personal data remains personal data and within the scope of the UK GDPR.

- b) Scottish Government will initially link the HWB Census data with the Pupil Census data, as noted above. However, as stated in its DPIA, the HWB Census could be linked with other data sources for statistics and research purposes and that there are already processes in place for this to occur safely, securely, lawfully and legally.
- (c) Yes, the Scottish Government could include examination results.

Question (7) Health & Wellbeing Census Timescales

This census has been planned by the Scottish Government for four years.

CEC completed the initial Data Protection Impact Assessment nearly six months ago in September 2021.

When members of the public, including parents submit information requests or complaints to the council, they have to wait 20 working days for a response.

Why have parents across the city only been given 10 days' notice of this census taking place in their schools?

Answer (7) Local authorities may notify parents at any point, but it must be a minimum of 10 days prior to pupils completing the HWB Census. This is so that parents and pupils are given notice of the census and are able to decide whether or not to participate.

Question (8) Health & Wellbeing Census latest statistics

How many schools

- a) Have begun data collection?
- b) Have completed their involvement in the surveys?
- c) How many opt outs have been received in total in Edinburgh?
- d) How many of these were from parents?
- e) How many of these were from children on the day?

Answer (8)

- a) 57
- b) 10 schools have so far let us know that they have completed the census.
- c) We won't know this until the census has been completed in early April. Anecdotally, some schools have told us that there have been no or very few (less than 5) opt outs but we know of at least one school where that figure will be higher.
- d) see c above
- e) see c above

Question (9) Health & Wellbeing Census Opt-out process

Different schools are using different processes to manage opt outs.

- a) Please outline all the different opt-out processes being used by schools in Edinburgh. Eg paper forms, ParentPay lunch booking/school trips system
- b) Please provide the numbers of schools using each one.

- Answer** (9) a) The options of a tear-off slip to the parents' letter or using ParentPay have been suggested in the information sent to schools but it is for schools to decide how best to manage the process.
- b) We won't know until the census closes in early April.

Question (10) **School email addresses for children**

The HWBC census has raised concerns about the use of a child's Scottish Candidate Number (SCN) as their email address and the visibility of a city-wide directory of children's names, schools and SCNs. Other councils do not use SCN in children's email addresses.

- a) Why was SCN chosen as a basis for children's email addresses?
- b) What risk assessments were carried out in relation to this?
- c) Were parents advised that there would be city-wide visibility of their children's information and that it would be easy for children/adults at other schools to contact their children directly or indeed, any adult from any external email address?

- Answer** (10) a) Using SCN as a pupil's computer and Office 365 username is considered best practice nationally. It is a unique identifier that does not identify them by name or location. This approach is used by many local authorities across the country and by Education Scotland in their national provision of Glow.
- b) SCN has been used for pupils' computer usernames and email addresses since the inception of our wide area network and network services in CEC schools, dating back possibly as far as the 1990s and the council's first in-house email service. Risk assessments carried out at that time are not readily available but may be archived, although accessing documents that old may be challenging.

- c) Our teachers and pupils all have accounts within our Office 365 tenancy, so they can communicate and collaborate in learning activities within, across and outwith schools as required, as well as to learn vital digital skills. Schools issue pupils and parents with an ICT Responsible Use Agreement to outline appropriate use of this technology and will deliver Digital Safety lessons to ensure pupils are aware (for example) of what to do if they receive an unsolicited or inappropriate email. It is also necessary that pupil email addresses can receive external communication so they can make use of certain tools or sign up for online services, but pupils' SCNs are not publicised or available externally, and we have robust filtering in place to remove spam and emails with inappropriate content, so the risk of unsolicited or inappropriate email is low. We do have the means to exclude identified key individuals from our internal address list if specific personal circumstances require that, but in doing so, it may also limit that pupil's ability to participate in certain digital activities undertaken by their class, as a result of those restrictions.

QUESTION NO 23

By Councillor Mitchell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question

Please could the Convener confirm the (a) current status and (b) expected delivery date of the following active travel projects which had previous levels of consultation and design work.

- i) Junction of Queensferry Road - Learmonth Terrace - Oxford Terrace - Clarendon Crescent walking and cycling improvements.
- ii) Carrington Road walking and cycling improvements.
- iii) Botanics - Inverleith Park crossing.
- iv) Leslie Place - Deanhaugh Street / Haugh Street crossing and signal improvements.

Answer

At present the current status and expected delivery dates of the four projects concerned are as follows:

- i) Junction of Queensferry Road - Learmonth Terrace - Oxford Terrace - Clarendon Crescent walking and cycling improvements

Temporary measures were implemented in 2021 as part of Spaces for People. It is proposed to retain these temporary measures using an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order as part of the Travelling Safely programme. Permanent measures will be considered further during the experimental period.

- ii) Carrington Road walking and cycling improvements.

In June 2019, a report to Transport and Environment Committee noted that affordability of the project by 2023/24 was under review. Following the review of the [Active Travel Investment Programme](#) in 2021, this project was not

included in the programme for delivery to 2025/26. This means that delivery will be deferred for inclusion in future Active Travel Investment Programmes.

iii) Botanics - Inverleith Park crossing.

Temporary measures were implemented in 2021 as part of Spaces for People. It is proposed to retain these temporary measures in place using an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order as part of the Travelling Safely programme. Alongside this, work on a detailed design for the permanent project will be progressed, with a view to implementation during 2023.

iii) Leslie Place - Deanhaugh Street / Haugh Street crossing and signal improvements.

In line with the Active Travel Investment Programme which was reported to Transport and Environment Committee in October 2021, construction of this project is now due to take place in financial year 2023/24.

QUESTION NO 24

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question

Broken down by ward, how much money has been spent on either fixing or upgrading roads and pavements across each of the last five years?

Answer

The table below shows the expenditure on roads and pavements across each of the last five years, broken down by ward where it is possible to do so.

Ward	2017/18	2018/19	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22	Ward Total
1	£447,000	£1,091,000	£780,000	£632,000	£2,413,000	£5,350,000
2	£171,000	£981,000.00	£239,000	£409,000	£603,000	£2,403,000
3	£141,000	£310,514	£625,000	£125,000	£1,020,000	£2,221,514
4	£757,000	£354,000	£762,000	£636,000	£661,000	£3,170,000
5	£254,000	£469,000	£1,010,000	£919,000	£804,000	£3,456,000
6	£640,000	£438,000	£986,000	£402,000	£649,000	£3,115,000
7	£426,000	£756,000	£229,000	£517,000	£502,000	£2,430,000
8	£742,000	£1,065,000	£341,000	£632,000	£701,000	£3,481,000
9	£978,000	£485,000	£552,000	£197,000	£661,000	£2,873,000
10	£242,000	£1,286,000	£410,000	£1,441,000	£702,000	£4,081,000
11	£802,000	£1,133,000	£120,000	£1,686,000	£1,980,000	£5,721,000
12	£890,000	£780,000	£1,100,000	£481,000	£201,000	£3,452,000
13	£970,000	£100,000	£617,000	£896,000	£104,000	£2,687,000
14	£421,000	£886,377	£709,000	£401,000	£468,000	£2,885,377
15	£1,127,000	£298,000	£332,000	£362,000	£601,000	£2,720,000
16	£758,000	£331,000	£616,000	£750,000	£1,010,000	£3,465,000
17	£634,000	£505,000	£1,370,000	£909,000	£497,000	£3,915,000
Sub-total	£10,400,000	£11,268,891	£10,798,000	£11,395,000	£13,564,000	
Revenue	£5,080,756	£4,401,335	£3,861,755	£3,570,000	£5,650,000	
Bus Stop Maintenance	£120,000	£240,000	£500,000	£500,000		
In-Year Priorities		£.895,000		£1,000,000		
Surface Enhancements		£1,000,000	£1,000,000			
Design, Supervision & Miscellaneous Costs	£1,372,440	£1,900,000	£1,572,000	£1,598,000	£1,636,000	
Drainage	£200,000	£300,000	£200,000	£200,000	£200,000	
Dropped Crossings	£50,000	£100,000	£50,000	£50,000	£50,000	
Total	£17,223,196	£20,105,226	£17,981,755	£18,313,000	£21,100,000	

QUESTION NO 25

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question

How many reports of fly tipping have been received in each of the past three years broken down by ward, and what were the timescales for dealing with these once reported?

Answer

Table 1 below shows the number of recorded service requests for dumping and fly tipping, by ward, in each of the last three years.

Table 2 below shows the average number of days taken to close requests, by ward, in each of the last three years. The time taken can include arranging for investigations by the Council's Street and Environmental Enforcement team

Table 1 - Dumping and Fly Tipping Service Requests for 2019 to 2021 by Ward

Ward	2019	2020	2021	Grand Total
01-Almond	384	532	626	1,542
02-Pentland Hills	1,082	712	724	2,518
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	249	283	357	889
04-Forth	711	859	1,075	2,645
05-Inverleith	374	442	447	1,263
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	164	193	169	526
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	1,043	1,320	1,867	4,230
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	324	276	320	920
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	422	466	646	1,534
10-Meadows/Morningside	551	626	904	2,081
11-City Centre	629	545	710	1,884
12-Leith Walk	715	875	1,081	2,671
13-Leith	653	769	793	2,215
14-Craigtinny/Duddingston	532	668	790	1,990
15-Southside/Newington	517	538	843	1,898
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	385	565	740	1,690
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	494	645	886	2,025
No code allocated	93	47	3	143
Grand Total	9,322	10,361	12,981	32,664

Table 2 - Dumping and Fly Tipping Service Requests for 2019 to 2021 by Ward

Average Number of Days to Close Requests

Ward	2019	2020	2021	Average
01-Almond	4.0	5.2	4.6	4.7
02-Pentland Hills	4.7	3.6	3.4	4.0
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	3.2	4.5	4.5	4.1
04-Forth	3.7	3.8	3.6	3.7
05-Inverleith	3.3	4.2	3.7	3.8
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	3.0	3.2	4.4	3.5
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	3.4	3.0	3.2	3.2
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	3.1	3.4	3.5	3.3
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.8
10-Meadows/Morningside	2.9	1.7	1.8	2.0
11-City Centre	2.7	2.0	2.2	2.3
12-Leith Walk	2.4	2.0	1.6	1.9
13-Leith	2.5	1.9	1.8	2.0
14-Craigtinny/Duddingston	3.9	1.9	1.9	2.4
15-Southside/Newington	2.4	1.4	1.7	1.8
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	4.4	2.9	2.3	3.0
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	4.7	3.3	3.0	3.5
No code allocated	7.7	8.4	6.0	7.9
Average	3.5	2.9	2.8	3.0

QUESTION NO 26

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) How many garden waste permits have been issued across the city broken down by ward for each year since the system came into effect?

Answer (1) Table 1 below provides details on the number of garden waste permit subscriptions in each calendar year between 2018 and 2021, broken down by ward.

Question (2) How many requests have been received by the council from residents wishing to register for garden waste collections outside of the registration window?

Answer (2) This information is not recorded.

However, Transport and Environment Committee in June 2021 requested details of this, and a report has been prepared for Committee on 31 March 2022.

The analysis of information available shows that approximately 260 people contacted the Council via email between September and end of November 2021 (after the summer window closed and the mid-year window opened) requesting details of how to register for the service.

The reasons for missing the summer window are mixed and include:

- Missing the reminder notification; and
- Moving into a property; and not realising that the property had not been registered.

It is not possible to specify the number of telephone calls in respect of registration for garden waste. However, there were 831 calls between September and October 2021 covering a range of garden waste topics including asking to register, as well as questions on non-exempt customer

paying for the service, requests for replacement bins, reports of missed collections from current customers, and asking when permits will arrive.

Table 1 - Garden Waste Permits by Ward from Jan 2018 to Dec 2021

Ward	2018	2019	2020	2021
01-Almond	7,875	8,465	9,039	8,762
02-Pentland Hills	5,720	5,775	6,413	6,464
03-Drum Brae/Gyle	4,767	5,228	5,517	5,394
04-Forth	4,081	4,493	4,799	4,715
05-Inverleith	4,694	4,990	5,289	5,269
06-Corstorphine/Murrayfield	6,046	6,489	6,781	6,815
07-Sighthill/Gorgie	3,076	3,459	3,779	3,571
08-Colinton/Fairmilehead	6,478	6,978	7,089	7,172
09-Fountainbridge/Craiglockhart	3,263	3,193	3,684	3,380
10-Meadows/Morningside	4,183	4,446	4,531	4,629
11-City Centre	581	574	614	660
12-Leith Walk	780	792	938	945
13-Leith	816	882	982	960
14-Craigtinny/Duddingston	4,030	4,360	4,645	4,566
15-Southside/Newington	3,882	4,238	4,349	4,409
16-Liberton/Gilmerton	6,204	7,127	7,830	7,672
17-Portobello/Craigmillar	4,186	4,594	4,904	4,847
Not available	2	1,398	102	243
Grand Total	70,664	77,481	81,285	80,473

QUESTION NO 27

By Councillor Douglas for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 17 March 2022

Question (1) What monitoring is being done of the increased congestion and pollution levels in and around Picardy Place since the westbound entrance to York Place was shut off due to the tram works?

Answer (1) Congestion at this location is being monitored centrally, as part of the Council's monitoring of congestion across the city. In addition, Lothian Buses are sharing their information with the Council's Traffic Management Review Panel.

In terms of the Council's statutory duties to review and assess air quality, consideration is given to likely exceedances of NO₂ (predominately traffic related) Air Quality Objectives (AQO) in terms of an annual average. Where significant issues arise, longer term trends are assessed with a minimum assessment period of 5 years. Pollution concentrations can fluctuate on an annual basis with local road changes or favourable/less favourable meteorological conditions. With the short term nature of the tram construction diversion, it would be unlikely to have significant impact on the findings of the review and assessment process.

There is no additional monitoring in place in response to construction diversions.

Question (2) What measures are the council taking to help alleviate the increased congestion?

Answer (2) Council officers are working closely with Lothian Buses and the Traffic Management Review Panel. This has resulted in all of the traffic signals in this area being switched to the Urban Traffic Control system. This allows officers to control lights to ease congestion in real time and has resulted in a reduction in congestion in the area.