

Minutes

The City of Edinburgh Council

Edinburgh, Thursday 21 March 2024

Present:

LORD PROVOST

The Right Honourable Robert Aldridge

COUNCILLORS

Scott Arthur
Danny Aston
Jule Bandel
Alan C Beal
Fiona Bennett
Marco Biagi
Chas Booth
Graeme Bruce
Steve Burgess
Jack Caldwell
Lezley Marion Cameron
Kate Campbell
Christopher Cowdy
James Dalglish
Euan R Davidson
Cammy Day
Sanne Dijkstra-Downie
Denis Dixon
Stuart Dobbin
Phil Duggan
Katrina Faccenda
Pauline Flannery
Catherine Fullerton
Neil Gardiner
Fiona Glasgow
Margaret A Graham
Griffiths
Dan Heap
Euan Hyslop
Stephen P Jenkinson
Tim Jones

David Key
Simita Kumar
Kevin Lang
Lesley Macinnes
Martha Mattos Coelho
Finlay McFarlane
Ross McKenzie
Amy McNeese-Mechan
Jane E Meagher
Claire Miller
Max Mitchell
Jo Mowat
Alys Mumford
Marie-Clair Munro
Vicky Nicolson
Adam Nols-McVey
Kayleigh O'Neill
Hal Osler
Ben Parker
Tim Pogson
Susan Rae
Neil J Ross
Jason Rust
Alex Staniforth
Edward J Thornley
Val Walker
Mandy H Watt
Iain Whyte
Norman J Work
Louise Young
Lewis J Younie

1 Order of Business - Motion by Councillor Mumford - Reaffirming the Council's Call for Immediate Ceasefire

The Lord Provost ruled that the Motion submitted by Councillor Mumford - Reaffirming the Council's Call for Immediate Ceasefire was incompetent in terms of Standing Order 30.1 (changing a Council decision within 6 months).

Councillor Mumford requested in terms of Standing Order 28.1, that Standing Order 30.1 be suspended for this item to allow discussions to take place.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

To not suspend Standing Order 30.1	-	34 votes
To suspend Standing Order 30.1	-	28 votes

(To not suspend Standing Order 30.1: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalglish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Daggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

To suspend Standing Order 30.1: Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.)

Decision

To not suspend Standing Order 30.1.

2 Minutes

Decision

- 1) To approve the minute of the Special Council meeting of 8 February 2024 as a correct record.
- 2) To approve the minute of the Council of 8 February 2024 as a correct record.
- 3) To approve the minute of the Council of 22 February 2024 as a correct record.

3 Leader's Report

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

- Death of Thomas Wong
- Issues around Anchorfield
- Fire at Breadalbane Street
- Congratulations to Foster Care Team – 25 year award
- Edinburgh Airport – Volunteer Edinburgh - Ukrainians
- Trams Award
- Leith – best place to live
- City Centre West to East Link
- Cllr Nols-McVey – thanks for work as SNP Leader
- Single Parents Day

The following questions/comments were made:

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---|
| Councillor Nols-McVey | - | Thanks to officers for support over past 7 years |
| | - | Substantive policy differences between the Labour and Conservative Groups |
| Councillor Lang | - | Contributions of Councillor Nols-McVey |
| | - | Group staff members - thanks – Irene Aitchison |
| Councillor Mumford | - | Congratulations to Cllr Nols-McVey |
| | - | Re-affirm position to call for a ceasefire in Palestine |
| Councillor Whyte | - | Thanks to Irene Aitchison for council service |
| | - | International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance - working definition of anti-semitism |
| Councillor Dalglish | - | Fire in Breadalbane Street – thanks to emergency services, officers and community workers |
| Councillor McKenzie | - | Health and Social Care cuts |
| Councillor MacInnes | - | Impact on citizens of Edinburgh of Labour party policies |
| Councillor Younie | - | Spending on National Care Service |

- | | | |
|----------------------------------|---|---|
| Councillor Parker | - | Opening of City Centre West to East Link cycling route |
| Councillor Cowdy | - | Improvement of school crossing attendants' recruitment |
| Councillor Walker | - | Muslim Community – peaceful Ramadan – possible installation to celebrate diversity |
| Councillor Nicolson | - | Unpaid carers - funding |
| Councillor Caldwell | - | Sectarian behaviour at football matches |
| Councillor Heap | - | Misuse of Blue Badge scheme and eligibility |
| Councillor Doggart | - | Consequence of flagship policy of VAT on private school fees |
| Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron | - | Appreciation of Councillor Nols-McVey work
Euro 24 Football Championships – requests for funding for inclusive accessible fan zone |
| Councillor Hyslop | - | Void houses |
| Councillor Osler | - | Fir at Breadalbane Street – funding for emergency services |
| Councillor Booth | - | Climate change – Heat and Buildings Bill– Council targets |
| Councillor Aston | - | Allocation of funding to freeze garden aid |
| Councillor McNeese-Mechan | - | Congratulation to Kurdish and Iranian communities for Nowruz celebrations |
| Councillor Mowat | - | Thanks to Steve Williamson for 44 years of service to the Council |
| Councillor Campbell | - | Labour and Conservative Parties' spending plans – benefit to Edinburgh |

4 Appointment to Various Committees, Boards and Working Groups

Decision

To appoint Councillor Bruce in place of Councillor Rust on the Short Term Lets Working Group.

5 Scheme of Delegation to Officers 2024

Details were provided on proposed changes to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers regarding Estates Services and short term let licences which supported internal controls, accountability and the transparent operation of the Council with the Scheme being a statutory requirement.

Motion

- 1) Agrees to approve the changes to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers regarding short term let licences.
- 2) Agrees to defer the changes to the Scheme of Delegation to officers regarding Estate Services, till next Full Council.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

Amendment

- 1) To repeal the existing Scheme of Delegation to Officers and approve in their place appendix one to the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services, such repeal and approval to take effect from 22 March 2024.
- 2) To delegate authority to the Executive Director of Corporate Services to take such actions and make such minor adjustments to the documents set out in appendix one to the report as may be necessary to implement the decision of the Council in relation to this report.
- 3) To note concerns relating to decisions being taken under the scheme of delegation that constitute a policy change, or where the decision could be considered material or politically controversial.
- 4) Agrees that all policy changes are a matter for committees and Councillors and requests the Director of Corporate Services bring a report to Council in 3 cycles with further changes to the scheme of delegation to tighten up the scheme, particularly in relation to section 1.5, section 2 and any other relevant

sections, to ensure all policy decisions are taken by Councillors through Committees, as set out in statute.

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor Campbell

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), the amendment was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the motion.

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To agree to approve the changes to the Scheme of Delegation to Officers regarding short term let licences.
- 2) To agree to defer the changes to the Scheme of Delegation to officers regarding Estate Services, till next Full Council.
- 3) To agree that all policy changes were a matter for Committees and Councillors and request the Director of Corporate Services bring a report to Council in 3 cycles with further changes to the Scheme of Delegation to tighten up the Scheme, particularly in relation to section 1.5, section 2 and any other relevant sections, to ensure all policy decisions were taken by Councillors through Committees, as set out in statute.

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

6 Revised Polling Places for the Next UK Parliamentary General Election

The Council was asked to delegate authority to the Chief Executive to amend polling arrangements for the next UK Parliamentary General Election. As the election might be called with a minimum of 25 working days' notice, many of the polling places previously designated and agreed by Council were private venues that might be unavailable at such short notice and there would be insufficient time in the election timetable to allow Council to agree new polling places. Any changes would be made following consultation with ward councillors.

Decision

To delegate authority to the Chief Executive to make minor amendments to the polling arrangements for the next UK Parliamentary General Election, where venues were unavailable at short notice, with changes made following consultation with ward councillors.

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

7 Calls for Views on the Scottish Languages Bill - Council Response

An overview was provided on the Scottish Languages Bill together with the Council's draft response to a call for views on the provisions of the Bill.

Decision

To agree the draft response for submission to the Scottish Parliament's Education, Children and Young People Committee to the call for views on the Scottish Languages Bill.

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

8 People Strategy 2024-27 - referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee

The Policy and Sustainability Committee had referred a decision on the People Strategy 2024-2027 to the City of Edinburgh Council for approval.

Motion

- 1) To approve the People Strategy 2024/27 in principle. To note the need to develop the Workforce Plan and other respective plans alongside the strategy to answer many of the outstanding issues and therefore agree the strategy would come back to committee for final approval alongside the proposed refreshed Workplace Plan.
- 2) To regret that the timeline for the replacement of the Chief Executive would leave a gap in the post, creating uncertainty for the organisation. To therefore agree that the workforce plan would set out in detail plans to develop senior leadership team members to enable them to cover all relevant positions in the senior leadership team which were essential to the running of the Council. These plans should set out training, personal development and approach to succession planning as well as covering essential roles.
- 3) To welcome the aspiration for an anti-discriminatory, anti-racist workplace, but note that there were no kitemarks or specific policy recommendations relating to race currently.
- 4) Therefore to request that these issues were considered prior to the "deep dive" presented to committee on this theme and specific recommendations developed to embed an anti-racist approach.
- 5) To agree to amend "We'll create separate policy and guidance for harassment relating to sex" to read "We'll create a separate gender informed sexual

harassment policy, with appropriate training and toolkits.” to ensure it was in-line with previous decisions of this committee.

- 6) To welcome that a refreshed Workforce Plan would be presented to Policy and Sustainability Committee in August 2024.
- 7) To request that this set out plans to implement the Council’s aspirations around in-sourcing and reduction in agency spend, including specifying workforce areas.
- 8) To request that in advance of this report, officers meet with Trade Union representatives and elected members specifically on the topic of insourcing and agency spend, as well as other planned engagement.
- 9) Additionally, to request that this consider setting targets for employment in different departments with an aim to achieve a 50:50 gender split across all sectors with a specific focus on increasing women’s representation in executive positions and men’s representation in social care.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

Amendment 1

- 1) To approve the People Strategy 2024/27 in principle. To note the need to develop the Workforce Plan and other respective plans alongside the strategy to answer many of the outstanding issues and therefore agree the strategy would come back to committee for final approval alongside the proposed refreshed Workplace Plan.
- 2) To regret that the timeline for the replacement of the Chief Executive would leave a gap in the post, creating uncertainty for the organisation. To therefore agree that the workforce plan would set out in detail plans to develop all relevant management team members to enable options for act up arrangements into relevant positions in the senior leadership team which are essential to the running of the Council. These plans should set out training opportunities, personal development opportunities and approach to succession planning to provide assurance for Elected Members of the robustness of arrangements to cover essential roles.
- 3) To welcome the aspiration for an anti-discriminatory, anti-racist workplace, but note that there were no kitemarks or specific policy recommendations relating to race currently.
- 4) Therefore to request that these issues were considered prior to the “deep dive” presented to committee on this theme and specific recommendations developed to embed an anti-racist approach.

- 5) To agree to amend “We’ll create separate policy and guidance for harassment relating to sex” to read “We’ll create a separate gender informed sexual harassment policy, with appropriate training and toolkits.” to ensure it was in-line with previous decisions of this committee.
- 6) To welcome that a refreshed Workforce Plan would be presented to Policy and Sustainability Committee in August 2024.
- 7) To request that this set out plans to implement the Council’s aspirations around in-sourcing and reduction in agency spend, including specifying workforce areas.
- 8) To request that in advance of this report, officers meet with Trade Union representatives and elected members specifically on the topic of insourcing and agency spend, as well as other planned engagement.
- 9) Additionally, to request that this consider setting targets for employment in different departments with an aim to achieve a 50:50 gender split across all sectors with a specific focus on increasing women’s representation in executive positions and men’s representation in social care.

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor Macinnes

Amendment 2

Council

- 1) To agree to amend “We’ll create separate policy and guidance for harassment relating to sex” to read “We’ll create a separate gender informed sexual harassment policy, with appropriate training and toolkits.” to ensure it was in-line with previous decisions of this committee.
- 2) Asks the Equalities Working Group to consider what kitemarks or specific policy recommendations are required for the elements of the strategy relating to making the Council an anti-discriminatory and anti-racist workplace, and that the outcomes of this work should be reported to the Policy & Sustainability Committee as part of the refreshed Equalities Strategy and Action Plan in Autumn 2024.
- 3) Notes that a refreshed Workforce Plan will be presented to Policy and Sustainability Committee in August 2024/25 and agrees that this should reflect the position whereby in-sourcing and a reduction in agency spend is progressed where a) there is genuine value for money and b) service levels are maintained or improved, and that such work should fully engage Trade Union representatives.

- 4) Additionally requests that the equalities action plan considers how the gender split across all sectors can be improved with a specific focus on increasing women’s representation in executive positions and men’s representation across sectors such as social care and primary schools.

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment 3

Council agrees to approve the People Strategy for 2024-2027 as submitted to the Policy and Sustainability Committee by the Executive Director of Corporate Services.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the Motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 2 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting

Vote 1

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	25 votes
For Amendment 2 (as adjusted)	-	29 votes
For Amendment 3	-	9 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Lang, Meagher, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 2 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O’Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

There being no overall majority, Amendment 3 fell and a second vote was taken between the Motion (as adjusted) and Amendment 1 (as adjusted).

Vote 2

For the Motion (as adjusted) - 34 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted) - 29 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Duggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To approve the People Strategy 2024/27 in principle. To note the need to develop the Workforce Plan and other respective plans alongside the strategy to answer many of the outstanding issues and therefore agree the strategy would come back to committee for final approval alongside the proposed refreshed Workplace Plan.
- 2) To regret that the timeline for the replacement of the Chief Executive would leave a gap in the post, creating uncertainty for the organisation. To therefore agree that the workforce plan would set out in detail plans to develop senior leadership team members to enable them to cover all relevant positions in the senior leadership team which were essential to the running of the Council. These plans should set out training, personal development and approach to succession planning as well as covering essential roles.
- 3) To welcome the aspiration for an anti-discriminatory, anti-racist workplace, but note that there were no kitemarks or specific policy recommendations relating to race currently.
- 4) Therefore to request that these issues were considered prior to the “deep dive” presented to committee on this theme and specific recommendations developed to embed an anti-racist approach.
- 5) To agree to amend “We’ll create separate policy and guidance for harassment relating to sex” to read “We’ll create a separate gender informed sexual harassment policy, with appropriate training and toolkits.” to ensure it was in-line with previous decisions of this committee.
- 6) To welcome that a refreshed Workforce Plan would be presented to Policy and Sustainability Committee in August 2024.

- 7) To request that this set out plans to implement the Council's aspirations around in-sourcing and reduction in agency spend, including specifying workforce areas.
- 8) To request that in advance of this report, officers meet with Trade Union representatives and elected members specifically on the topic of insourcing and agency spend, as well as other planned engagement.
- 9) Additionally, to request that this consider setting targets for employment in different departments with an aim to achieve a 50:50 gender split across all sectors with a specific focus on increasing women's representation in executive positions and men's representation in social care.
- 10) To ask the Equalities Working Group to consider what kitemarks or specific policy recommendations were required for the elements of the strategy relating to making the Council an anti-discriminatory and anti-racist workplace, and that the outcomes of this work should be reported to the Policy and Sustainability Committee as part of the refreshed Equalities Strategy and Action Plan in Autumn 2024.
- 11) To note that a refreshed Workforce Plan would be presented to Policy and Sustainability Committee in August 2024/25 and agree that this should reflect the position whereby in-sourcing and a reduction in agency spend was progressed where a) there was genuine value for money and b) service levels were maintained or improved, and that such work should fully engage Trade Union representatives.
- 12) To additionally request that the equalities action plan consider how the gender split across all sectors could be improved with a specific focus on increasing women's representation in executive positions and men's representation across sectors such as social care and primary schools.

(Reference – Policy and Sustainability Committee of 12 March 2024 (item 11); referral from the Policy and Sustainability Committee, submitted)

9 Annual Treasury Management Strategy 2024/25 - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred the Treasury Management: Strategy 2024/25, to the Council for approval and then on to the Governance Risk and Best Value Committee for scrutiny.

Decision

- 1) To approve the Annual Treasury Strategy 2024/25.

- 2) To refer the report by the Executive Director of Corporate Services to Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee for scrutiny.

(Reference – Finance and Resources Committee of 14 March 2024 (item 6); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

10 Capital Strategy 2024-34 - Annual Report - referral from the Finance and Resources Committee

The Finance and Resources Committee had referred the Capital Strategy 2024-34 – Annual Report, to the Council for approval.

Decision

To approve the Capital Strategy 2024-34 – Annual Report.

(Reference – Finance and Resources Committee of 14 March 2024 (item 7); referral from the Finance and Resources Committee, submitted.)

11 Reporting Broken Communal Bin Lids– Motion by Councillor Caldwell

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

“Council

Notes;

- 1) The Communal Bin Review Phase 1 and 2 have fully rolled out in predominately tenemental areas for residential waste and recycling streams.
- 2) This review has led to new model of 1,100L communal bins, with the waste bins having hatch-based lids.
- 3) That many of these lids have succumbed to the elements and/or have been broken off which exposes a large quantity of waste contents to be blown away by the wind or scattered by seagulls. Therefore requests the Waste and Cleansing Department;
- 4) Investigate how the lids could be strengthened for both the current stock and potential new stock.
- 5) Investigate the implementation of a ‘Report a Broken Bin Lid’ function on the website, potentially using a similar system to the ‘Report an overflowing communal bin’ interface.

- 6) Report back to the Transport and Environment committee's next appropriate Communal Bin Review update."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Caldwell

- moved by Councillor Caldwell, seconded by Councillor Flannery

Amendment 1

To add to the motion by Councillor Caldwell:

- 1) A new point 4 to read:
 - "That a common and frequent complaint from residents is the noise that the bin lids make when bags are deposited."

and renumbers accordingly,

- 2) A new point 6:

"Investigates a 'dampening' system that can be deployed to reduce the lid noise for both the current stock and potential new stock."

- moved by Councillor Dobbin, seconded by Councillor Aston

Amendment 2

- 1) To amend point 4 of the motion by Councillor Caldwell to read:

"Provides an update to the Transport & Environment Committee at the next appropriate opportunity via the Business Bulletin, Update Report, or verbally on the work already underway with the supplier following apparent quality and resilience issues with new bin lids during recent storms."
- 2) To amend in point 5 of the motion "Report a broken bin lid" to read "Report a broken or damaged bin".
- 3) To remove point 6.

- moved by Councillor Mitchell, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

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

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Caldwell:

- 1) To note the Communal Bin Review Phase 1 and 2 had fully rolled out in predominately tenemental areas for residential waste and recycling streams.
- 2) To note this review had led to new model of 1,100L communal bins, with the waste bins having hatch-based lids.
- 3) To note that many of these lids had succumbed to the elements and/or had been broken off which exposed a large quantity of waste contents to be blown away by the wind or scattered by seagulls.
- 4) To note that a common and frequent complaint from residents was the noise that the bin lids make when bags were deposited.
- 5) To therefore request the Waste and Cleansing Department;
 - a) Provide an update to the Transport and Environment Committee at the next appropriate opportunity via the Business Bulletin, Update Report, or verbally on the work already underway with the supplier following apparent quality and resilience issues with new bin lids during recent storms.
 - b) Investigate the implementation of a "Report a broken or damaged bin" function on the website, potentially using a similar system to the 'Report an overflowing communal bin' interface.
 - c) Investigates a 'dampening' system that could be deployed to reduce the lid noise for both the current stock and potential new stock.

12 Proactively Maximising Income – Motion by Councillor Caldwell

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

- "1) Notes that the 2024/25 City of Edinburgh Council Budget included a provision of £0.5m revenue to proactively support families to maximise their income through providing advice on benefits and related issues to reduce child poverty.
- 2) Notes that this funding may be utilised via several methods, such as the Poverty Prevention and Transformation team, the Advice Shop, Benefits Support, targeted crisis services, advertising of existing services, outreach into schools, libraries and community centres, and many other channels.

- 3) Requests a report to Policy and Sustainability Committee, targeting one cycle, outlining proposals for the additional funding.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Caldwell.

- moved by Councillor Caldwell, seconded by Councillor Flannery

Amendment 1

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

“Notes the work already being done by the Council as the Annual Poverty Progress outlines:

- £20m of financial gains for Edinburgh households through money, welfare and debt advice services – including the Council advice shop, and outreach advice services embedded in schools, early years centres, GPs and health settings across the city.
- £193m for Edinburgh citizens through locally administered benefits such as housing benefit, DHP, and Council Tax Reduction
- £2.1m of Scottish Welfare Fund crisis payments for people in crisis in Edinburgh, alongside £300k of Council support for local foodbanks
- £206k in savings for Council tenants through Energy Advice Support
- A 61% increase in the number of people supported through Free School Meal and Uniform Grant programmes over the past three years through automation of application processes.

Further notes the reconvening of the Edinburgh Poverty Commission later this year to help assess the progress the Council is making against the calls to action from 2020.

Understands a report on the proposed process for that review is planned for scrutiny by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in May this year.

Recognises the work of officers involved in rolling out these programmes of work and looks forward to continued work in this area.”

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Watt

Amendment 2

- 1) To add after “funding” in point 3 of the motion by Councillor Caldwell:

“including recommendations for actions targeted at groups at higher risk of poverty who would benefit from additional support to maximise their income,”

2) To insert a new point at the end of the motion:

“4) Requests this report also includes

- (a) any recommendations for making Council-administered entitlements easier to access that would require funding;
- b) an update on the establishment of the new Annual Social Security Uptake Report process, including when the 2024/25 report will be provided to Policy and Sustainability Committee.”

- moved by Councillor Heap, seconded by Councillor O’Neill

Amendment 3

Council notes the terms of the Motion by Councillor Caldwell and that the actions requested are all being progressed and will be reported in the normal course of events to the relevant Committee as part of their business plan. Council further considers that, given concerns repeatedly raised about officer workload and the pressures on officers, that an additional report is unnecessarily burdensome and therefore agrees that no further report is necessary.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Doggart

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the Motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	54 votes
For Amendment 3	-	9 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O’Neill, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Caldwell:

- 1) To note that the 2024/25 City of Edinburgh Council Budget included a provision of £0.5m revenue to proactively support families to maximise their income through providing advice on benefits and related issues to reduce child poverty.
- 2) To note that this funding might be utilised via several methods, such as the Poverty Prevention and Transformation team, the Advice Shop, Benefits Support, targeted crisis services, advertising of existing services, outreach into schools, libraries and community centres, and many other channels.
- 3) To request a report to Policy and Sustainability Committee, targeting one cycle, outlining proposals for the additional funding including recommendations for actions targeted at groups at higher risk of poverty who would benefit from additional support to maximise their income.
- 4) To requests that this report also include:
 - (a) any recommendations for making Council-administered entitlements easier to access that would require funding;
 - b) an update on the establishment of the new Annual Social Security Uptake Report process, including when the 2024/25 report would be provided to Policy and Sustainability Committee.
- 5) To note the work already being done by the Council as the Annual Poverty Progress outlined:
 - £20m of financial gains for Edinburgh households through money, welfare and debt advice services – including the Council advice shop, and outreach advice services embedded in schools, early years centres, GPs and health settings across the city.
 - £193m for Edinburgh citizens through locally administered benefits such as housing benefit, DHP, and Council Tax Reduction
 - £2.1m of Scottish Welfare Fund crisis payments for people in crisis in Edinburgh, alongside £300k of Council support for local foodbanks
 - £206k in savings for Council tenants through Energy Advice Support
 - A 61% increase in the number of people supported through Free School Meal and Uniform Grant programmes over the past three years through automation of application processes.
- 6) To further note the reconvening of the Edinburgh Poverty Commission later this year to help assess the progress the Council was making against the calls to action from 2020.
- 7) To understand a report on the proposed process for that review was planned for scrutiny by the Policy and Sustainability Committee in May this year.

- 8) To recognise the work of officers involved in rolling out these programmes of work and look forward to continued work in this area.

13 Right to Grow – Support – Motion by Councillor Osler

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

“Council

- 1) Notes in December 2023 the Culture and Communities Committee agreed to investigate looking into the possibility of whether Edinburgh could adopt “a right to grow” policy on Council-owned land that is deemed suitable for cultivation.
- 2) Notes that a report is due to come back to Committee later in the summer.
- 3) Notes that in the Council budget passed on 22nd February 2024 that £750,000 was set aside to Flood Prevention/Biodiversity (additional Trees & Grow Your Own” Allotments Investment.
- 4) Notes that work is being done on progressing Flood Prevention, tree planting and an update is being prepared for Culture and Communities on Allotment Provision.
- 5) Knows that there is a huge demand for growing food and allotment provision is limited and not suitable for all users.
- 6) Knows access to land is only part of the issue for Individuals wishing to grow food and support is vital.
- 7) Agrees that in the report due to come back to Culture and Communities Committee (mentioned in point 2) to include what support is already available (outside of allotment provision) and what more could be provided to allow residents to grow food.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Osler

- moved by Councillor Osler, seconded by Councillor Thornley

Amendment 1

To add a new point 7 to the motion by Councillor Osler to read:

- “7) Recognises the pioneering work of many organisations across the city, such as Granton Community Gardeners, in developing community and

individuals growing activities and that their learning, experience and advice should inform the report requested at [new] Point 8 in respect of motivating and activating communities and the support required.”

and renumber accordingly

- moved by Councillor Dobbin, seconded by Councillor Aston

Amendment 2

1) To add after paragraph 5 of the motion by Councillor Osler:

“6) Knows that community growing initiatives, for example, present alternative opportunities for many people to come together to grow food, build community, improve wellbeing, reduce social isolation, and learn about nature and sustainability.”

2) To add at the end of paragraph 7 of the motion:

"including but not limited to community growing."

- moved by Councillor Bandel, seconded by Councillor Parker

Amendment 3

Council notes the terms of the Motion by Councillor Osler and that the actions requested are all being progressed and will be reported in the normal course of events to the relevant Committee as part of their business plan. Council further considers that, given concerns repeatedly raised about officer workload and the pressures on officers, an additional report is unnecessarily burdensome and therefore agrees that no further report is necessary.

- moved by Councillor Rust, seconded by Councillor Munro

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the Motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	54 votes
For Amendment 3	-	9 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dagleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key,

Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Osler:

- 1) To note that in December 2023 the Culture and Communities Committee agreed to investigate looking into the possibility of whether Edinburgh could adopt “a right to grow” policy on Council-owned land that was deemed suitable for cultivation.
- 2) To note that a report was due to come back to Committee later in the summer.
- 3) To note that in the Council budget passed on 22nd February 2024 that £750,000 was set aside to Flood Prevention/Biodiversity (additional Trees & Grow Your Own” Allotments Investment.
- 4) To note that work was being done on progressing Flood Prevention, tree planting and an update was being prepared for Culture and Communities on Allotment Provision.
- 5) To know that there was a huge demand for growing food and allotment provision was limited and not suitable for all users.
- 6) To know that community growing initiatives, for example, presented alternative opportunities for many people to come together to grow food, build community, improve wellbeing, reduce social isolation, and learn about nature and sustainability.
- 7) To know access to land was only part of the issue for Individuals wishing to grow food and support was vital.
- 8) To recognise the pioneering work of many organisations across the city, such as Granton Community Gardeners, in developing community and individuals growing activities and that their learning, experience and advice should inform the report requested at Point 9 in respect of motivating and activating communities and the support required.
- 9) To agree that in the report due to come back to Culture and Communities Committee (mentioned in point 2) to include what support was already available (outside of allotment provision) and what more could be provided to allow residents to grow food including but not limited to community growing.

14 Safety of Council Operated Heavy Vehicles – Motion by Councillor Lang

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

“Council

- 1) notes the recent tragic events in Scotland where children have died following collisions with waste collection vehicles, including the death of Thomas Wong on Whitehouse Road.
- 2) notes that these events have not involved any Edinburgh Council owned or operated heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and recognises the seriousness with which our own staff take their responsibilities towards health and safety.
- 3) nevertheless, recognises the renewed focus on the dangers associated with HGVs, particularly in regard to children and other vulnerable groups, and the need for the Council’s operations to demonstrate best practice when it comes to health and safety, in order to minimise the potential for accidents, collisions and fatalities.
- 4) therefore requests a report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee in two cycles, setting out:
 - a) the current fitness-to-operate and training requirements for Council HGV drivers and any assessment for how these could be enhanced.
 - b) how the choice of model of HGVs and any additional installed equipment /IT can be used to avoid collisions with pedestrians and cyclists, including speed monitoring and speed limitation.
 - c) how waste collection routes and timetables can be amended to ensure HGVs do not pass near schools or nurseries (both Council and independent) at key start and finish times.
 - d) any other relevant information on how health and safety can be maximised for Council HGV operations.”

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Dijkstra-Downie

Amendment 1

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

“5) Furthermore, Council:

- a) Notes the HGV Safety Permit Scheme in Greater London, part of the Mayor of London's Vision Zero plan, which requires operators of all HGVs weighing more than 12 tonnes to apply for a free permit to operate in London.
 - b) Notes that the aim of the HGV Safety Permit Scheme is to ensure higher safety standards for HGVs to reduce the risks posed to vulnerable road users such as people walking and cycling, and that HGVs which do not meet the safety levels it requires are accordingly not permitted to operate in Greater London.
 - c) Notes that the Direct Vision Standard (DVS) forms part of the requirements of the HGV Safety Permit Scheme and that this requires HGVs to be graded out of five on how much the driver can see directly through the cab window; further notes that the minimum grading required to receive a permit to operate is increasing from one star to three stars from October 2024.
- 6) Understands that the powers to implement such a scheme sit with the Scottish Government and Transport Scotland and therefore requests that the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee writes to the Cabinet Secretary for Transport asking that introduction of a permit scheme based on safety requirements as outlined above is considered for HGVs operating in Edinburgh and Scotland.”

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

To add to the motion by Councillor Lang:

- “5) To also address the issues of road safety and wellbeing of children, also requests a report in four cycles to Transport & Environment Committee with the relevant information from the report to Policy & Sustainability Committee and information on additional safety measures including but not limited to:
- a) Full implementation of safe routes to schools;
 - b) Segregated cycle infrastructure;
 - c) Restriction of other vehicles (e.g private car) during school travel times;
 - d) Improved markings on problematic roads;
 - e) Possibility of new traffic calming measures on problematic roads
 - f) Parking restrictions and improvement of pavements

- 6) Finally, notes that the Council has limited scope to restrict the operations of private refuse companies and therefore requests that the report to P&S includes information about waste collection in Edinburgh since the Council ended its trade waste service in 2016, including but not limited to:
- a) demand for and provision of waste collection across the city including trade waste and waste collection services for commercial events;
 - b) any private waste collection services that are purchased by the council cost and resource implications for the Council to conduct a feasibility study or create a business case into bringing waste services in-house and expanding services offered.”

- moved by Councillor O'Neill, seconded by Councillor Bandel

Amendment 3

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

- “4) Council notes the recently agreed Telematics Policy that provides information about the usage of Council operated vehicles and driving behaviours.
- 5) Council agrees that output from the new Policy should be analysed to consider what driving issues may arise from the operation of Council vehicles.
- 6) Refers this motion to Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee for consideration of how best to assess vehicle usage and assessment of whether an additional audit for 2024/25 should include a review of Council operated heavy vehicles and whether Council HGV drivers meet all the qualifications for driving such vehicles.”

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Mowat

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 1 was accepted as an addendum to the Motion and Amendment 3 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the Motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1 and Amendment 3 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	38 votes
For Amendment 2 (as adjusted)	-	29 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Duggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted motion by Councillor Lang:

- 1) To note the recent tragic events in Scotland where children had died following collisions with waste collection vehicles, including the death of Thomas Wong on Whitehouse Road.
- 2) To note that these events had not involved any Edinburgh Council owned or operated heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) and recognise the seriousness with which our own staff took their responsibilities towards health and safety.
- 3) Nevertheless, to recognise the renewed focus on the dangers associated with HGVs, particularly in regard to children and other vulnerable groups, and the need for the Council's operations to demonstrate best practice when it came to health and safety, in order to minimise the potential for accidents, collisions and fatalities.
- 4) To therefore request a report to the Governance Risk and Best Value Committee in two cycles, with onward referral to the Policy and Sustainability Committee, setting out:
 - a) the current fitness-to-operate and training requirements for Council HGV drivers and any assessment for how these could be enhanced.
 - b) how the choice of model of HGVs and any additional installed equipment /IT can be used to avoid collisions with pedestrians and cyclists, including speed monitoring and speed limitation.
 - c) how waste collection routes and timetables can be amended to ensure HGVs do not pass near schools or nurseries (both Council and independent) at key start and finish times.
 - d) any other relevant information on how health and safety can be maximised for Council HGV operations taking into account the output and analysis from the recently agreed Telematics policy which provides

information about the usage of Council operated vehicles and driving behaviours arising from their operation.

- 5) To refer this motion to Governance, Risk and Best Value Committee for consideration of how best to assess vehicle usage and assessment of whether an additional audit for 2024/25 should include a review of Council operated heavy vehicles and whether Council HGV drivers meet all the qualifications for driving such vehicles.
- 6) Furthermore:
 - a) To note the HGV Safety Permit Scheme in Greater London, part of the Mayor of London's Vision Zero plan, which required operators of all HGVs weighing more than 12 tonnes to apply for a free permit to operate in London.
 - b) To note that the aim of the HGV Safety Permit Scheme was to ensure higher safety standards for HGVs to reduce the risks posed to vulnerable road users such as people walking and cycling, and that HGVs which did not meet the safety levels it required were accordingly not permitted to operate in Greater London.
 - c) To note that the Direct Vision Standard (DVS) formed part of the requirements of the HGV Safety Permit Scheme and that this required HGVs to be graded out of five on how much the driver could see directly through the cab window; to further note that the minimum grading required to receive a permit to operate was increasing from one star to three stars from October 2024.
- 7) To understand that the powers to implement such a scheme sat with the Scottish Government and Transport Scotland and to therefore request that the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee write to the Cabinet Secretary for Transport asking that introduction of a permit scheme based on safety requirements as outlined above be considered for HGVs operating in Edinburgh and Scotland.

15 Tram – Phase 1

The Council, 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 Paragraph 12 of Part 1 of Schedule 7(A) of the Act.

An update was provided on the outcome of the review of the Edinburgh Tram Inquiry Report.

Decision

As detailed in the Confidential Schedule, signed by the Lord Provost, with reference to this minute.

(References: Act of Council No 8 of 14 December 2024; report by the Chief Executive, submitted.)

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Lang declared a financial interest as an employee of the Law Society of Scotland and left the meeting during consideration of the above item.

Councillor Beal declared a non-financial interest in the above item.

16 Control of Amplified Busking – Motion by Councillor Ross

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

“Council:

- 1) Notes that, following a request from the Culture and Communities Committee, the Council wrote to the Minister for Local Government Empowerment and Planning to ask for his support to amend Section 54 of the Civic Government (Scotland) Act 1982 to extend the enforcement powers to cover the amplification of sound in public spaces.
- 2) Notes that the reply received from the Minister in November 2023 drew attention to the powers available to the Council to
 - a) Make management rules to regulate the use of, and conduct of persons while on, any land owned, occupied or managed by the local authority.
 - b) Expel someone from the land if they have reasonable grounds for believing that a person has, is, or is about to contravene a management rule.
 - c) Issue exclusion orders to a person who has persistently contravened or attempted to contravene management rules.
- 3) Notes the allocation of £50,000 in the 2024/25 budget for enforcement and signage to address amplified busking.
- 4) With the summer festivals fast approaching, and given that residents have been calling for action for many years, instructs officers to bring a report to the May meeting of the Culture and Communities Committee with proposals for

appropriate management rules for Council owned, occupied or managed land, including effective enforcement measures, to control the amplification of sound in public spaces. These management rules should be in place for the 2024 summer festival period on a trial basis.

- 5) In addition, instructs officers to bring a report back to the Culture and Communities Committee in the autumn with results from the trial for evaluation.”

- moved by Councillor Ross, seconded by Councillor Osler

Amendment

To insert a new point 6 in the motion by Councillor Ross as follows:

“Noting the importance of working positively with the busking communities and local residents impacted, requests the Autumn report to include plans to establish co-curated (between the Council, residents and busking community) busking spaces”

and renumber accordingly.

- moved by Councillor Heap, seconded by Councillor Miller

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	33 votes
For the amendment	-	29 votes

(For the motion: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Duggart, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For the amendment: Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Ross.

17 EIJB Budget – Motion by Councillor Davidson

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

“Council

- 1) Notes that after the funding settlement delivered by the Scottish Government, the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board has been required to find £58.39 million in-year savings in 2024/25, rising to £108.71 million in-year savings by 2026/27.
- 2) Recognises that this settlement has left health and social care officers no option but to bring forward a range of savings measures that will have direct negative impact to the delivery and outcomes for health and social care services in Edinburgh.
- 3) Notes that this has been exacerbated by the decision of the Scottish Government and COSLA to award funding for the real living wage on the basis of Grant Aided Expenditure (GAE), a formula which has repeatedly left Edinburgh as the lowest funded local authority in Scotland, well below the national average. The decision to use this formula has left an additional recurring funding gap of £5.3 million in the EIJB’s budget.
- 4) Notes that despite repeated appeals, the Scottish Government have not addressed the year-on-year failure to fund demographic growth in Edinburgh.
- 5) Notes that the Scottish Government is proceeding with a bill for an unwanted National Care service which could cost up to £2.2 billion despite widespread opposition from social care professionals and trade unions.
- 6) Believes that Health and Social Care cuts of these scales will have a catastrophic impact on some of the most vulnerable groups in society, including unpaid carers, people with learning disabilities, care home residents and people residing in the most deprived areas.
- 7) Expresses dismay at the potentially devastating effect of these cuts and is deeply concerned about the impact on all those affected by the cuts, including service users, unpaid carers and the health and social care workforce.
- 8) Unequivocally condemns the Scottish Government for failing to act on these repeated warnings and provide funding to tackle Edinburgh’s health and social care budget shortfalls.

- 9) Requests that the council leader write to the Scottish Government urgently asking for immediate financial support to protect services and a longer-term plan to fund Edinburgh's demographic challenges.
- 10) Requests a report to Policy and Sustainability within one cycle on the potential impact on other council services due to increased demand caused by withdrawal or reductions of health and social care services on this scale."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Davidson.

- moved by Councillor Davidson, seconded by Councillor Bennett

Amendment 1

- 1) Adds to the end of point 1 of the motion by Councillor Davidson:

"The estimated 24/25 EIJB delegated budget is £830m with an additional (assumed) £5m in consequentials from the Spring Budget compared with compared with £809.4m in 23/34 and £749.5m in 2022/23. Notes further that Health and Social Care across the rest of the UK is experiencing crisis and that UK government settlements is the common denominator".

- 2) Adds to end of point 3 of the motion:

"Notes further that the much higher use of outsourcing in Edinburgh than in other Scottish councils has, in part, resulted in this disparity."

- 3) Replaces point 5 of the motion with:

"Notes further that the UNITE the Union deputation at the EIJB Budget Meeting called for the creation of a National Care Service. Further notes that on 6th March 2024, MSPs voted for the general principles of the National Care Service (Scotland) Bill which will ensure greater transparency in the delivery of community health and social care, improve standards, strengthen the role of the workforce and provide better support for unpaid carers. The proposals, which also include establishing a National Care Service Charter, rights to breaks for carers and provisions to enact Anne's Law so people in care homes have the right to be visited by their families, were backed by a Scotland wide consultation led by the Scottish Government".

- 4) Adds to end of point 6 of the motion:

"Council notes multiple concerns within the EIJB budget proposals affecting third sector partners, who deliver lean, high quality, cost-effective, preventative services which could increase demand for critical care even further and

negatively impact the MTFS. Council requests cost benefits analysis of the voluntary sector contribution to Health and Social Care are carried out.”

5) Replaces point 8 of the motion with:

“Council notes the total cost for agency staff has increased hugely since May 2022 and further notes the failure of the EIJB to upstream services, failing to adapt services to anticipate and plan for demographic changes, failing to invest in more cost-effective preventative services which push more residents into needing more costly, poorer outcome emergency care

6) Replaces point 9 of the motion with:

“Requests that the council leader write to the Scottish Government and UK governments urgently asking for immediate financial support to protect services and a longer-term plan to fund Edinburgh’s demographic challenges.”

- moved by Councillor Nicolson, seconded by Councillor Nols-McVey

Amendment 2

Adds at end of the motion by Councillor Davidson:

“Notes the decision of the EIJB to close two care homes by March 2025, thus reducing the Council's market share of care homes from 15% to 11%.

Notes that this conflicts with Council policy, as stated on 21 March 2023, when Policy and Sustainability Committee agreed:

- a) 'the council’s role as a care provider is best met through council owned and operated care homes’
- b) 'CECs presumption going forward should be in favour of an in-house model’

Notes that on 23 May 2023, Policy and Sustainability Committee agreed:

"To request a report from the IJB to this committee within 4 cycles outlining options for expanding council provision of long-term care, including upgrading existing care homes, building new care homes and acquiring care homes from private providers."

Notes that this request has not been actioned.

Therefore agrees that the report requested at Paragraph 10 of the motion should include options for implementing Council policy in relation to care homes.”

- moved by Councillor McKenzie, seconded by Councillor Miller

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an amendment to the Motion and Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the Motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	44 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	18 votes
Abstentions	-	1

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Booth, Bruce, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Mumford, Munro, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Rust, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Biagi, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Fullerton, Gardiner, Glasgow, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, Nicolson, Nols-McVey and Work.

Abstentions: Councillor McKenzie.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Davidson:

- 1) To note that after the funding settlement delivered by the Scottish Government, the Edinburgh Integrated Joint Board had been required to find £58.39 million in-year savings in 2024/25, rising to £108.71million in-year savings by 2026/27.
- 2) To recognise that this settlement had left health and social care officers no option but to bring forward a range of savings measures that would have direct negative impact to the delivery and outcomes for health and social care services in Edinburgh.
- 3) To note that this had been exacerbated by the decision of the Scottish Government and COSLA to award funding for the real living wage on the basis of Grant Aided Expenditure (GAE), a formula which had repeatedly left Edinburgh as the lowest funded local authority in Scotland, well below the

national average. The decision to use this formula had left an additional recurring funding gap of £5.3 million in the EIJB's budget.

- 4) To note that despite repeated appeals, the Scottish Government had not addressed the year-on-year failure to fund demographic growth in Edinburgh.
- 5) To note that the Scottish Government was proceeding with a bill for an unwanted National Care service which could cost up to £2.2 billion despite widespread opposition from social care professionals and trade unions.
- 6) To believe that Health and Social Care cuts of these scales would have a catastrophic impact on some of the most vulnerable groups in society, including unpaid carers, people with learning disabilities, care home residents and people residing in the most deprived areas. To note multiple concerns within the EIJB budget proposals affecting third sector partners, who delivered lean, high quality, cost-effective, preventative services which could increase demand for critical care even further and negatively impact the MTFS. To request that cost benefits analysis of the voluntary sector contribution to Health and Social Care be carried out.
- 7) To express dismay at the potentially devastating effect of these cuts and be deeply concerned about the impact on all those affected by the cuts, including service users, unpaid carers and the health and social care workforce.
- 8) To unequivocally condemn the Scottish Government for failing to act on these repeated warnings and provide funding to tackle Edinburgh's health and social care budget shortfalls.
- 9) To request that the council leader write to the Scottish Government urgently asking for immediate financial support to protect services and a longer-term plan to fund Edinburgh's demographic challenges.
- 10) To request a report to the Policy and Sustainability Committee within one cycle on the potential impact on other council services due to increased demand caused by withdrawal or reductions of health and social care services on this scale.
- 11) To note the decision of the EIJB to close two care homes by March 2025, thus reducing the Council's market share of care homes from 15% to 11%.
- 12) To note that this conflicted with Council policy, as stated on 21 March 2023, when the Policy and Sustainability Committee agreed:
 - a) 'the council's role as a care provider is best met through council owned and operated care homes'

- b) 'CECs presumption going forward should be in favour of an in-house model'
- 13) To note that on 23 May 2023, the Policy and Sustainability Committee agreed:
- "To request a report from the IJB to this committee within 4 cycles outlining options for expanding council provision of long-term care, including upgrading existing care homes, building new care homes and acquiring care homes from private providers."
- 14) To note that this request had not been actioned.
- 15) To therefore agree that the report requested at Paragraph 10 of the motion should include options for implementing Council policy in relation to care homes.

18 Westminster's Squandering of Public Funds - Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey

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

- "1) Council notes Westminster's "levelling up" initiative had a stated aim of creating economic development focused on areas that needed it most: "An improvement in perceived wellbeing in all parts of the UK, with a narrowed gap between areas with the highest and lowest levels."
- 2) Council notes this has not transpired, with funding announcements increasingly following a model of "pork barrel" spending rather than strategic investment to encourage inclusive economic opportunities.
- 3) Council condemns in the strongest possible terms the decision to award £242m of levelling up funding to Canary Wharf, one the richest areas in the world.
- 4) Council believes this is further proof of the UK Government's immoral approach to decision making relating to the allocation of public funds.
- 5) Council agrees that the Council Leader writes to the UK Chancellor within 5 working days of this motion, setting out Edinburgh's opposition to this allocation and requesting this be reversed and channelled towards much needed regeneration projects across her country instead.
- 6) Council further agrees, in expectation of a change in Government in Westminster, that the Council Leader writes to the leader of the Labour group in Westminster within 5 working days, calling for the discredited levelling up initiative to be scrapped and replaced with commensurate capital funding that

is given directly to the devolved administrations of the Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish Governments. This would allow investment to support more of Edinburgh’s communities, as previous EU funding did.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey.

- moved by Councillor Nols-McVey, seconded by Councillor Campbell

Amendment 1

- 1) In paragraph 1) of the motion by Councillor Nols-McVey, delete “Westminster” and insert “the UK Government’s”
- 2) Adds at the end of the motion:

“7) Council further agrees that the Council leader writes to the First Minister within 5 working days, calling for the Scottish Government to improve its own use of public funds, given its outrageous mismanagement of ferry contracts, its wasted money on documents to promote Scottish independence, and its squandered resource on pursuing a centralised National Care Service, all at a time when Edinburgh Council is the worst funded Scottish local authority per head of population.”

- moved by Councillor Lang, seconded by Councillor Osler

Amendment 2

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Mowat

In accordance with Standing Order 24(4), the Lord Provost ruled that a first vote be taken for or against Amendment 2 for no action.

Voting

First Vote

The voting was as follows:

For Amendment 2	-	20 votes
Against Amendment 2	-	41 votes
Abstentions	-	1

(For Amendment 2: Councillors Arthur, Bruce, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Day, Doggart, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Pogson, Rust, Walker, Watt and Whyte.

Against Amendment 2: Lord Provost, Councillors Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Campbell, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Work, Young and Younie.

Abstentions : Councillor Faccenda.)

As the vote for no action was lost, a second vote was then taken between the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey and Amendment 1 by Councillor Lang.

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	28 votes
For Amendment 1	-	25 votes
Abstentions	-	9

(For the Motion: Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work

For Amendment 1: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Lang, Meagher, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Young and Younie.

Abstentions: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte

Decision

To approve the Motion by Councillor Nols-McVey.

19 Co-working Spaces in Council New Developments – Motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho

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

“Council notes that the pandemic normalised alternative ways of working, “making flexibility and working from home easier to all workers, especially parents, whose jobs allow that.

Council welcomes all the work done by officers, to plan this organisation’s developments across the city, retrofitting, converting or even building new schools, hubs or housing that the communities so much need.

Council acknowledges that families are living with less money, that the cost of living crisis makes them choose between eating or heating, welcoming the warm hubs available across all wards.

Council also acknowledges that Co-working spaces benefits include networking opportunities, fighting loneliness, business growth, as well as savings in energy bills, reduce commuting times and engagement with local community.

Council, therefore, asks officers to bring to Finance and Resources committee in 3 cycles:

- A report with a list of all the ongoing planning or planned developments with the capacity to include co-working spaces;
- A report listing the advantages versus disadvantages of providing such services, including costs to implement those and possible profits

Moreover, Council requests, after such information is provided, and if approved by committee, that officers prepare a consultation allowing the communities around the developments identified, to have their views heard.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho.

- moved by Councillor Mattos Coelho, seconded by Councillor McNeese-Mechan

Amendment 1

1) After the 4th paragraph of the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho, insert:

“Council further notes the approval of our 20-Minute Neighbourhood Strategy which aims to support people to live well locally, reduce barriers to work, and

help advance equality for those more vulnerable in our communities. Also notes the activity ongoing regarding accessibility audits, development of a suitability matrix, and collaboration of HR and The Spatial Design Team to improve Council spaces.

2) After the paragraph in the Motion ending "...those and possible profits", insert a new bullet point:

- “• A report that includes and considers how co-working spaces aligns with our existing strategies and goals under the new Corporate Property Strategy.”

- moved by Councillor O'Neill, seconded by Councillor Staniforth

Amendment 2

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Doggart, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13, Amendment 1 was accepted as an addendum to the Motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	28 votes
For Amendment 2	-	34 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.

For Amendment 2: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalglish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 2 by Councillor Doggart.

20 Queensferry Town Centre Designation – Motion by Councillor Hyslop

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

“Council

Notes:

- 1) That Town and Local Centre designations are reviewed through the Local Development Plan process and that work has started on the Evidence Report that will inform early consultation as part of the preparation for City Plan 2040.
- 2) That there are currently eight Town Centres in Edinburgh, outside of the City Centre Retail Core, that serve as a focal point for their local communities with a mix of shopping facilities and other commercial and community services.
- 3) Notes that in the most recent review of Town Centres as part of the CityPlan2030 process Queensferry was ruled out of consideration due to the relatively low number of retail units when compared to other Town Centres.
- 4)
 - a) That the designation of ‘Town Centre’ grants protections to the important retailing function of defined centres through planning policies and can also lead to the allocation and prioritisation of Council resource.
 - b) One recent example of Queensferry’s lack of designation meaning it has lost out is the Edinburgh’s Winter Festivals tender specification which stated “The Contractor must deliver a programme of events (especially for Edinburgh’s Christmas) within the city centre and reaching into the eight local town centres” which excluded Queensferry.

Agrees:

- 5) That Queensferry High Street and Local Centre is a focal point for the residents of Queensferry and surrounding communities of rural West Edinburgh that offers vital access to shopping facilities and other commercial and community services for local residents, and that this function must be enhanced and protected in order to allow residents in these growing communities to ‘live well locally’.
- 6)
 - a) That the vitality of our local high streets is at risk due to the Cost of Living Crisis and the impact of associated pressures on small businesses and households.

- b) That the retail function of Queensferry High Street faces particular risk without the same protections that officially designated Town Centres are granted.
- 7) That Edinburgh Council should consider Queensferry to all extents and purposes a ninth 'Town Centre' when considering its economic, social and cultural policies and that any future reports which outline expenditure or resource allocation to Town Centres include provision for Queensferry Town Centre regardless of any official designation in planning terms.
- 8) That for reasons set out in this motion, there is a strong argument for designating the Local Centre of the historic Royal Burgh of Queensferry as a Town Centre in planning terms beyond mere consideration of the quantity of shopfronts.

Requests:

- 9) That Officers prepare a report to the Planning Committee in 3 cycles which outlines the correct process for officially designating Queensferry High Street and Local Centre as an official Town Centre in Planning Terms. This should consider any possible way of expediting this designation before the adoption of the CityPlan 2040."

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Hyslop.

- moved by Councillor Hyslop, seconded by Councillor Work

Amendment 1

- 1) To delete part 4) b of the Motion by Councillor Hyslop and insert:
 - "b) Understands that Council policy supports the spread of festivals across the city and outwith the city centre and that town centre status is not a strict qualifying criteria for winter festival events taking place in a specific area."
- 2) To delete part 6) b of the Motion and insert:
 - "b) That allocating Queensferry as a Town Centre may result in unintended consequences such as requirements for small businesses to undertake further documentation which would be onerous to business owners. City Plan 2030 will (subject to approval by Scottish Government Reporters) provide further protections under planning policy to safeguard the character of the area and function of businesses in

Queensferry that would not be afforded under a town centre designation.”

- 3) To delete 8) of the Motion and insert:

“Notes that there is a strong case for continued preservation and investment in the community of Queensferry which should be pursued by any option, planning policy or otherwise, and that the clear focus should be for Elected Members to work with Council Officers to implement long term projects in Queensferry such as the High Street upgrade project as quickly as possible.”

- 4) To delete part 9) of the Motion and insert:

“That a briefing is sent to Elected Members of Almond Ward as well as the mover of the motion that considers any advantages and disadvantages of Queensferry being made a town centre in comparison to a local centre in planning terms, and what implications this would have on the High street upgrade project.

That a briefing note is sent to all Elected Members setting out the process of how areas are designated as town centres as well as including information on other alternative planning policies to promote local high streets and other areas such as Local Place Plans.”

- moved by Councillor Dalgleish, seconded by Councillor Walker

Amendment 2

Council

- 1) In 4a) of the Motion by Councillor Hyslop to add at the end:

“but equally recognises that policies associated with town centres can also bring additional requirements for planning applications in terms of studies and other supporting documentation, which could risk deterring small businesses in smaller areas such as Queensferry.”

- 2) To add the following under 4) of the Motion:

“4c) that present planning policy Ret 5 relating to ‘local centres’ also brings specific protections in terms of positive contributions to the shopping environment and appearance of the centre, which is particularly relevant to Queensferry as a conservation area and World Heritage Site.

4d) that the local centre designation also brings protections which, under the emerging City Plan 2030 Policy RE 5 in particular, are tailored towards the retail function of a centre of the size and character of

Queensferry, protections which do not exist under policies associated with Town Centres.

- 4e) that, separate from any issue around town centre designation, there is considerable frustration over the delay to the delivery of the long-awaited upgrade and renewal of the Queensferry High Street which was agreed with community groups as a priority project but where, despite six years of discussion and consultancy spend, very limited changes have been delivered.”
- 3) To delete 6b) in the Motion and insert:
“6b) that despite Queensferry having a range of highly successful independent retailers, the overall centre of the town should not be disadvantaged by being formally designated a local centre in strict planning terms.”
- 4) To delete 8) of the Motion and insert:
“8) that the most important and pressing issue for the centre of Queensferry is the delivery of the promised High Street upgrade project, where the necessary traffic orders have still not been published or consulted on and where the full funding for delivery is still not fully identified, and agrees to get an update to the next meeting of the Transport & Environment Committee on a) the current status of the project and b) the timetable to delivery given there has been no substantive committee update since February 2023.
- 5) In 9) of the Motion, delete from “the correct process...” and insert:
“...the advantages and disadvantages in planning terms of Queensferry being designated as a town centre as opposed to a local centre and the process by which any change could be expedited if that was considered appropriate.”

- moved by Councillor Younie, seconded by Councillor Beal

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the Motion and Amendment 2 was accepted as an amendment to the Motion.

Decision

- 1) To note that Town and Local Centre designations were reviewed through the Local Development Plan process and that work had started on the Evidence Report that would inform early consultation as part of the preparation for City Plan 2040.

- 2) To note that there were currently eight Town Centres in Edinburgh, outside of the City Centre Retail Core, that served as a focal point for their local communities with a mix of shopping facilities and other commercial and community services.
- 3) To note that in the most recent review of Town Centres as part of the CityPlan2030 process Queensferry was ruled out of consideration due to the relatively low number of retail units when compared to other Town Centres.
- 4)
 - a) To note that the designation of 'Town Centre' granted protections to the important retailing function of defined centres through planning policies and could also lead to the allocation and prioritisation of Council resource but equally recognise that policies associated with town centres could also bring additional requirements for planning applications in terms of studies and other supporting documentation, which could risk deterring small businesses in smaller areas such as Queensferry.
 - b) To understand that Council policy supported the spread of festivals across the city and outwith the city centre and that town centre status was not a strict qualifying criteria for winter festival events taking place in a specific area.
 - c) To note that present planning policy Ret 5 relating to 'local centres' also brought specific protections in terms of positive contributions to the shopping environment and appearance of the centre, which was particularly relevant to Queensferry as a conservation area and World Heritage Site.
 - d) To note that the local centre designation also brought protections which, under the emerging City Plan 2030 Policy RE 5 in particular, were tailored towards the retail function of a centre of the size and character of Queensferry, protections which did not exist under policies associated with Town Centres.
 - e) To note that, separate from any issue around town centre designation, there was considerable frustration over the delay to the delivery of the long-awaited upgrade and renewal of the Queensferry High Street which was agreed with community groups as a priority project but where, despite six years of discussion and consultancy spend, very limited changes had been delivered.
- 5) To agree that Queensferry High Street and Local Centre was a focal point for the residents of Queensferry and surrounding communities of rural West Edinburgh that offered vital access to shopping facilities and other commercial and community services for local residents, and that this function must be

enhanced and protected in order to allow residents in these growing communities to 'live well locally'.

- 6)
 - a) To agree that the vitality of the local high streets was at risk due to the Cost of Living Crisis and the impact of associated pressures on small businesses and households.
 - b) To agree that despite Queensferry having a range of highly successful independent retailers, the overall centre of the town should not be disadvantaged by being formally designated a local centre in strict planning terms.
- 7) To agree that Edinburgh Council should consider Queensferry to all extents and purposes a ninth 'Town Centre' when considering its economic, social and cultural policies and that any future reports which outlined expenditure or resource allocation to Town Centres include provision for Queensferry Town Centre regardless of any official designation in planning terms.
- 8) To agree that the most important and pressing issue for the centre of Queensferry was the delivery of the promised High Street upgrade project, where the necessary traffic orders had still not been published or consulted on and where the full funding for delivery was still not fully identified, and agree to get an update to the next meeting of the Transport and Environment Committee on
 - a) the current status of the project; and
 - b) the timetable to delivery given there had been no substantive committee update since February 2023.
- 9) To request that Officers prepare a report to the Planning Committee in 3 cycles which outlined the advantages and disadvantages in planning terms of Queensferry being designated as a town centre as opposed to a local centre and the process by which any change could be expedited if that was considered appropriate.

21 After School Clubs Provision – Motion by Councillor Kumar

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

- "1) Notes the administration's budget decision at the meeting of the full council on 22nd February and notes that no additional provisions were made around after school clubs.

- 2) Notes that the above decision means that there will be no provision of after school clubs for children and young people with additional support needs as discussed in the council meeting of 31st August 2023.
- 3) Notes that the discontinuation of this service will cause significant distress for families and children including an increase in inequality of services provided.
- 4) Notes that elected members have limited information to understand what after-school club provision looks like across Edinburgh.
- 5) Requests a report to the Children, Education, and Families Committee in 3 cycles to:
 - a) Detail what after school provision looks like across the City.
 - b) Are there pockets with no provision? And if so, what (if any) action plans are in place to rectify this.
 - c) Share any best practice from can be disseminated and replicated.
 - d) Explain what future provision for children and young people with additional support needs might look like.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Kumar.

- moved by Councillor Kumar, seconded by Councillor Key

Amendment 1

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

“Council notes that:

- 1) Out of School Care is a service regulated by the Care Inspectorate and in Edinburgh is delivered by a mix of commercial providers and organisations with charitable status.
- 2) Approximately 43 Out of School Care (OoSC) providers deliver 113 after school clubs across Edinburgh.
- 3) Only 4 schools, plus one joint campus school which have no term time after school care due to low demand. However, to ensure these school have provision they do have their own breakfast club and can access holiday care with OoSC providers which have opened their service to all families in Edinburgh.

- 4) There is no discontinuation of the provision of after school clubs for children and young people with additional support needs. This service was recently brought in-house and OoSC providers can apply for support (including 1-1 support) for children attending their setting with Additional Support Needs using the online application form on the City of Edinburgh website.

Council requests:

- 5) That a briefing note is circulated to Education, Children and Families Committee members on after school provision across the city.”

- moved by Councillor Griffiths, seconded by Councillor Graham

Amendment 2

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 24(4), the Lord Provost ruled that a first vote be taken for or against Amendment 2 for no action.

Voting

First Vote

The voting was as follows:

For Amendment 2	-	9 votes
Against Amendment 2	-	53 votes

(For Amendment 2: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

Against Amendment 2: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalglish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie.)

As the vote for no action was lost, a second vote was then taken between the Motion by Councillor Kumar and Amendment 1 by Councillor Griffiths.

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion - 28 votes
For Amendment 1 - 34 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.

For Amendment 1: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Duggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Griffiths.

22 Save the George Cinema – Motion by Councillor Campbell

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

“Notes that the Category C listed George Cinema has been empty since July 2016, during which time there has been deterioration of the fabric of the building. Notes that there have been two planning applications to demolish most of the building leaving only the facade, both of which have been refused, alongside two failed appeals to the Reporter. Notes that an attempt to delist the building has also failed.

Notes that not only has the building been left derelict for almost eight years, most recently earth has been piled along an external wall which is likely to exacerbate the decay.

Notes that many residents have contacted local elected members, raising concerns about the deterioration of the building.

Agrees that a report shall be brought to Planning Committee or Development Management Sub-Committee (as appropriate) no later than end June 2024 which assesses the case for enforcement action, the condition of the building and the appropriate next steps in order to secure the future of the building.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Campbell.

- moved by Councillor Campbell, seconded by Councillor Gardiner

Amendment 1

To remove the last paragraph of the motion by Councillor Campbell and insert:

“Council:

Notes that owners of listed buildings have an important obligation to preserve and invest in buildings that contribute to Edinburgh’s unique heritage.

Therefore, asks that Planning and Building standards officers investigate the potential of carrying out an assessment of the building as soon as possible; and that after this visit has happened Council officers meet with Portobello and Craigmillar Councillors to update members on the condition of the building and any action it is proposed to take.

Notes that Planning Enforcement Officers will be a part of the process set out above and that they can be contacted at Planning@edinburgh.gov.uk should Members be concerned by a listed building in their ward.

Asks that an update is provided to members via the Planning Committee business bulletin on any actions taken in respect of the George Cinema.”

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

Amendment 2

Council notes the terms of the Motion by Councillor Campbell and that the actions requested are all being progressed and will be reported in the normal course of events to the relevant Committee as part of their business plan. Council also notes that any subsequent enforcement options offered by officers will need to be brought to the appropriate Committee for proper scrutiny and decision making.

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

First Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	27 votes
For Amendment 1	-	25 votes
For Amendment 2	-	9 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.

For Amendment 1: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Lang, Meagher, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.)

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

Second Vote

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion	-	27 votes
For Amendment 1	-	34 votes

(For the Motion: Councillors Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.

For Amendment 1: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.)

Decision

To approve Amendment 1 by Councillor Dalgleish.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Aston declared a non-financial interest in the above item as he worked for an MP who had made public statements on this matter.

23 Review of Edinburgh Award – Motion by Councillor Staniforth

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

“Council notes

- 1) That the City of Edinburgh Council issues a number of awards to still-living people the most prestigious of which is the Edinburgh Award.
- 2) That the Edinburgh Award is “to honour an outstanding individual who has made a positive impact on the city and gained national and international recognition for Edinburgh.”
- 3) That this award includes physical elements – a name on a wall in the City Chambers and the award winner’s handprints in gold outside the City Chambers.
- 4) That giving an award to still-living people always carries an element of risk as unknown activities could come to light or new activities conducted which brings the city into disrepute by association.
- 5) That aside from a motion to full council there is no current established method of rescinding an award granted to a living person.

Council believes

- 6) That while ‘positive impact’ implies it, the Edinburgh Award should explicitly be given to those who uphold the city’s values. Council therefore agrees
- 7) That a review should be conducted into awards granted to living people, especially the Edinburgh Award, to ensure that awards represent the values of the city and to establish a process for rescinding said awards should a recipient later act in such a way as to bring the city into disrepute.
- 8) That a report on how this review will be conducted and the timescale for its delivery should be brought to the next Policy and Sustainability Committee.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth.

- moved by Councillor Staniforth, seconded by Councillor Mumford

Amendment

To take no action on the matter.

- moved by Councillor Whyte, seconded by Councillor Munro

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	41 votes
For the amendment	-	21 votes

(For the motion: Lord Provost, Councillors Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Campbell, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Work, Young and Younie

For the amendment: Councillors Arthur, Bruce, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Day, Doggart, Faccenda, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Pogson, Rust, Walker, Watt and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Staniforth.

24 Flood Defences – Motion by Councillor Meagher

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

“Council

Notes the deterioration of the groynes and damage to the promenade wall along the stretch of sea front between Eastfield and Seafield

The significant depletion of sand along the whole stretch and the consequent loss of amenity and this aspect of sea defences

The effect of rising sea levels and increasing storm frequency on the coast and its sea defences.

Welcomes the recent capital funding allocation for Flooding within the 24/25 budget.

Notes the intention of officers to bring a report to an upcoming Transport and Environment committee, setting out the recommendations on how this funding should

be allocated and asks that this report should consider the funding of repair or replacement of any damaged infrastructure forming part of the Portobello beach sea defences.

Furthermore, recognises the increase likelihood of similar storm events happening in the future, as well as rising sea levels, and asks for a report to Transport and Environment committee before the end of 2024 which sets out the likely impact for Portobello in the short, medium and long term and how these impacts could be mitigated.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Meagher.

- moved by Councillor Meagher, seconded by Councillor Arthur

Amendment 1

- 1) To add to the end of the penultimate paragraph of the motion by Councillor Meagher:

“and the sea defences along the length of the Seafield waterfront masterplan site, which has been identified as a strategic development and regeneration area in the emerging City Plan 2030.”

- 2) In the final paragraph of the motion, after ‘Portobello’, ADD ‘and Seafield’.

- moved by Councillor Aston, seconded by Councillor Dobbin

Amendment 2

- 1) To add at the end of the penultimate paragraph of the motion by Councillor Meagher:

“as well as consideration of alternative, nature-based solutions to flood risk given that, in some cases, hard-engineering solutions can have other, negative impacts on the wider environment.”

- 2) To add at the end of the final paragraph of the motion:

“with a particular focus on nature-based solutions, in line with the Council’s existing climate and nature strategies.”

- moved by Councillor Parker, seconded by Councillor Mumford

Amendment 3

Council notes the terms of the Motion by Cllr Meagher and further notes that officers are already progressing actions on the issues involved in consultation with Portobello/Craigmillar ward councillors. Council therefore considers that, given concerns repeatedly raised about additional pressures on officer workload created by calls for additional reporting, no additional report is necessary other than that already planned by officers on as part of the local work noted or in future Committee Workplans.

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendments 1 and 2 were accepted as addendums to the Motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	51 votes
For Amendment 3	-	9 votes
Abstentions	-	2

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalgleish, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Faccenda, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 3: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte.

Abstentions: Councillors Day and Dobbin

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Meagher:

- 1) To note the deterioration of the groynes and damage to the promenade wall along the stretch of sea front between Eastfield and Seafield.
- 2) To note the significant depletion of sand along the whole stretch and the consequent loss of amenity and this aspect of sea defences.
- 3) To note the effect of rising sea levels and increasing storm frequency on the coast and its sea defences.

- 4) To welcome the recent capital funding allocation for Flooding within the 24/25 budget.
- 5) To note the intention of officers to bring a report to an upcoming Transport and Environment Committee, setting out the recommendations on how this funding should be allocated and ask that this report should consider the funding of repair or replacement of any damaged infrastructure forming part of the Portobello beach sea defences and the sea defences along the length of the Seafield waterfront masterplan site, which had been identified as a strategic development and regeneration area in the emerging City Plan 2030 as well as consideration of alternative, nature-based solutions to flood risk given that, in some cases, hard-engineering solutions could have other, negative impacts on the wider environment.
- 6) Furthermore, to recognise the increase likelihood of similar storm events happening in the future, as well as rising sea levels, and ask for a report to Transport and Environment Committee before the end of 2024 which set out the likely impact for Portobello and Seafield in the short, medium and long term and how these impacts could be mitigated with a particular focus on nature-based solutions, in line with the Council's existing climate and nature strategies.

25 Princes Street Gardens Development Fun – Motion by Councillor Day

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

“Council,

Calls for the establishment of a voluntary levy on all Princes Street Gardens events.

Envisages this levy could be used to create a Development Fund which would help maintain and upgrade the Gardens.

Understands productions such as the Fly Festival, have already expressed an interest in voluntary levies that will maintain facilities and venues such as Princes Street Gardens.

Requests a report to the Finance and Resources Committee in two cycles to investigate how best such a levy would be administered. “

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Walker

Amendment 1

Council;

- 1) Inserts “major” between “on all” and “Princes Street Gardens” in the first paragraph of the motion by Councillor Day.
- 2) Inserts the following after the third paragraph in the motion;
 - 1) Notes that terms and conditions for operating events in West Princes Street Gardens and the Ross Bandstand were agreed by Culture & Communities Committee in October 2022 limiting the number of major events per annum.
 - 2) Notes that Finance & Resources has already considered a report in January this year on cost recovery from commercial events and referred that to the Culture & Communities Committee for consideration at their meeting in May.
 - 3) Notes that the above report showed only 6% of events are classed as major, while 70% are small.
 - 4) Notes that a report on the future of West Princes Street Gardens/Ross Bandstand for Events is scheduled to come before Culture & Communities Committee in May this year and
- 3) In final paragraph of the motion, delete “Finance and Resources” and insert “Culture and Communities”, and adds at end “ensuring the report is fully aligned with the other reports mentioned above”.

- moved by Councillor Thornley, seconded by Councillor Younie

Amendment 2

Council notes the terms of the Motion by Cllr Day and that the actions proposed raise significant issues that it would be burdensome to officers to investigate. Given the pressures of workload currently on officers Council agrees not to progress with this matter at this time.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 1 was accepted as an amendment to the Motion.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	51 votes
For Amendment 2	-	9 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Campbell, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Faccenda, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Hyslop, Jenkinson, Key, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meechan, Meagher, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Work, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 2: Councillors Bruce, Cowdy, Doggart, Jones, Mitchell, McKenzie, Mowat, Munro, Rust and Whyte

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Day:

- 1) To call for the establishment of a voluntary levy on all major Princes Street Gardens events.
- 2) To envisage this levy could be used to create a Development Fund which would help maintain and upgrade the Gardens.
- 3) To understand productions such as the Fly Festival, had already expressed an interest in voluntary levies that would maintain facilities and venues such as Princes Street Gardens.
- 4) To note that terms and conditions for operating events in West Princes Street Gardens and the Ross Bandstand were agreed by Culture and Communities Committee in October 2022 limiting the number of major events per annum.
- 5) To note that the Finance and Resources Committee had already considered a report in January this year on cost recovery from commercial events and referred that to the Culture and Communities Committee for consideration at their meeting in May.
- 6) To note that the above report showed only 6% of events were classed as major, while 70% were small.
- 7) To note that a report on the future of West Princes Street Gardens/Ross Bandstand for Events was scheduled to come before Culture and Communities Committee in May this year.

- 8) To request a report to the Culture and Communities Committee in two cycles to investigate how best such a levy would be administered ensuring the report was fully aligned with the other reports mentioned above.

26 Community Councils – Motion by Councillor Graham

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

“Council, Extends its thanks to the Community Councils from across the city of Edinburgh for their hard work and commitment to representing their local communities.

Notes it is just over 50 years since the legislation which brought Community Councils into existence, the Local Government (Scotland) Act 1973, which defined the purpose of a Community Council as: "to ascertain, co-ordinate and express to the Local Authorities for its area and to public authorities the views of the community which it represents, in relation to matters for which those authorities are responsible."

Understands that during the last 50 plus years, Community Councils across Edinburgh have made important contributions to their communities, by engaging with local people on the issues which matter to them and working to change their area for the better

Further understands that while the role of the Community Councils has remained much the same since 1973, the introduction of the Community Empowerment (Scotland) Act 2015 provides new statutory rights for Community Councils, while the Planning (Scotland) Act 2019 also strengthened Community Councils' engagement with the planning system.

Believes this is the ideal time for the Council to recognise the contribution that Community Councils have made to Edinburgh and to celebrate their work.

Looks forward to the results of the ongoing review into Community Council membership, which should encourage more and more people from across society to take part and ensure its members are more reflective of communities across the city.

Requests that Community Council participation is promoted through Council media channels to encourage more people to take part in representing their communities and to raise awareness of the positive impact community councils make.

Asks the Lord Provost to host an appropriate event in the City Chambers to mark this important occasion.”

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

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Graham.

Declaration of Interests

Councillor Whyte made a transparency statement in respect of the above item as his partner was a member of a Community Council.

27 Commemorating the Legacy of Saroj Lal – Motion by the Lord Provost

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

“Council notes that:

- 1) Saroj Lal, Edinburgh resident for over fifty years up to her passing in 2020, leaves an enormous legacy of work and positive change across the city of Edinburgh and far beyond, improving race relations and race equality across several fields, particularly education, policing, health, social work, prisons and many more;
- 2) At its August 2020 meeting, Council unanimously passed a motion celebrating the “inspirational life” of Saroj Lal, and during that debate, former councillor, Melanie Main, said the following, “I’m sure we’d all agree there should be a permanent memorial to this wonderful lady so that generations to come are reminded and encouraged to learn about her work and her legacy in Edinburgh and Scotland”;
- 3) There are no statues of named persons of colour in Edinburgh, and remarkably few of any named women;
- 4) One of the recent recommendations of the Edinburgh Slavery and Colonialism Review was to commit to public art that fairly represents the diversity of the city and its histories;
- 5) There are no statues in Southside Newington ward and specifically in the Southside/Sciennes area, home to the Lal family for many decades, and
- 6) Fundraisers are in a position to fully fund the creation and erection of a statue of Saroj Lal.

Council supports the proposal to mark Saroj Lal’s legacy with a permanent memorial in the city, and requests that a report be brought forward to the Culture and Communities Committee within two cycles considering options for the site of a statue,

preferably in the Southside area, fully-funded through private fundraising, both to commemorate the life and legacy of Saroj Lal and to inspire future generations.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Decision

To approve the motion by the Lord Provost.

28 Jo Cox Civility Commission Recommendations – Motion by Councillor O’Neill

The following motion by Councillor O’Neill was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17 and verbally adjusted in terms of Standing Order 22(6):

““Council:

- 1) Remembers Jo Cox MP for Batley and Spen, who was murdered in June 2016 when arriving to host a surgery in her constituency.
- 2) Reiterates a statement made by Cox’s husband following the tragic event where he urges everyone to “fight against the hatred that killed her.”
- 3) Recognises the impact of the Jo Cox Foundation, set up in 2016, which nurtures stronger communities, champions respect in politics and advocates for a fairer world no matter one’s party colours.
- 4) Notes, as part of their Respectful Politics workstream, the Jo Cox Civility Commission (the Commission) was launched in February 2023 and recommendations were published in January 2024 with the subheading ‘No place in politics: tackling abuse and intimidation.
- 5) Further notes the Commission aims to find implementable solutions that make a difference to the issues of abuse and intimidation of elected officials; in their own words the “recommendations are deliberately ambitious.”
- 6) Highlights that the calls to action and recommendations cover topics of co-ordination, behaviour, political literacy, social media use, traditional media, police, security, Parliaments (including devolved), local governments, elections and political parties.
- 7) Confirms support of the Commission’s recommendations and asks the Lord Provost, Chief Executive, Council Leader and Council to publicly endorse these via the Commission’s website, and asks that the pledge, recommendations and () information be shared to all elected members.

- 8) Requests a report in 6 months to Policy and Sustainability Committee which addresses how the Council has adopted or considered recommendations in existing workstreams, with specific reference to:
- a) How the Council can improve risk planning for abuse at Council meetings and other events.
 - b) How the Council can ensure security and wellbeing resources are available to staff and elected members.
 - c) How we can engage with relevant toolkits such as the Local Government Association’s ‘Debate Not Hate’ Councillor toolkit and the National Association of Local Councils’ (NALC) Civility and Respect Project.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor O’Neill.

- moved by Councillor O’Neill, seconded by Councillor Mumford

Amendment

Council notes the content of the motion by Councillor O’Neill, and in particular the highlighting of potential best practice work by English local government organisations. Council agrees to refer consideration of the motion to the Barriers to Elected Office Working group to be considered as part of its final report to Committee/ Council.

- moved by Councillor Mowat, seconded by Councillor Whyte

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	41 votes
For the amendment	-	21 votes

(For the motion: Lord Provost, Councillors Aston, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Caldwell, Campbell, Davidson, Dijkstra-Downie, Dixon, Dobbin, Flannery, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Lang, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKENzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O’Neill, Osler, Parker, Rae, Ross, Staniforth, Thornley, Work, Young and Younie.

For the amendment: Councillors Arthur, Bruce, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalglish, Day, Duggart, Faccenda, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Pogson, Rust, Walker, Watt and Whyte.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor O'Neill.

29 Early Years Provision and Out of Catchment – Motion by Councillor Davidson

The following motion by Councillor Davidson was submitted in terms of Standing Order 17 and verbally adjusted in terms of Standing Order 22(6):

“Council notes that:

- 1) The meeting of the Education, Children and Families Committee (ECF) on 23 January 2024 considered the Early Years Service (EYS) as part of reports and budget concerns.
- 2) There is a reported £6m cut in funding from the Scottish Government for provision of EYS
- 3) The report on the EYS sets out a range of areas which were “being considered by the SPB (Strategic Programme Board)” to bring the EYS back within budget. These areas included: 5.2.1 Maximise the use of local authority places by reducing the need to commission external provision and providing places for children from other local authorities whose parents/carers work in Edinburgh.
- 4) Since the ECF meeting, the SPB has met and made a determination on proceeding with the removal of including cross-boundary families in 1140 funded hours PVI provision. These families can continue to apply for space in CEC EYS settings where there is unused capacity.
- 5) The decision by the SPB has not been referred back to ECF or another relevant committee such as Policy & Sustainability for agreement and therefore councillors have voted to “consider” but not to “implement”.
- 6) The Scottish Government is in discussion with local authorities on how cross-boundary placements should be funded /crosscharged.
- 7) That following the Education Committee approval, concerns have been raised with councillors about the potential impact on private/voluntary/independent (PVI) nurseries who may rely on funded hours placements from families outwith the Edinburgh Council area.
- 8) That the EYS currently has available capacity for meeting its obligations for 1140 funded hours but the flexibility required by parents means that a greater percentage are looking to PVI providers to meet their needs. There is

therefore provision within CEC not being used and not being funded by the 1140 provision.

Council therefore agrees to:

- 9) To speak with any PVI provider who is significantly impacted by cross-boundary placements and identify if any exceptions are required until the Scottish Government comes to a determination.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Davidson.

- moved by Councillor Davidson, seconded by Councillor Young

Amendment 1

- 1) To amend point 2 in the motion by Councillor Davidson as follows::

“Notes that funding allocations to local authorities for Early Years were partly based on historic formulas and partly upon cost estimates provided by Council. Notes that a new formula was agreed with COSLA through ELC Finance Working Group to more accurately reflect national costs of delivering funded ELC. This is based primarily on population (75%) and also takes account of deprivation (20%) and rurality (5%).”

- 2) To add to point 5 of the motion:

“Council agrees these changes constitute a policy change and therefore are out with of the powers of officer delegation and changes should have been presented to Councillors at committee to make this decision. Regrets the failure of the Convenor of Education, Children and Families in failing to meet their obligation to ensure this happened.”

- 3) To amend point 10 of the motion as follows:

“Notes that PVI providers and social enterprises have been informed that no new providers will be recruited by the Council but it is unclear how this decision was made. To speak with any PVI provider impacted by this and those who are significantly impacted by cross-boundary placements and identify if any exceptions are required until the Scottish Government comes to a determination.”

- moved by Councillor Kumar, seconded by Councillor Hyslop

Amendment 2

To delete all after bullet point 8 in the motion by Councillor Davidson and replace with:

“Council further notes:

- 9) An Officer briefing note dated 20th Feb on the “Early Learning and Childcare Revised Delivery Programme” stated that the SPB plan had been shared with EC&J Committee in January.
- 10) The SPB “Revised Delivery Plan” shared with EC&J Committee in January did not include mention of phasing out Cross Boundary Places in private providers from August 2024.
- 11) EARLY LEARNING AND CHILDCARE STATUTORY GUIDANCE 2021 provides recommendations for funding of Cross Boundary Places - Point 185: “It is recommended that education authorities meet on a regional or neighbouring basis to identify movement and places across boundaries and reach sustainable and mutually beneficial arrangements.”
- 12) The West Partnership of Local Authorities (Glasgow, East Renfrewshire, Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, South Lanarkshire, North Lanarkshire, East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire) has designed a Cross Boundary Funding protocol to support the implementation of Funding Follows the Child.
- 13) Council notes that the 2021 Statutory Guidance states that:

“It is expected that for many education authorities their admissions policies will include cross-boundary arrangements. Under Funding Follows the Child the choice of setting available to families is not restricted to their own local authority boundary. Therefore, families should be able to access their child’s early learning and childcare entitlement at any setting that meets the National Standard, has a space available and is willing to enter into contract with the education authority.”

and that any suggestion as stated in

“5.2.1 Maximise the use of local authority places by reducing the need to commission external provision and providing places for children from other local authorities whose parents/carers work in Edinburgh.”

Is likely to be in breach of this Statutory Guidance and the policy principle that the Funding Follows the Child.

- 14) Council notes that there should be no funding shortfall to the Council of this policy as the funding should be paid from the home local authority of each child either through a cross border funding arrangement or through a direct contract between the home authority and the EYP. Council also recognises

that some councillors from neighbouring Councils have suggested that funding already flows in this way so no places should be removed in partner providers for out of authority children.

Council therefore agrees:

- 15) That the Chief Internal Auditor should commission an urgent audit of early years funding and cross boundary places to ensure that the arrangements meet the Statutory Guidance and that the Council is ensuring that all funding due is being received or is otherwise offsetting the costs to the childrens' home authorities.
- 16) That the Director bring a Report to the April Education Committee reviewing the SPB's "Revised Delivery Plan" with particular focus on Cross Boundary Places and the overall requirements of the Statutory Guidance to provide parents with flexibility of provider by ensuring the principle in the legislation of "The Funding follows the Child" is complied with. The Report should consider the feasibility of a mechanism to claim funds from other Local Authorities for any Cross Boundary Places in future, what steps CEC has taken to date to agree a Cross Border Funding arrangement with neighbouring Authorities, and the cost to date for CEC of not having such a mechanism in place.
- 17) To speak with any PVI provider who is significantly impacted by cross-boundary placements and identify if any exceptions are required until the Scottish Government comes to a determination."

- moved by Councillor Jones, seconded by Councillor Cowdy

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), Amendment 1 was adjusted and accepted as an addendum to the Motion and Amendment 2 was accepted as an addendum to the Motion.

In accordance with Standing Order 22(13), the Motion and Amendment 2 were accepted as addendums to Amendment 1.

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the Motion (as adjusted)	-	34 votes
For Amendment 1 (as adjusted)	-	28 votes

(For the Motion (as adjusted)): Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Beal, Bennett, Bruce, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalgleish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Doggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, Meagher, Mitchell, Mowat, Munro, Osler, Pogson, Ross, Rust, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For Amendment 1 (as adjusted): Councillors Aston, Bandel, Biagi, Booth, Burgess, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Gardiner, Glasgow, Heap, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McKenzie, McNeese-Meechan, Miller, Mumford, Nicolson, Nols-McVey, O'Neill, Parker, Rae, Staniforth and Work.)

Decision

To approve the following adjusted Motion by Councillor Davidson:

- 1) To note that the meeting of the Education, Children and Families Committee (ECF) on 23 January 2024 considered the Early Years Service (EYS) as part of reports and budget concerns.
- 2) To note that there was a reported £6m cut in funding from the Scottish Government for provision of EYS.
- 3) To note that the report on the EYS set out a range of areas which were “being considered by the SPB (Strategic Programme Board)” to bring the EYS back within budget. These areas included:

5.2.1 Maximise the use of local authority places by reducing the need to commission external provision and providing places for children from other local authorities whose parents/carers work in Edinburgh.
- 4) To note that since the ECF meeting, the SPB had met and made a determination on proceeding with the removal of including cross-boundary families in 1140 funded hours PVI provision. These families could continue to apply for space in CEC EYS settings where there was unused capacity.
- 5) To note the decision by the SPB had not been referred back to ECF or another relevant committee such as Policy and Sustainability for agreement and therefore councillors have voted to “consider” but not to “implement”.
- 6) To note that the Scottish Government was in discussion with local authorities on how cross-boundary placements should be funded /crosscharged.
- 7) To note that following the Education Committee approval, concerns had been raised with councillors about the potential impact on private/voluntary/independent (PVI) nurseries who might rely on funded hours placements from families outwith the Edinburgh Council area.
- 8) To note that that the EYS currently had available capacity for meeting its obligations for 1140 funded hours but the flexibility required by parents meant that a greater percentage were looking to PVI providers to meet their needs. There was therefore provision within CEC not being used and not being funded by the 1140 provision.

- 9) To further note that an Officer briefing note dated 20th Feb on the “Early Learning and Childcare Revised Delivery Programme” stated that the SPB plan had been shared with EC&J Committee in January.
- 10) To note that the SPB “Revised Delivery Plan” shared with EC&J Committee in January did not include mention of phasing out Cross Boundary Places in private providers from August 2024.
- 11) To note that PVI providers and social enterprises had been informed that no new providers would be recruited by the Council but it was unclear how this decision was made. To speak with any PVI provider impacted by this and those who were significantly impacted by cross-boundary placements and identify if any exceptions were required until the Scottish Government came to a determination.”
- 12) To note that EARLY LEARNING AND CHILDCARE STATUTORY GUIDANCE 2021 provided recommendations for funding of Cross Boundary Places - Point 185: “It is recommended that education authorities meet on a regional or neighbouring basis to identify movement and places across boundaries and reach sustainable and mutually beneficial arrangements.”
- 13) To note that the West Partnership of Local Authorities (Glasgow, East Renfrewshire, Renfrewshire, Inverclyde, South Lanarkshire, North Lanarkshire, East Dunbartonshire and West Dunbartonshire) had designed a Cross Boundary Funding protocol to support the implementation of Funding Follows the Child.
- 14) To note that the 2021 Statutory Guidance stated that:

“It is expected that for many education authorities their admissions policies will include cross-boundary arrangements. Under Funding Follows the Child the choice of setting available to families is not restricted to their own local authority boundary. Therefore, families should be able to access their child’s early learning and childcare entitlement at any setting that meets the National Standard, has a space available and is willing to enter into contract with the education authority.”

and that any suggestion as stated in

“5.2.1 Maximise the use of local authority places by reducing the need to commission external provision and providing places for children from other local authorities whose parents/carers work in Edinburgh.”

Was likely to be in breach of this Statutory Guidance and the policy principle that the Funding Follows the Child.

- 15) To note that there should be no funding shortfall to the Council of this policy as the funding should be paid from the home local authority of each child either through a cross border funding arrangement or through a direct contract between the home authority and the EYP. To also recognise that some councillors from neighbouring Councils had suggested that funding already flowed in this way so no places should be removed in partner providers for out of authority children.
- 16) To agree that the Chief Internal Auditor should commission an urgent audit of early years funding and cross boundary places to ensure that the arrangements met the Statutory Guidance and that the Council was ensuring that all funding due was being received or was otherwise offsetting the costs to the childrens' home authorities.
- 17) To agree that the Director bring a Report to the April Education Committee reviewing the SPB's "Revised Delivery Plan" with particular focus on Cross Boundary Places and the overall requirements of the Statutory Guidance to provide parents with flexibility of provider by ensuring the principle in the legislation of "The Funding follows the Child" was complied with. The Report should consider the feasibility of a mechanism to claim funds from other Local Authorities for any Cross Boundary Places in future, what steps CEC had taken to date to agree a Cross Border Funding arrangement with neighbouring Authorities, and the cost to date for CEC of not having such a mechanism in place.
- 18) To agree to speak with any PVI provider who was significantly impacted by cross-boundary placements and identify if any exceptions were required until the Scottish Government came to a determination.

30 Fire on Breadalbane Street – Emergency Motion by Councillor Day

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

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

"Council:

Is aware of the fire that took place in the flats of Breadalbane Street in the early hours last Thursday. All 100 affected residents were safely evacuated and after 12 tireless hours by 70 firefighters, the fire was successfully put out.

Places our sincere gratitude on record to our emergency services for keeping the community safe, to our own colleagues from housing, and health and social care

teams who were quickly on-site providing help to those who needed a safe place to stay, and to recognise the reaction from the local community and businesses alike who rallied to donate food, blankets and warm clothes, the generosity to their neighbours during this difficult time.

Also wishes the safe and speedy recovery of the two firefighters were injured in the line of duty.

Notes that some residents remain displaced and agrees that those who were living in rented accommodation should also be receiving support through their respective landlords or agents. This support has unfortunately not been forthcoming from all organisations who have a duty of care responsibility for their tenants.

Council therefore agrees:

- 1) To hold an event for residents, landlords/agents and factors with council officers and local members to look at the response to this incident and all further outstanding actions.
- 2) To request an update is provided to Council or Committees, as appropriate, on the steps that have been taken by council officers, and partners, as a result of the fire, including information on building standards, fire regulations, cladding and any relevant detail from Fire Scotland.
- 3) To request a report to the next appropriate Regulatory Committee on the licensing of agents, factors and landlords who have not acted fairly in supporting their tenants in this situation.”

Motion

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

- moved by Councillor Day, seconded by Councillor Dalgleish

Amendment

To insert after the third paragraph of the motion by Councillor Day:

“Council expresses sympathy with those residents affected, many of whom have still not been able to access their properties.”

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

Voting

The voting was as follows:

For the motion	-	45 votes
For the amendment	-	17 votes

(For the motion: Lord Provost, Councillors Arthur, Bandel, Beal, Bennett, Booth, Bruce, Burgess, Caldwell, Lezley Marion Cameron, Cowdy, Dalglish, Davidson, Day, Dijkstra-Downie, Duggart, Faccenda, Flannery, Graham, Griffiths, Heap, Jenkinson, Jones, Lang, McKenzie, Meagher, Miller, Mitchell, Mowat, Mumford, Munro, O'Neill, Osler, Parker, Pogson, Rae, Ross, Rust, Staniforth, Thornley, Walker, Watt, Whyte, Young and Younie.

For the amendment: Councillors Aston, Biagi, Campbell, Dixon, Dobbin, Gardiner, Glasgow, Hyslop, Key, Kumar, Macinnes, Mattos Coelho, McFarlane, McNeese-Meehan, Nicolson, Nols-McVey and Work.)

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Day.

31 80th Anniversary One Parent Families Scotland – Motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho

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

“Council notes that 2024 is the 80th Anniversary of One Parent Families Scotland.

Council also notes that today, 21st March, is Single Parents Day, and that this year OPFS’s chosen theme is “Recognition”.

OPFS were founded in 1944, originally named the ‘Scottish Council for Unmarried Mothers’, and are the leading charity working with single parent families in Scotland. They provide expert advice, practical support and campaign with parents to make their voices heard to change the systems, policies and attitudes that disadvantage single parent families.

Their **vision** is of a Scotland where single parent families are celebrated in all their diversity, are treated fairly and live free from discrimination and poverty. Their mission is to amplify the voices of single parent families in their unique role as sole carers and providers and together challenge stigma, poverty and inequality to achieve change.

Their **mission** is to work with and for single parent families, providing support services that enable them to achieve their potential and help create lasting solutions to the poverty and barriers facing many single parents and their children.”

In [Who we are - OPFS is a Scottish charity working with single parent families](#)

Council asks that the Lord Provost mark this significant **80th anniversary** in an appropriate way, notes that 1 in 4 families with children is a single parent family, recognises the strength and love offered by so many single parents in Scotland for their children whilst acknowledging the need for wider supports and structural change to improve the lives of single parent families.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Mattos Coelho.

32 100th Anniversary FetLor Youth Club – Motion by Councillor Nicolson

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

“Council notes that 2024 is the 100th Anniversary of FetLor Youth Club.

Founded in 1924, FetLor Youth Club supports children and young people in North Edinburgh to develop their resilience, their confidence and achieve their potential. By offering a safe place, they support our members to build their confidence, achieve their ambitions and play a positive role in society.

FetLor’s mission is to offer children and young people a safe place where skilled youth workers take the time to build trust and support young people, even in times of challenge, hardship and real need. The club welcomes over 300 young people to their club each week and everyone who goes to FetLor is offered a healthy, hot meal and the opportunity to have fun, develop new skills and enjoy new experiences. All activities and food are provided free of charge to everyone who attends. Club nights, throughout the week, provide members with a safe place where they can enjoy activities and one to one support from the team of qualified youth workers.

Council asks the Lord Provost to appropriately mark this occasion and notes that Councillor Nicolson is sponsoring an event on 06/09/2024 in the Main Council Chamber.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Nicolson.

33 Area Support Team (Children's Hearings) – Motion by Councillor Kumar

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

“Council

- 1) Notes Children’s Hearings Scotland is reforming its current tribunal support model and that allocation of panel members are being centralised.
- 2) Recognises the dedication and commitment of the volunteers in the Area Support Team (AST) who have for many years (and in some cases – decades) worked tirelessly to ensure the delivery of children’s hearing in City of Edinburgh Council.
- 3) Notes that this represents approximately 30,000 hearings held annually. Notes that the roles and functions of the Area Convenor, Deputy Area Convenor, Panel Representatives and Rota Manager have been undertaken on a voluntary basis. This equates to approximately 20-40 voluntary hours per week.
- 4) Requests that the Lord Provosts celebrates writes to all volunteers expressing our gratitude and appreciation for their outstanding contribution for children and young people in Edinburgh.”

- moved by the Lord Provost, seconded by Councillor Lezley Marion Cameron

Decision

To approve the motion by Councillor Kumar.

34 Questions

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

Appendix 1

(As referred to in Act of Council No 34 of 21 March 2024)

QUESTION NO 1

By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question (1) What notification was / is being given to Council staff and contractors on the enforcement of Pavement Parking?

Answer (1) Numerous awareness raising activities have been undertaken to inform Council staff, especially those who drive on behalf of the Council, about the start of enforcement in relation to the new parking rules. These activities included:

- Providing briefings for the contact centre, including provision of Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs);
- An email was sent to all employees with council driving permits;
- Two Newsbeat articles were published; and
- Articles were also published in: Managers News, Colleague News (which includes colleagues without a work email address), the Leader's Report and in Housing and Neighbourhood Environmental Services service area blogs.

The Scottish Government also ran a national publicity campaign, with press articles, radio adverts, social media promotion and on-street advertising, e.g. adverts on phone boxes around the city centre. In addition, there was significant TV interest in Edinburgh being the first Scottish city to start enforcement (with items on BBC Breakfast and other news bulletins).

Information was also displayed on the Council's website homepage, at the car pound, and on lamp post wraps around the city. Thousands of warning flyers were also issued to vehicles in advance of the start of enforcement.

Overall, I feel the Council's media and parking teams have done a fantastic job promoting and implementing enforcement of the ban in Edinburgh.

Question (2) How is feedback of problematic areas gathered from Council staff and contractors so mitigations can be explored to continue to deliver Council services without parking on footways or drop kerbs?

Answer (2) Incorrect footway parking can be reported directly to the Council's enforcement provider through the [report incorrect parking](#) web form.

Officers are also working together (particularly Parking and Waste) to identify and address problems (such as double parking which prevents communal bins from being emptied) to ensure services continue to be delivered effectively.

Council teams, contractors and public transport operators have been contacting the Council directly and working with them on proposed mitigations including the introduction of parking restrictions through a Traffic Regulation Order process.

Enforcement action will be taken against Council and contractor vehicles parked in contravention of the regulations.

QUESTION NO 2

By Councillor Caldwell for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question (1) Trades permits for builders and contractors in Controlled Parking Zones currently finish at 4.30pm. Why is this?

Answer (1) Trades parking permits are valid for all day parking in pay and display and shared use parking places.

However, they can only be used between 9.00am and 4.30pm (Monday to Saturday) and all day on Sundays in residents' parking places within the Controlled Parking Zone.

This is to give residents priority in permit holder only parking places at the start and end of the day.

Question (2) Is there scope to extend the finish time until 5pm or 5.30pm so residents within Controlled Parking Zones are not subject to a potential earlier finish time from tradespeople?

Answer (2) Officers have advised me that they would not recommend extending the hours that Trades permit holders could park in residents' parking places. Allowing residents priority after 4.30pm is the aim of the current scheme. Trades permit holders can park in pay and display and shared use parking places until 6.30pm in the city centre.

Question (3) Is there scope to review to align zones N, S and B with central zones which allow trades permit parking until 6.30pm on a Sunday?

Answer (3) There are currently no plans to extend the operational hours of the Extended (N and S) Controlled Parking Zones (which operate Monday to Friday 8.30am to 5.30pm) or the Priority Parking Areas (B areas) (which operate for a set 90 minutes period between Monday and Friday).

Question (4) How were the annual rates for trades permits set, and are there any incentives for more fuel-efficient or electric registered trades vehicles?

Answer

- (4)** Prices for monthly and annual Trades parking permits are set as part of the Council's budget setting process.

There are currently no incentives for more fuel-efficient or electric vehicles, as Trades permits can be used by several registered company vehicles, but only one at a time.

QUESTION NO 3

**By Councillor Lang for answer by the
Convener of the Development
Management Sub- Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 21 March
2024**

- Question** (1) What is the total amount of Section 75 healthcare contribution money received so far from planning permission 16/06280/FUL?
- Answer** (1) The total amount of healthcare contributions received to date is £57,555.82
- Question** (2) Can the convener confirm that all the money received so far has been transferred to NHS Lothian?
- Answer** (2) No money has been transferred. The separate agreement between the Council and NHS Lothian is currently being developed.
- Question** (3) What remaining Section 75 healthcare contribution money is still to be received from this development?
- Answer** (3) There is one remaining contribution payment (to be paid prior to the completion of the 255th residential property) of £17,902.50 (to be indexed – for example, if paid before the end of March 2024, the payment would be £20,841.72).

QUESTION NO 4

By Councillor Lang for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question

To ask the Convener of Transport and Environment, when does he expect the consultation to be launched on the Granton to Bioquarter tram extension?

Answer

On 1 February 2024, Transport and Environment Committee:

Approved a consultation to begin in Spring 2024 on the Strategic Business Case for taking trams from Granton to the Bioquarter and beyond, with a report is due back to Committee in Autumn 2024.

Committee agreed that the consultation should:

- a) Present objectively the pros and cons of both the Roseburn and Orchard Brae routes.
- b) Provide objective analysis of the following which should be incorporated within the consultation response report to Committee in Autumn 2024:
 - The potential to install a high-quality walking and cycling route alongside the tramline on the Roseburn Path;
 - Market research undertaken to understand what a demographically representative sample of Edinburgh feels about the plans; and
 - The potential to protect and enhance the local ecological network as part of either tram route.
 - The potential to protect and enhance the local ecological network as part of either tram route.

In light of these additional requirements, officers are currently updating the consultation content. A date for the start of the consultation will be confirmed in due course.

QUESTION NO 5

By Councillor Osler for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question

Much work has been done on making the new bin hubs more accessible for all to use. Can the Convener tell me what analysis has been done on making sure that the new bins can actually be used by all, in particular lifting the lids and placing waste within the units for those with limited mobility or of anyone below a certain height now that there is no foot pedal?

Answer

An [Integrated Impact Assessment](#) (IIA) was undertaken in consultation with the Access Panel as part of the project development.

In the IIA, it is acknowledged communal bins are not easily accessible to wheelchair users due to their height, but there are no practicable mitigation measures which can be taken with regard to this on a citywide basis (e.g. using underground bins) or using bins with accessible apertures (as these do not physically work due to waste spilling out of the aperture and also as, once material inside the bin rises above this level, it then renders the aperture unusable). The 1100/1280 bins now being used have a lid which is easier to lift than the previous version.

In order to support users with disabilities, an assisted bin collection can be requested to enable them dispose of their waste and recycling.

In addition, Transport and Environment Committee also agreed that large side loading bins with foot pedal should be discontinued.

QUESTION NO 6

**By Councillor McFarlane for answer
by the Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 21 March
2024**

In the 2024/5 budget £500,000 was allocated “for the Edinburgh 900 Project” and a subsequent amendment was passed at Culture and Communities Committee to agree any monies set aside and not required will be retained and redistributed to Strategic Partner Organisations.

Question (1) Can you detail what these funds are currently intended to be used to deliver as part of Edinburgh 900?

Answer (1) The draft Edinburgh 900 programme currently consists of two key strands: a civic event strand and a community strand.

The community strand is intended to be open for application and will focus on local events. In addition, it is proposed that there will be a small allocation for website development and marketing purposes to ensure the Edinburgh 900 Programme is appropriately branded and promoted.

An Edinburgh 900 Programme Board of Council officers has been convened and will meet for the first time on 20 March 2024 to agree terms of reference and monitor, review, and oversee the Council’s contribution to the Edinburgh 900 programme (based on the funding agreed by the Council on 22 February 2024). The Programme Board will report developments and decisions including the content of the civic strand, regularly to the relevant committee.

Question (2) Do you agree that any funds spent creating an Edinburgh 900 Project Fund should be fully open for bids from grassroots culture organisations?

Answer (2) The proposed purpose of the community strand is to have a fund that is open for application to support and facilitate local celebrations and activities across the city that are based on the anniversary. The Edinburgh Local Heritage Network, a network with representatives from 30 community groups and societies across the city, has been instrumental in providing guidance and input around the creation of a community fund. The development of detailed criteria will be overseen by the Programme Board.

Question (3) Will the Convenor ensure that any and all funding is open for applications by community organisations, third-sector organisations, educational establishments, CEC museums and galleries and our other creative partners who form the year-round fabric of our city and would ensure that Edinburgh's 900 is delivered for the city, by the city and across the entirety of the city?

Answer (3) The community fund is intended to support local activity around Edinburgh 900, and to ensure that communities, citywide, can celebrate the anniversary in their own way. The fund is not intended for Council services, though the Council's heritage services can work in partnership with groups that want to use our collections to tell their stories.

QUESTION NO 7

**By Councillor Heap for answer by the
Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 21 March
2024**

Question

Why, despite assurances that they would all be contacted to offer help, at least one resident who took in Gorgie Farm animals is yet to receive any contact or offer of help?

Answer

At time of taking over the lease, EVOC got in touch with all of those believed to have taken in animals to offer a range of individual support.

If Councillors are aware of individuals who have either not received, or responded to, this approach, then I would be grateful if they could arrange (with the consent of the individuals) to provide their contact details to EVOC who will then contact the individuals directly.

QUESTION NO 8

**By Councillor Heap for answer by the
Convener of the Culture and
Communities Committee at a
meeting of the Council on 21 March
2024**

Question

Has transferring ownership of the Gorgie Farm site to a new Gorgie Farm organisation has been discussed between herself, the Leader and/or any Council official with the Edinburgh Council of Voluntary Organisations?

Answer

No, there have been no discussions on this.

QUESTION NO 9

**By Councillor Heap for answer by the
Leader of the Council at a meeting of
the Council on 21 March 2024**

Question

What checks are in place to ensure the accuracy of eligibility criteria for local social security entitlements on Council websites and websites of ALEOs and other organisations delivering services in partnership with the Council, including Edinburgh Leisure?

Answer

The content on the Council website is checked by identified publishers in each service. This activity is formally undertaken twice a year, with more regular updates undertaken where a change needs to be communicated.

To ensure the ongoing accuracy of benefit and welfare information, links are typically provided to the administering body e.g. Social Security Scotland, DWP etc. This ensures the information is current.

The websites of AELOs and other Partners remain the responsibility of the specific organisations, however, it would be possible to share the Council's website welfare content to allow them to review their information and ensure it is up to date.

QUESTION NO 10

By Councillor Heap for answer by the Leader of the Council at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question

Has the leader or Council officials approached, for the purposes of identifying Edinburgh families who are eligible for but do not claim Scottish Child Payment, (a) the Department for Work and Pensions to request access to data on those who claim Scottish Child Payment qualifying benefits but not SCP itself and (b) Social security Scotland to request data on those who claim SCP?

Answer

The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) does not permit the Council to use data for this purpose. As a result it is not possible to cross reference with any potential Social Security Scotland data to identify those who are eligible for, but do not claim Scottish Child Payment. Access and use of DWP data is strictly controlled and the Council will be part of a routine external audit regarding this access in October 2024.

The Council continues to promote the Scottish Child payment on its website and in related welfare engagements.

QUESTION NO 11

By Councillor Heap for answer by the Vice-Chair of the Edinburgh Integration Joint Board at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question (1) Can they please explain the nature of the insurance and PVG checks that were not done on the large healthcare provider that are referred to in report 8.3 (p.13) presented to the GRBV Committee on 20 February 2024?

Answer (1) We have progressed the matter with the provider in question. We have since received assurances that PVG checks are and have always been routinely carried out for anyone who requires it and that processes are in place to ensure this happens prior to commencing employment. Again, appropriate checks are undertaken to ensure insurance requirements are in place.

Question (2) Can they please detail what enquiries have been made to ascertain whether the problem regarding a lack of insurance and PVG checks on the large healthcare provider that is referred to in report 8.3 (p.13) presented to the GRBV Committee on 20 February 2024 are not more widespread?

Answer (2) We have sought assurance from the wider market and can confirm there are no issues with PVG not being in place and that appropriate insurance checks are in place. We routinely assess for compliance in respect of insurance and PVG check via targeted contract monitoring.

Question (3) Has the failure of a large healthcare provider to conduct PVG and insurance checks that is referred to in report 8.3 (p.13) presented to the GRBV Committee on 20 February 2024 presented a risk to service users and/or staff?

Answer (3) As per response to Q(1) we have received assurances from the provider in question that appropriate recruitment and selection procedures, including PVG and Insurance checks are in place and routinely carried out.

QUESTION NO 12

By Councillor Aston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question

Further to the answer to my question 10.24 at full council on 22 June 2023, please will the convener provide an update on progress towards the introduction of a school street at Stanwell Street to serve Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce?

Answer

During development of the School Travel Plan for Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce, only one parent questionnaire response requested a school street at Stanwell Street with more parent responses requesting parking restrictions.

The potential for a school street in Stanwell Street is, however, something that officers will investigate further and will consult on with residents and the school.

Officers are also progressing the following actions around Bun-sgoil Taobh na Pairce:

- Investigate further speed reducing measures on Bonnington Road;
- Create a cycle gap at the junction of West Bowling Green Street with The Quilts; and
- Run a Parksmart Campaign with the school.

QUESTION NO 13

By Councillor O'Neill for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

- Question** (1) As of February 2024, how many people have a disabled National Entitlement Card (NEC) issued by the City of Edinburgh Council?
- Answer** (1) Using current data, 1,525 cards have been issued since February 2023.
- Question** (2) In the past year, how many people applied for a disabled NEC?
- Answer** (2) The system only keeps a record of approved applications. As noted in answer (1), 1,525 cards have been approved.
- Question** (3) How many journeys were taken on a Lothian bus last year using a disabled NEC?
- Answer** (3) There are two categories of disabled NEC cards, one for the visually impaired and one for other disabilities. In total, there were 6.3 million journeys taken on Lothian Buses last year using a disabled NEC card. This is a reminder of how much people with disabilities in Edinburgh rely on public transport.
- Question** (4) How many officers are dedicated to the administration of the disabled NEC scheme?
- Answer** (4) It is not possible to identify the dedicated resource that supports the administration of the disabled NEC scheme. This is because the activity is undertaken by team that supports various services. At this time, nine Contact Centre team members are trained to take calls and process emails that support all bus cards, with more than 250 Library staff potentially providing face to face support for the NEC process.
- Question** (5) How much does the disabled NEC scheme cost for the Council?

- Answer** (5) Due to the configuration of the team and the wider activities that are undertaken, it is not possible to accurately confirm the specific service cost.
- Question** (6) How much would it cost to allow users of the disabled NEC to travel for free on Lothian Night Buses?
- Answer** (6) Lothian Buses are unable to confirm the cost as current usage levels are unknown (as all passengers pay full fare and no records are available to determine if a passenger may or may not have a disabled NEC).

QUESTION NO 14

**By Councillor Mitchell for answer by
the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 21 March 2024**

Please could the Convener confirm that:

Question (1) the information provided in response to Question 11 on 14th December 2023 is accurate.

Answer (1) Yes, officers have confirmed that the information provided in December was accurate.

Question (2) How many metres of single-yellow lines have been removed within CPZ 5A to accommodate bin hubs.

Answer (2) Officers have confirmed that this information is not held in a form that would easily enable it to be provided.

Question (3) How many metres of double-yellow lines have been removed with CPZ 5A to accommodate bin hubs.

Answer (3) Officers have confirmed that this information is not held in a form that would easily enable it to be provided.

QUESTION NO 15

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question (1) Given that approximately 25% of high school age pupils in Edinburgh attend independent schools, what assessment has the Council made of the numbers who would transfer to local authority schools should there be an imposition of VAT on independent school fees under a future government?

Answer (1) The [2019 report to ECF](#) (see section 4,13-4.19) officers set out the demographics of school rolls, including the information available on independent schools.

Council officers have met with representatives from the Independent Sector (IS) to discuss the impact that could ensue should the charitable status of IS be revoked as per the Labour Party's manifesto. IS representatives are preparing a national strategic analysis and have indicated that they will share the Edinburgh data with us. Meanwhile a steering group has been set up to explore and scope short, medium and longer term solutions. As school capacities are already under review to ensure that timetables run efficiently and that all learning and pastoral spaces are used to their maximum, this information will be used, when complete, to scope any potential increases in capacity.

In addition, digital consortia and other plans are being explored to improve the offer in local authority schools, and plans are in place to invite the IS to partner with city schools, should that operating model suit both needs.

Question (2) What are the capital and revenue implications for the Council of accommodating an increase in school pupils in such circumstances?

Answer (2) Scenario planning including estimating capital and revenue implications will be part of the ongoing work of the steering group which has been established.

QUESTION NO 16

By Councillor Whyte for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Following the work on Trams to Newhaven, “Spaces for People” and other projects a large number of planters have been placed on Edinburgh’s streets including within the World Heritage Site.

Question **(1)** Does the Council have a complete inventory of street planter assets? If so can this please be published? If not, can one please be produced?

The inventory should provide a list of streets, the number of planters located in those streets, a description of the materials they are made of (wood, metal, mixed), the date they were ‘installed’, the project or funding stream that initially purchased them (i.e. how they came to be there) and whether they are regarded as a permanent or temporary feature of the public realm.

Answer **(1)** The Council does not currently have a single inventory of street planter assets. Officers are currently investigating the potential to combine existing data to create an inventory which includes, where possible, the information requested in this question.

In response to this Council Question, a summary of the information available for individual projects is provided below.

Question **(2)** Has a list of all street planters, particularly those which are blocking roads, been shared or is continuously available in an up to date form with the emergency services?

Answer **(2)** The emergency services are consulted as a matter of course of all temporary, experimental and permanent Traffic Regulation Orders. The information provided to them includes details of all measures, such as road closures or

other restrictions on vehicle movement, contained within those Orders. The information does not specifically cover the locations of planters, but rather the measures that enable planters to be placed so as to reflect the effect of the associated Order.

- Question** (3) What is the total cost to the taxpayer of acquiring street planters (both Council and other public funding including through methods such as Sustrans)?
- Answer** (3) The total cost is not known. The cost of some planters has been provided in Table 2 below.
- Question** (4) How many street planters are located within the World Heritage Site area?
- Answer** (4) See Table 1 below.
- Question** (5) Is there an agreed City of Edinburgh Council design or style for street planters? When and how was that agreed and what engagement took place with local communities and Edinburgh World Heritage? If there is not, how are designs chosen?
- Answer** (5) There is no agreed style for the planters within the World Heritage Site. However, the planters in place were installed around 2010, in partnership with the Council (Planning and Roads teams) and Edinburgh World Heritage.
- If new planters are proposed, these would be discussed with the Council's planning and roads teams prior to installation.
- Question** (6) How many of the street planters which City of Edinburgh Council is responsible for are actually planted with any flowers, shrubs or trees and what method is used to ensure species chosen are suitable for such planting?
- Answer** (6) Information available is provided in Table 1 below.
- Question** (7) When will those street planters that are not currently planted up be completed with a planting scheme?
- Answer** (7) This information is not currently available.

- Question** (8) What is the weeding and replanting plan/regime and performance standards for the street planters? Have communities been consulted/involved in determining this?
- Answer** (8) There are no performance standards set for the weeding and planting of street planters.
- Question** (9) Who is responsible and accountable for the maintenance of the street planters including initial planting and future maintenance of planting? What are their performance standards and objectives in relation to these assets?
- Answer** (9) The information received in preparation for this response is provided in Table 1 below.
- Table 3 provides details of planters which have been adopted and are maintained by local people. To support this, Inch Nursery provides plants, compost, tools and advice.
- Question** (10) How can members of the public or Councillors report problems with planters including broken and damaged items and lack of planting or the need for weeding and what is the performance standard for responding to reports of failures with our street planter assets?
- Answer** (10) Councillors can report issues with planters maintained by the Council's Parks and Openspace Operations Team can be reported by emailing the Neighbourhood Environmental Services team. For all other planters, issues can be reported by emailing customer.care@edinburgh.gov.uk.

Table 1 - Planter Summary – Information collated for question response

Location	Number	Project/Programme	Planting and Maintenance Arrangements (if known)
Moffat Way at Collier Place	1		
Moffat Way at St Francis Way	1		
Collier Place at Collier Place beside no. 10	1		
Collier Place at Hay Gardens	1		
Sighthill Loan at Sighthill Avenue	1		
Sighthill Loan at Sighthill Gardens	1		
Montpelier at Montpelier Park	3	Spaces for People - Schools	Maintenance and watering arrangement for the duration of the contract.
Bruntsfield Avenue at Bruntsfield Place (beside cycle hangar)	1		
Sciennes Road at west school gate	2		
Sciennes Road at Livingstone Place	2		
Paisley Drive at Paisley Avenue	1		
Paisley Drive at Meadowfield Drive	1		
Magdalene Drive at Magdalene Gardens	1		

Magdalene Drive at no.35	1		
Magdalene Drive at Magdalene Avenue	1		
Prestonfield Road at no. 71	1		
Clearburn Road at Prestonfield Road	1		
Clearburn Road at Prestonfield Avenue	1		
Lampacre Road at Tylers Acre Road	1		
Lampacre Road at Tylers Acre Gardens	1		
Tylers Acre Avenue at Tylers Acre Gardens	1		
Baberton Mains Wynd at Baberton Mains Drive	1		
Broomhall Drive at South Gyle Road	1		
Wester Broom Place at South Gyle Road	1		
Craighall Terrace at Craighall Road	1		
Featherhall Road at Featherhall Terrace	1		
Manse Street at Manse Road	1		
Oxgangs Green outside no. 18	1		
Crarae Avenue at Ravelston Dykes	1		

Ivanhoe Crescent at Rutherford Drive	1		
Woodstock Place at Rutherford Drive	1		
Ivanhoe Crescent at Glenvarloch Crescent	1		
Gracemount Drive at Balmwell Grove	1		
Gracemount Drive at entry into car park to 34/36	1		
Gracemount Drive at entry into school car park	1		
Gracemount Drive at Balmwell Avenue	1		
Balmwell Avenue at Captains Row	1		
Wester Drylaw Avenue at Groathill Road North	1		
Wester Drylaw Avenue at No. 96	1		
Wardieburn Street E at Boswall Parkway	1		
Wardieburn Street E at Wardieburn Terrace	1		
Wardieburn Street W at Boswall Parkway	1		
Wardieburn Street W at Wardieburn Terrace	1		
Moredun Park Street at fence to Scotmid delivery entrance	1		
	1		

Moredun Park Street Moredun Park Loan	1		
Forth View Crescent at Curriehill Road	1		
Forth View Crescent at Palmer Road	1		
Bonaly Brae at Bonaly Grove	1		
Redhall Grove at its junction with Redhall Road	1		
Redhall Grove at its junction with Redhall Drive	2		
West Pilton Crescent at West Pilton Bank	1		
West Pilton Crescent at Pennywell Road	1		
Buckstone Circle at High Buckstone	1		
Buckstone Loan East at Buckstone Close	1		
Canaan Lane	1		
Silverknowes Road	2		
Silverknowes Road South			
King's Place – north end at roundabout	12	Spaces for People – Various	Maintenance and watering arrangement for the duration of the contract.
Links Place – between Salamander Place and Gladstone Place	3		

Hope Lane – North of Christian Grove	2		
A71 London Road – Junction with Hillside Crescent and Junction with Southfield Road West	4		
A90 Queensferry Road – Junctions with Buckingham Terrace and Claredon Crescent	4		
Seafield Road East	6	Fillyside Road Crossing	Maintenance arrangement in place for the duration of the contract.
Coburg Street	6	Leith Connections	All planted with a mix of native and non-native pollinator species. Maintenance contract in place for the duration of the contract.
Sandport Street	11		
Burgess Street	8		
Tolbooth Wynd	1		
John’s Place	21		
Wellington Place	5		
Elm Row	2	Trams to Newhaven	Contractor responsible for defects following planting for a period of one year. No
Haddington Place	2		
Brunswick Street	2		

Croall Place	3		responsibility for third party damage.
Albert Street	2		
Crichton Place	1		
Middlefield	2		
Leith Walk	14		
Pilrig Street	1		
Iona Street	4		
Arthur Street	1		
Jamieson Place	1		
Constitution Street	7		
Blenheim Place	3		
Waverley Bridge	10	Installed circa 2010	Not known
City Chambers	12 (11 window boxes also)		Maintained by the Council's Parks and Openspace Operations team
Grassmarket	18		Some maintenance carried out by residents

High Street	8		
Tollcross	3		
High Riggs	3		
Mound Precinct	6		
Lauriston Place	1		
George Street	Not Known		
Rose Street	Not Known		
Waverley Court Entrance	2		Maintained by the Council's Parks and Openspace Operations team
Morrison Street, Festival Square and Conference Square	20 (including tree planters)		Maintained by the Council's Parks and Openspace Operations team
TOTAL	274		

Table 2 – Costs where known

Project/Programme	Cost of Installation	Cost of Maintenance
Spaces for People (including schools)	£67,492	£7,584
Leith Connections	c. £123,000 (fully funded by Sustrans Places for Everyone)	Not known

Table 3 – Planters adopted and maintained by residents

Location	Quantity	Maintenance
Causewayside	6	Supported by Inch Nursery – compost, plants and advice provided
Ferry Road	3	
Walter Scott Avenue	4	
Meadows	5	
Old Dalkeith Road	1	
Marchmont	7	

QUESTION NO 17

**By Councillor Nols-McVey for answer
by the Convener of the Transport and
Environment Committee at a meeting
of the Council on 21 March 2024**

Question

Will all surveys conducted by the Council, tram project or any other body acting on behalf of the council into the condition of 4 Anchorfield and the attributed causes be published?

If yes, when and at what committee will this information be presented to councillors?

If no, why not?

Answer

The Survey Report commissioned by the Council to enable the temporary make safe works to be completed, has been shared with owners of the tenement.

A report relating to Anchorfield has been instructed as part of an ongoing claim against the Trams to Newhaven project (TTN). An insurance claim is a legal process, and there is no automatic right to compensation. The report commissioned as part of the ongoing claim will assess whether the TTN is liable for any of the allegations made as part of the claim. The report is legally privileged as it is prepared in contemplation of litigation and is not subject to disclosure except in the event of court proceedings.

QUESTION NO 18

By Councillor Kumar for answer by the Convener of the Education, Children and Families Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question (1) Can the Convener confirm the entire allocation of money approved in the budget will be added to the DSM?

Answer (1) Yes.

Question (2) Can the Convener confirm the additional allocation per school?

Answer (2) DSM is delegated to headteachers and therefore we are working with the finance board to agree allocation.

Question (3) Can the Convener confirm if the budget proposals next year will include the £8.2m of cuts to education?

Answer (3) Budget allocations for next year will be considered through the 2025/26 revenue budget process with final decisions taken by Council in February 2025, following consideration of key funding parameters including the Local Government Finance Settlement and proposals on Council Tax.

QUESTION NO 19

**By Councillor Key for answer by the
Convener of the Housing,
Homelessness and Fair Work
Committee at a meeting of the
Council on 21 March 2024**

Question **(1)** Of the 7,200 homes reported as long-term empty by City of Edinburgh in 'Housing statistics: Empty properties and second homes' report published by Scottish Government on 12 December 2023, how many of these were owned by the local authority or were last occupied as social housing via a housing association or other social housing provider?

Answer **(1)** It is not possible to provide information on how many empty homes were previously council houses at the time of reporting these figures to the Scottish Government. However, in terms of social housing relating to housing associations, 267 of these properties were last occupied as social housing.

Question **(2)** Of these properties, how many had been empty for a) six months or longer at the time information was collected for the report; and b) how many had been empty for twelve months or longer at the time information was collected for the report?

Answer **(2)** a) 106 of the properties that were last occupied as social housing were empty for 6 months or longer at the time the information was collected for the report.

 b) 64 of the properties that were last occupied as social housing were empty for 12 months or longer at the time the information was collected for the report.

QUESTION NO 20

By Councillor Aston for answer by the Convener of the Transport and Environment Committee at a meeting of the Council on 21 March 2024

Question **(1)** Given the rollout of the new style travel tracker displays is due to be completed by March 2024 but alignment with real time information as provided in the TfE app is not scheduled to be delivered until June 2024, can the Convenor confirm that no bus stops in the city will be providing accurate up to the minute public transport service information on Lothian Buses services until at least June, i.e. a three month period?

Answer **(1)** As reported to Transport and Environment Committee earlier this month, a VPN (Virtual Private Network) link has been implemented between Lothian Buses new Real Time System and the City of Edinburgh Council's On-Street Content Management System (CMS) to allow testing to begin on Lothian Buses' Service Interface for Real Time Information (SIRI) data feed (the feed that will transfer their data to the Council's system).

Testing SIRI data feeds can be a complex process and both Lothian and the Council must be sure that the end product provides a high level of reliable real time information to customers.

The testing may prove that a reliable solution is in place well before June 2024, but given the volume and complexity of the data exchange and the likelihood of development work being required to overcome some issues, it is not currently possible to confirm this.

Question **(2)** Will information be presented to councillors on the delivery of the system, effectiveness of the delivery and the value for money of the system."

Answer **(2)** Transport and Environment Committee will now receive monthly Business Bulletin updates on progress with the testing and will be updated when the system is operating

effectively with real time information from all bus operators. The effectiveness of the system and value for money can only be measured when development work is complete, and a comparison can be made against the old system. However, I am sure value for money would have been - considered when the 2017-22 administration procured the system.